



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, DECEMBER 8, 2015

No. 177

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
December 8, 2015.

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

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

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

SUPPORTING THE MENTAL HEALTH NEEDS OF OUR SOLDIERS AND VETERANS

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, late last month President Barack Obama signed into law the National Defense Authorization Act of 2015, otherwise known as the NDAA.

Included in the legislation was language directing the United States Department of Defense to study a mental health assessment for all incoming

military recruits. This assessment would then be used as a baseline throughout the service careers of our servicemen and -women.

This was included in the Medical Evaluation Parity for Servicemembers, or MEPS, Act, which I introduced earlier this year. Now, I believe this assessment is essential in addressing the suicide epidemic which has affected our military members and veterans over the past several years.

Mr. Speaker, when it comes to suicide within the ranks of our American heroes, commissioned studies have been implemented by the Department of Defense in the past.

We have found that, for over 60 percent of those individuals who attempt or commit suicide while serving in the military, it was not their first attempt. Their first attempt was before they joined the military. This is about pre-existing conditions that have failed to have been recognized.

Mr. Speaker, if you are like me and you assume that it is what people see on the battlefield—I have been to Afghanistan. I have been to Iraq in the past. It is the horrors of war that drive people, largely, to suicide.

But these studies, Mr. Speaker, have found that the large majority of those individuals who attempt or commit suicide while in the military never saw deployment. They were not in combat situations. Again, it speaks to pre-existing conditions that have not been adequately identified and addressed. This is a matter that really has been thoroughly examined in recent years.

So while I am happy that it is in the National Defense Authorization Act, I urge the Pentagon to act quickly to take steps to better assess the mental health of our servicemen and -women at the time of enlistment with this commonsense, baseline evaluation.

These heroes deserve all the information that we can provide in order to make their lives a bit easier.

CONGRATULATING THE PORTLAND, OREGON, TIMBERS ON THEIR MAJOR LEAGUE SOCCER CUP VICTORY

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor this morning barely able to talk. But not having much of a voice is common in Portland, Oregon, these days, as fans shouted themselves hoarse after the Portland Timbers' stunning victory over the Columbus Crew on Sunday, winning the Major League Soccer Cup.

There is no doubt that my hometown of Portland, Oregon, is Soccer City, USA. Fans continue to prove the point with a huge celebration today.

I want to congratulate the Timbers for an amazing season and for being such a huge part, indeed, of Portland, and all of Oregon.

This season had it all: injuries and bumps along the way that made Sunday's result seem highly unlikely. But under the leadership and direction of Coach Caleb Porter, the Timbers stayed focused and made course corrections that led them to a national championship, finishing with a flourish.

This team has so many heroes that it is impossible, in the time I have, to give them their due recognition. But I want to give special mention to new U.S. citizen Darlington Nagbee; Diego Chara; Rodney Wallace; Jake Gleason; and the old, salty dog, Jack Jewsbury, all of whom have been with the Timbers since our inaugural season.

I also want to highlight the Maestro, Diego Valeri; defenders Liam Ridgeway and Nat Borchers, he of the beard; as well as goalkeeper Adam Kwarasay for their heroic efforts this season.

Merritt Paulson and his management team deserve recognition for their passion for the support and their love for our city.

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.

H9027

Of course, you can't mention the Portland Timbers without talking about, as the song goes, the greatest football supporters the world has ever seen, the Timbers Army. Your dedication to team, town, and country is an inspiration and very much in evidence in Columbus this weekend.

Mr. Speaker, let me conclude by reminding all of America and several places in Canada that, in case you didn't get the hint with Timber Joey and his chain saw, there is no pity in the Rose City.

DONALD TRUMP MUST END HIS PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDACY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. JOLLY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call on Donald Trump to withdraw his candidacy for the White House. We face a security test in this Nation, a national security test. It is a real and audible threat.

I have been most critical of the President's foreign policy. It is an area that, respectfully, I have the greatest disagreement with this administration. I have begged him in correspondence, and I have used the word "beg" to do more to defeat the threat of terror.

I believe his Oval Office address Sunday night, frankly, was forgettable. He spent 5 minutes suggesting he was going to do nothing different to defeat ISIS. He spent 5 minutes lecturing Congress, and he spent 5 minutes lecturing the American people.

You see, we do face a security test that I believe the President's policies have underestimated. But we also face a test of our commitment to religious freedom, one of the basic freedoms upon which our Nation was founded. We are either going to defend that religious freedom or we are not.

It should be heartbreaking to every American that we have a frontrunner in the Presidential race that suggests there will be a religious test for anybody who wishes to come to our shores. It is an affront to the very principles upon which our Nation was founded.

We broke from a monarch that suggested all freedom and liberty was vested in the Crown and then the Crown would distribute freedom and liberty to the people. We founded a Nation based on what Jefferson called the natural rights of man, that we were, indeed, endowed by our Creator with very fundamental rights.

Mr. Speaker, I am a born-again Christian. I believe in the saving grace of the Jesus Christ that I call my God. The beautiful thing about this country is I can stand here on the House floor, among my peers and in front of the Nation, and declare that faith without fear of any reprisal.

But if Donald Trump has his way, we may not have the liberty to do that anymore. It is a freedom that has been fought for, from the Founders of our

country, and generation upon generation of men and women who have worn the uniform of the Armed Forces and defended it, for the security of our Nation, and for the freedom of people.

We are a Nation worried about our security, rightfully so. It is why we are calling on the President to do so much more to defeat this terror. It is why we are begging the President for a stronger national security test.

We must always insist on a security test, but we must never require a religious test.

It is time that my side of the aisle has one less candidate in the race for the White House. It is time for Donald Trump to withdraw from the race.

CONFIDENTIAL INFORMANTS

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to congratulate the gentleman from Florida (Mr. JOLLY) on his statement. I thought that showed some courage. It reflects the values of a lot of people here in this House and in the United States of America. It needed to be said.

Mr. Speaker, some of us on both sides of the aisle have been working hard to reform our marijuana laws to allow more State flexibility in how marijuana is regulated and treated commercially and medically.

What binds us together across a broad ideological spectrum is our strong belief that we must be able to distinguish between marijuana and seriously dangerous and lethal drugs: meth, heroin, crack, cocaine, and prescription drugs as well.

People don't rob corner groceries and liquor stores to get money to supply their habit of marijuana. They do that for meth, crack, cocaine, heroin. It is a different, different drug.

The movement that is occurring here in this Congress and around our country is ongoing and growing rapidly, thanks to open minds, common sense, and some people having the courage to stand up for things they know are true because they, themselves, their friends, their family, and others have smoked marijuana, and they have seen that it is not a great problem.

Sunday night, I and millions of Americans watched a disturbing "60 Minutes" piece on the issue of confidential informants. Lesley Stahl was the host. It focused on how local law enforcement appears to be increasingly using young people as informants without regard to their rights or their safety.

It is being done without distinguishing between marijuana and the dangerous drugs that affect our society and our safety: heroin, meth, crack, cocaine, opiates.

Here is how it works. A young person is cited for violating drug laws, usually possessing a small amount of marijuana and perhaps having sold some to

a friend, which happens regularly in high school and college—not that high school kids should be doing it, but it is a fact, and so are college kids. The police tell them that, unless they agree to wear a wire and implicate a number of their friends, often close friends, they could be sentenced to a long prison term, the maximum permitted by law.

They are cornered, frightened. Any person in that situation would take that deal. Most of them do it under supreme duress, and they do it without the presence of a lawyer or the knowledge that they have a right to a lawyer.

Most of them seem to do it without even telling their parents because the police tell them: Don't tell anybody. This is just between you and me. You need to do this or you are going to prison for a long time.

In the case of Rachel Hoffman and Andrew Sadek, it cost them their lives. Rachel had dealt a small amount of marijuana. They got her into dealing with people that dealt heavy drugs and guns and got her to try to make a big purchase. They didn't do a very good job of covering her. Rachel was murdered.

Mr. Sadek was murdered, also, as a confidential informant, without police protecting him.

The underpinnings for this counterproductive and dangerous behavior by some of our police are the very drug laws that many of us are trying to reform. This is wrong. I hope my colleagues will work with me to help stop it.

President Eisenhower warned us about the military industrial complex and its effect on our country and our budgets.

We need to be warned about the law enforcement-marijuana industrial complex, which is driven by monies that they get from busts and perverts justice and ruins people's lives and takes away their college scholarships, their opportunity to have housing, on occasion, and their opportunities to get jobs and, indeed, their liberty.

□ 1015

In the meantime, it is time for the Department of Justice to take a close look at how this behavior not only threatens to ruin young lives but, in some cases, to end those lives.

As the Department of Justice, in the aftermath of all too many instances of police overreach and overreaction, works with local communities to educate law enforcement on more just and humane practices, the issue of forcing young people to be confidential informants should be added to its list.

Mr. Speaker, we will be working on legislation. I hope we have people to join us. This is just part of the scourge that has come across this Nation, ruining people's lives because of the misunderstanding of marijuana starting in the 1930s with Harry Anslinger and continuing in the 1970s with Richard

Nixon, who used it as a political tool. It needs to stop.

PHARMACY BENEFIT MANAGERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOLLY). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I come here today, as I have on many other occasions, to discuss an issue that is close to my heart, but it is also close to every small community and every large community across the country, and that is the plight of our community pharmacists. Community pharmacists are struggling to survive each and every day in light of the anti-competitive behavior of pharmacy benefit managers, PBMs.

Let me state up front: I have no problem with a company doing business. I have no problem with them playing in the bounds of what is fair and what is legal, and PBMs have a role in the marketplace. However, what we found out just in the last few weeks in the Judiciary Committee in a hearing is there is still a lack of regulation, enforcement, and transparency, and it is threatening the very existence of our community pharmacists in which the PBMs are acting not as competitors but, many times, as bullies.

To make matters even worse—and this is what was amazing to me—community pharmacists cannot even speak out about the appalling practices of the PBMs that they are forced to do business with because, when they do, the repercussions are swift and severe. It has been amazing to me to talk all across the country to community pharmacists who simply want to talk about what is going on in their business model in which they are put at a distinct disadvantage, and yet there are many of them saying: I can't say anything publicly because I know I will be reprimanded or my contract will be changed or my contract will be withdrawn, and I will be out of business.

Mr. Speaker, that is just wrong. No matter what is said, we have seen firsthand that in relation to State laws that have been in response to this issue, the States have enacted transparency reform with generic drug prices and reimbursement systems called the MAC transparency laws.

In fact, to date, 24 States have enacted such laws. The goals of these laws is to increase transparency and provide structure around the generic drug pricing and reimbursement system. But when community pharmacists speak out in support of these reasonable reforms, the PBM community has retaliated through business lawsuits against the State and even discussing it in the contracts with community pharmacists saying: Well, it would be better if we get these laws repealed.

There is just a problem here. When you have the ability to force your competitors to be audited by you and to be controlled by you to where there is no

transparency, where there are issues of community pharmacists simply barely able to survive, the PBMs are not representing the best interests of consumers; the PBMs are representing themselves. If they were truly acting in the best interest of consumers, as they claim, they would not oppose virtually every single transparency reform effort on the State and the Federal level. In fact, it is really interesting. They come to Congress and say one thing to Members, and then they turn around and behave however they wish in the pharmacy marketplace without fear of enforcement or oversight.

As I said from this floor a few weeks ago, I will continue this fight because they can't audit me. They can audit my community pharmacists, and my community pharmacists are scared because they know their very livelihood is being put out by those who would come with shiny objects and savings that many times never materialize, but at the same time funneling money to their own businesses.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to change, and it is time to change it now. We must preserve pharmacy access for patients, especially those in rural areas like north Georgia, and we must put an end to the bullying that seems to be going on.

What is amazing is a PBM can make a mistake and say that a pharmacy was not part of the new network, and when called on that, saying that we are part of that new network, they say: Well, we will send out a retraction when we get around to it. Pharmacists lose business based on these kinds of letters, and, yet the PBMs say: Oh, well, we will get around to it when we can.

That is why I am proposing H.R. 244, because community pharmacists routinely incur losses of approximately \$100 or more on prescriptions because PBMs reimburse pharmacies well below their cost to acquire and dispense generic prescription drugs, and they have skyrocketed in price. The PBMs may wait weeks or months to update the reimbursement benchmarks they use to compensate pharmacies while drug prices increase virtually overnight. This situation jeopardizes pharmacists' ability to continue to serve patients because it leaves community pharmacists with unsustainable losses.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge you and other colleagues to cosponsor H.R. 244. This reasonable legislation would require PBMs to update their maximum allowable cost benchmark every 7 days to better reflect market costs and allow pharmacists to know the source by which PBMs set reimbursements for their community pharmacist.

Many times we come to the floor fighting for businesses both large and small. But this is a time in which we are coming and I am coming to the floor fighting for community pharmacists who many times are the main source of health care in a community.

They are the ones that are trusted. They are the ones that are needed. And it is time for this body to stand up for them, against the anti-competitive tactics of PBMs and the bullying behavior that has got to stop.

OUR CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, in a conversation that I had recently, speaking about the other body, it was mentioned that that body is the deliberative body. There are opportunities for collaboration between Members, Democrat and Republican. But I am in the people's House, and I believe that Members also have the duty and commitment to collaborate and to be deliberative and thoughtful.

This morning, I would like to offer just a number of points about our wonderful Constitution.

I first want to begin by saying this is Restore the Vote Tuesday, and I am wearing a pin that highlights the importance of voting and the responsibilities of our civic constituency. My colleague from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL) is on the floor, and I join her in recognizing how special this right is and to know that many of us—I attempted to register sharecroppers in South Carolina, North Carolina, and Georgia in my college days, people who were still frightened about voting. I saw what the 1965 Voting Rights Act did, and we need to restore it.

We have an election coming up in Houston on Saturday, and I want to say to my constituents that we will do all that we can to prevent any prohibitive barriers from voting, from your voting.

That is a right, Mr. Speaker, just as it is the right to have the right to freedom of expression, freedom of speech, and freedom of religion.

Mr. Speaker, one of our Presidential candidates took to the airwaves in the last 24 hours to pronounce or announce or demagogue, saying that no Muslims should be allowed in this country. Mr. Speaker, I believe that we, as Members of Congress, should be empathetic and sympathetic to the concern of the American people. Maybe some are frightened. I do not make light of that.

I have been on the Homeland Security Committee since 9/11, and I now serve as the ranking member of the Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations Subcommittee. I take these obligations very seriously. For any of us who have been to Ground Zero even at that time and since that time, it is seared in our minds.

I know the people in San Bernardino, those of us reflecting on Paris, but now our own brothers and sisters realize that government must act in a way for Americans to feel safe and secure. But I would say that having met and stood with the Muslim community in my district on Sunday, late in the afternoon,

we stood in front of the Mickey Leland Federal building with Christians alike. Arm in arm we prayed. But I just stood back and listened to one Muslim representative after another come and proclaim their patriotism and denouncing the violence and distortion of their faith.

A young imam who had just moved from New Jersey just moved me. He began to articulate the elements of the Koran: benevolence and love. As a 25-year-old, he stood up to denounce this violence. That is the kind of American partnership that we need.

When we concluded that meeting, we had a press conference and vigil. We said that we would form a task force. I encourage Members throughout this body to have task forces on this very issue: How can we help?

Then as the President spoke—I want to thank him, for maybe people were not listening—the President was very clear that he is going to take the hunt and hunt down terrorist plotters to any country where they are. The President also indicated he will continue to provide training and equipment to Iraqi and Syrian forces and work with friends and allies to stop ISIL's operations; and with American leadership, the international community has begun to establish a process and timeline to pursue cease-fires and a political resolution to the Syrian war. Our President is focused. The Congress needs to be focused.

Yes, we need to be able to put forward legislative ideas, not contentious. No terrorist should have the ability to get a gun. Therefore, we should pass this bill that indicates that any terrorist on the terrorist watch list should not be able to buy a gun in the United States of America. I have legislation in the Judiciary Committee that we are preparing to come to the floor: no-fly for foreign terrorists, stopping them in their tracks, from wherever they come from, from getting on any plane coming to the United States of America. That is not hostility. That is saying to the American people we care. As they say in the community: We have got your back.

Then we must go back to the alert system, Mr. Speaker. We did it after 9/11. We understand the Secretary is offering that thought, the red alert. It is interesting that I thought about that, to give the American people some sense.

But let me finish, Mr. Speaker, by simply saying that I love this country. What a wonderful set of principles in the Constitution. And I want to say to the American people that, with our God, with our faith vested in a higher power, and the knowledge of democracy, we are going to withstand, survive, fight, and have a better nation. I know that that is the better way, not demagoguery and condemnation of a faith. I would never do that.

MASS SHOOTINGS

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, last week's shooting in San Bernardino, California, happened to be the second shooting of the day and the 355th of the year, equating to more mass shootings than days in the year. The social media pages of some of the most influential leaders in Congress expressed sympathy, thoughts, and prayers to the victims and their families. But what many failed to express was a commitment to act on this issue to make mass shootings and horrendous gun violence a far less common instance in America.

While no grand solution exists to end all gun violence, we know from the experience of other countries that a combination of small but practical policy solutions can severely reduce it. But Congress continues to choose inaction.

Last week, immediately following the devastating news coming out of Paris and San Bernardino, a majority of Members blocked the House from even debating bipartisan legislation to close the outrageous loophole that allows suspects on the FBI's terrorist watch list to buy guns. It may be hard for some to believe, but in the U.S., individuals on the Federal terrorist watch list are shockingly still not prohibited from purchasing firearms.

Quite simply, Mr. Speaker, this means you can be on the terrorist watch list, considered by the Federal Government to be a potential risk to the national security of the United States and be prohibited from boarding a plane, but still have the ability to walk into any Walmart around the country and purchase a semiautomatic weapon.

Current Federal law prohibits nine categories of dangerous people from purchasing or owning firearms; suspected terrorists on FBI watch lists, however, are not one of them. I don't have to explain to Members of the House the growing terrorist threat that this country is facing from lone-wolf extremists which are often unpredictable and incredibly difficult to thwart. Even just one unsophisticated lone-wolf extremist with a gun can do a remarkable amount of damage.

This isn't some sort of theoretical threat either. A GAO investigation found that individuals on terrorist watch lists successfully purchased guns 1,321 times between February 2004 and December 2010. And that was before the rise of ISIS and their persistent social media campaign to recruit homegrown terrorists.

Mr. Speaker, I have worked with Congresswoman LOWEY in the Appropriations Committee on a commonsense amendment to allow the Attorney General to deny firearms sales to individuals known or suspected to be involved in terrorism. Unfortunately, our attempts to pass this amendment in committee have been rebuffed every time. But this week, we have an oppor-

tunity to change that. This week, we can show our enemies, intent on destroying Americans and our way of life, that Congress cares more about protecting the safety of its citizens than it does about the gun lobby by finally closing this terror gap in our gun laws.

The American people, gun owning and not, overwhelmingly support responsible, commonsense gun reforms. If this isn't the definition of responsible and commonsense reform, I don't know what is. There is also widespread support specifically among gun owners for closing the gap. In 2013, a survey found that 80 percent of non-NRA gun owners support prohibiting people on the terrorist watch list from obtaining guns. Mr. Speaker, 71 percent of NRA gun owners support prohibiting people on this watch list from obtaining guns.

It is naive to think that al Qaeda and ISIS are not paying attention to what is happening here in Congress. Fixing this loophole is simple, responsible, and the right thing to do for public safety. Let's not pass on this critical opportunity to close a dangerous loophole that threatens our national security.

□ 1030

HOMEOWNERSHIP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ) for 5 minutes.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight an issue that is incredibly important. It is probably the number one issue going on in my district today. And that is the whole issue of housing: housing, and the opportunity to own your own home, to provide a safe haven for your family, to build wealth.

You see, owning your own home for almost everybody in our country is the first rung of the ladder of wealth creation. Yet today, that dream—and it is a dream for many of our citizens, particularly those in the Latino and minority communities—is just that, a dream. Latinos, like all Americans, are committed to building a better and stronger future for their families and for their communities. It starts by becoming a homeowner, to own a piece of America, to have a real stake in America.

That is one of the reasons homeownership is so important. It is important because it creates wealth—as I said, the first rung on the ladder for people to have an investment. It creates social stability. It creates a haven for the family, for family get-togethers. A home is really one of the most important assets for a family to have. Owning a home has far-reaching consequences in our economy for communities.

This fall, I had the opportunity to be a keynote speaker at a bipartisan leadership forum on achieving the American Dream, hosted by First American

Financial Corporation, who is headquartered in my district. I was joined by many of my colleagues, including Representative LINDA SÁNCHEZ, Representative EMANUEL CLEAVER, former Governor Luis Fortuno, industry leaders, and community activists.

The decision to become a homeowner is one of the most important decisions, and it commits a person. It commits a family. It commits us towards getting to the middle class. For people in the bottom 40 percent of annual income level, wealth creation is almost exclusively in homeownership.

According to the National Association of Home Builders, “the primary residence represents the largest asset category” in our country, accounting for 30 percent of our Nation’s total assets. The importance of homeownership is even greater for the middle class: 62 percent of the median homeowner’s assets and 42 percent of their total wealth lies in their home.

Not to mention that access to home equity, being able to pull out some of that equity you have built up, provides families with financial stability when there are financial stresses going on in the family. It is an emergency fund in some cases, and it helps to start a business, it helps to fund college for our children. Homeownership is a key to creating stable, economically successful households and to provide security for existing and future generations.

Households with wealth are able to weather financial shocks and increase upward economic mobility for themselves and for future generations. In fact, analysis provided by First American’s Chief Economist, Mark Fleming, highlighted homeownership trends based on household formation rates among Latino and African American Communities. The research identified the importance of homeownership-based wealth formation as the key, the key to wealth creation for middle- and low-income Americans. Providing Americans with equal opportunity to pursue that homeownership is a challenge, and it is very challenging in the Latino, African American, and other minority communities.

This last recession of 5 or 6 years—this really terrible, difficult recession for so many people—saw in the Latino community two-thirds, 66 percent, of the wealth across our Nation within the Latino community went away.

I hope that my colleagues will help us in building back to homeownership for all of our communities in America.

60TH ANNIVERSARY OF MONTGOMERY BUS BOYCOTT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in recognition and acknowledgement of Restoration Tuesday and to recognize the 60th anniversary of the Montgomery Bus Boycott. There has been, Mr. Speaker, a renewed

and relentless assault on our sacred right to vote in the aftermath of the Supreme Court’s ruling in *Shelby County v. Holder*.

Since elections are held on Tuesdays, my colleagues in the Democratic House caucus and I have declared that every Tuesday that the House is in session shall be declared as Restoration Tuesday. So I stand before you and this august body today in hopes of giving a voice to those who have been excluded from our political process. My hope is that all the Members, Members from both sides of the aisle, will join me and over 140 Members of this august body in supporting the Voting Rights Advancement Act.

This Voting Rights Advancement Act not only restores the Voting Rights Act of 1965, but it advances it. It gives more protection to more people in more States and is, indeed, what our Founding Fathers would have wanted when they declared that our electoral process would be fair.

I think that the events of last week—we celebrated the 60th anniversary of the Montgomery Bus Boycott in my district, in Montgomery, Alabama, last week. The Montgomery Bus Boycott—the 381 days when people refused to sit and use the buses in Montgomery, breaking desegregation of the bus systems in Montgomery—it stands forever as a powerful testimony of the will of disenfranchised people to work collectively to achieve extraordinary social change.

Sixty years ago, Mr. Speaker, Rosa Parks refused to give up her seat on a segregated bus, and her bold stand against racial discrimination sparked a city-wide boycott. I was in Montgomery to commemorate that occasion, along with several Members of this House. I want to thank Congressman BUTTERFIELD and Congresswoman CORRINE BROWN for joining me last week in that celebration, along with Congressman JOHN LEWIS, who forever stands as a beacon, a reminder of what it takes to show strength in the face of discrimination.

Mr. Speaker, I say to all of my colleagues, what will we do to progress this wonderful legacy of social change and democracy? So many average, ordinary Americans have stood up for that proposition in the face of tremendous adversity.

So it is my hope that on this Restoration Tuesday, we will remember their legacy, the legacy of Americans who stand up for social change, and we will do what we know is right to restore the Voting Rights Act of 1965. We can do that today, Mr. Speaker, by joining with all of the 140 or so Members of Congress who have already signed on to the Voting Rights Advancement Act; by remembering that on Tuesdays across this country, people go to vote, and they should do so without barriers, knowing that their polling stations will not be changed, knowing that if they are disabled, they will still be able to get into the ballot

box in order to vote. It is so important that we all recognize that modern day barriers still exists to voting, Mr. Speaker.

Mere words are not enough to restore the vote to millions of Americans who have wrongly been shut out of the Democratic process. The voice of those excluded cannot be unheard. The Voting Rights Advancement Act that I introduced alongside Representatives JUDY CHU and LINDA SÁNCHEZ contains a modern-day formula that will determine jurisdictions which should have Federal protections, Federal pre-clearance requirements.

I stand here before you to call on Congress to pass this bill to restore the Voting Rights Act of 1965. We cannot return to the days where only some votes matter. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, all voices, all votes matter. Our vote is our voice, and our voices must be heard.

DENY GUN SALES TO SUSPECTED TERRORISTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, Federal law prohibits nine categories of dangerous individuals from purchasing a firearm. This includes convicted felons, domestic abusers, and the seriously mentally ill. Yet, while we prevent those on the terrorist watch list from boarding planes, they are welcome in gun stores.

The Government Accountability Office found that between 2004 and 2014, individuals on terrorist watch lists tried to purchase guns or explosives 2,233 times. Of those attempts, 2,043, an astounding 91 percent, were approved.

Terrorists are knowingly exploiting this gap. In fact, in 2011, Adam Gadahn, an American-born member of al Qaeda, issued a video urging violent followers to exploit weaknesses in U.S. gun laws.

Adam Gadahn was not alone. In 2009, Daniel Patrick Boyd was arrested and charged with conspiring to murder U.S. military personnel at the Marine Corps base in Quantico, Virginia. Boyd, who was under investigation by the FBI Joint Terrorism Task Force, had amassed an arsenal of assault rifles and had even traveled to the Middle East to meet with militants to plan future attacks.

It is impossible to hear these facts and not think of the recent horrific attacks in Paris. France has extremely strict gun laws, so it is likely that the terrorists in question turned to black market sources for the weapons they used. But here in the United States, suspects on the terrorist watch list can legally purchase firearms. It simply doesn’t make any sense at all.

That is why I am a proud cosponsor of H.R. 1076, the Denying Firearms and Explosives to Dangerous Terrorists Act. This bill, along with an amendment that I have introduced in the Appropriations Committee, would give

the U.S. Attorney General the authority to block suspects on the terrorist watch list from purchasing firearms.

Given the repeated mass shootings in the United States and the ongoing threat of terrorism, it is hard to believe that four times, Republicans on the Appropriations Committee have said no to closing this dangerous loophole.

In 2011, I introduced my amendment. It was rejected. In 2013, I tried again. It was rejected. Again, in 2014, rejected. Even this year, in 2015, with the tremendous threats we face as a Nation, my amendment was rejected for the fourth time.

Even NRA members agree we should pass this commonsense measure. A 2012 poll found that 76 percent of gun owners, including 71 percent of NRA members, support prohibiting people on terrorist watch lists from purchasing guns. Yet, the NRA's stranglehold on the majority in Congress has prevented my amendment from passing and the bipartisan stand-alone bill from even being considered.

The time has long since come for us to cross the aisle and work together to make our country safer. Let's close this glaring loophole immediately and arm our law enforcement with the ability to deny gun sales to suspected terrorists.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 45 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

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

Send Your spirit down upon the Members of the people's House. Grant them wisdom, insight, and vision, that the work they do will be for the betterment of our Nation during a time of struggle for so many Americans.

Fear of violence on all fronts, tensions between people of different races or religion or cultures—so many things weigh upon the citizens of this country and the representatives who serve them.

Empower the Members of this House to rise above the din of anger and confusion, fear and contention, to face the issues of these times with equanimity and good judgment. Help them to trust one another and work with those with

whom they have been at odds in times past.

May we all strive to become our better selves and encourage that growth in one another.

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

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. WALORSKI led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on the Budget:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, December 4, 2015.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
Office of the Speaker,
Washington, DC.

MR. SPEAKER. In light of my recent appointment as Chairman of the Human Resource Subcommittee on Ways and Means, I hereby resign my position on the House Budget Committee.

Best Regards,

CONGRESSMAN VERN BUCHANAN.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTING A MEMBER TO A CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the House Republican Conference, I send to the desk a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 555

Resolved, That the following named member be, and is hereby, elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET: Mr. Renacci.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

CONGRATULATING THE ALLEGHANY HIGH SCHOOL LADY TROJAN VARSITY VOLLEYBALL TEAM

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize the Alleghany High School volleyball team, which recently won the North Carolina 1A State championship. It is the first NCHSAA State championship in the program's history.

Coach Debbie Weaver led the Lady Trojans on their winning campaign. The nine seniors on the team, including MVP Jade Shepherd, have been playing together since fifth grade, and it showed in their performance. They won three out of four games to defeat the defending State champion Princeton Bulldogs.

Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity to meet these young ladies at the annual Christmas parade in Sparta. It is clear that everyone in Alleghany County is proud of the teamwork, dedication, and perseverance they exhibited on the way to this great achievement.

I commend these young athletes and congratulate them on a job well done.

ATTACK ON PEARL HARBOR

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, one of the darkest days in American history was December 8, 1941. Over 2,400 lives were lost in the attack on Pearl Harbor the previous day. Half our Navy was destroyed, and our allies in Europe were on the verge of collapse. It was a terrifying and uncertain time to be in the world.

The world feels particularly dark these days, too. Things feel more uncertain. And for a country that enjoys the privilege of security, we might be forgiven for this growing anxiety. Fear makes it easy to be nervous and cynical.

We allowed our baser instincts to get the better of us in this country, as we did in 1941. We translated the contagion of xenophobia into national policy with the internment of German and Japanese from my area in internment camps.

We are hearing the same contemptible rhetoric today. It is dishonorable, it is false, and to believe it is to reject the fundamental truth that the American people are ultimately made of finer stuff than fear, blame, and prejudice.

We will get through these troubles, Mr. Speaker. Nothing is above our strength or our endurance as a nation so long as we have the grace and courage to remind ourselves on our darkest

days of our essential values and responsibilities as a free and open people.

RECOGNIZING MILLER'S VETS

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

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Miller's Vets, an organization in my district committed to supporting homeless veterans, and express my appreciation for the service and sacrifice our veterans have made on behalf of our country.

Miller's Vets was founded by Robert Miller, Sr., a former St. Joseph County Superior Court judge and a retired lieutenant commander in the U.S. Naval Reserve, who began the organization to instill confidence and create opportunities for local veterans.

Veterans in the program participate in various services, including color guard, flag raising, and parade marches. Miller's Vets also created a military honors funeral program comprised of 14 local veterans who have been trained to perform honor guard duty at funerals. This program partners with local funeral homes to provide full military service funerals to certain veterans without family or adequate finances to pay for their expenses.

Simply put, Mr. Speaker, Miller's Vets restores the honor that these men and women deserve. I am grateful to Miller's Vets for their dedication to providing dignity and hope to our bravest and finest.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring Miller's Vets for their tireless dedication to helping and honoring our local veterans.

CLOSING THE TERRORIST GUN LOOPHOLE

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my deep concern for the safety of our country and urge colleagues to act today on sensible gun safety legislation. Time after time, House Republicans have denied any discussion of voting on a measure that will close a dangerous loophole that currently allows suspects on the FBI's terrorist watch list to buy guns. Last week alone, House Republicans voted not one time, not two, but three times to block debate on the Denying Firearms and Explosives to Terrorists Act.

According to a report by the Government Accountability Office, since 2004, more than 2,000 suspects on the FBI's terrorist watch list have successfully purchased weapons in the United States. More than 90 percent of all suspected terrorists who attempted to buy a gun walked away with the weapon of their choice.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is just common sense: if you are too dangerous to fly, then you are too dangerous to buy a

gun. We must do all that we can to prevent senseless acts of violence in our communities and bring this legislation to a vote today.

RECOGNIZING ONE OF MINNESOTA'S FINEST FAMILIES

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

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 74th anniversary of Pearl Harbor and to honor all Minnesotans and all Americans who served in World War II. I would like to recognize the service of one Minnesota family in particular.

In 1885, Carl Nolte moved to Martin County, Minnesota, with his wife, Louise. They had 12 children and numerous grandchildren. An impressive 36 members of the Nolte family joined the Armed Forces and served in World War II. Fortunately, all 36 family members survived the war. However, two were wounded during their service.

It is often said that those who served in World War II belong to the Greatest Generation. I believe that the heroism and the dedication that this family demonstrated proves this to be true.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank this Minnesota family for their service to our Nation, and I would also like to wish one of them a very happy birthday. This week Loren Wessel of Truman, Minnesota, turns 96 years old. Happy birthday, Loren.

DENYING FIREARMS AND EXPLOSIVES TO DANGEROUS TERRORISTS ACT

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, last week, House Republicans voted three times to block debate on Republican Congressman PETER KING's Denying Firearms and Explosives to Dangerous Terrorists Act, which would close the outrageous loophole that allows suspects who are on the FBI's terrorist watch list to purchase weapons.

Mr. Speaker, 2,000 suspects on the FBI's watch list tried to buy weapons in the U.S. in the last 11 years, and 91 percent of them walked away with a weapon.

Democrats remain committed to blocking dangerous people from having guns. Eighty percent of gun owners support this. It is a bipartisan effort. PETER KING from the Republican Conference wrote this legislation, yet Republicans and the leadership blocked a chance for us to have a simple yes-or-no vote on what most Americans think would be logical, commonsense ways to keep us safe.

Seriously? Terrorist watch list? Buy a gun of your choice whenever you want? We are better than that. This Congress needs to act. I urge my colleagues to join me in stopping this nonsense.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF CHANCELLOR EUGENE MCKAY OF ARKANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

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

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the life and legacy of one of Arkansas' great educators, Chancellor Eugene McKay of Arkansas State University at Beebe. He will be retiring in January after 50 years of service to our State's educational system, particularly in helping assure a ready, skilled workforce.

Chancellor McKay has displayed an unrelenting commitment to education in Arkansas that has been a beacon for quality higher education at Arkansas State University.

First as a professor and then as the chancellor, Dr. McKay was responsible for the university's recognition of having the highest student success rate in Arkansas among both 2- and 4-year institutions.

He has been honored for this work as an educator by the Beebe Chamber of Commerce, that also presented him their lifetime achievement award.

Chancellor McKay made an indelible impact on the lives of Arkansans, faculty, alumni, students, and all of our communities. We will miss him. I extend him my warmest regards and best wishes for his retirement.

JAMES ZADROGA 9/11 HEALTH AND COMPENSATION ACT RENEWAL

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, you have told us over and over again that the James Zadroga 9/11 Health and Compensation Act will be passed in this year.

Well, the clock is running out. The time is here to live up to our pledge that "we will never forget." We lost 3,000 innocent people on 9/11, but thousands more lost their health care and are sick and dying. They are coming to this Congress praying for their health care.

It is a national disgrace that we have not responded to our responders. Yet everyone agrees. Leaders on both sides of the aisle have pledged to do this before the end of the year. Yet, even when we all agree, we still seem to do nothing. As Jon Stewart so succinctly put it: Congress has become the last responders.

It is time for the last responders to respond to the first responders and give them the health care and support they so justly deserve.

CONGRATULATING CATHOLIC HIGH SCHOOL AND COACH DALE WEINER

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

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, on Friday evening this past Friday, the 5A Division 1 playoffs occurred in high school football in Louisiana, and my high school alma mater of Catholic High in Baton Rouge played against our distinguished majority whip's Catholic high school, the Archbishop Rummel High School.

This was a great game, Madam Speaker, where it went on to the fourth quarter where things were tied up with only a few seconds left with both sides praying, I am sure. We had a little bit of intervention here. And while there is a chance, Madam Speaker, that this poster was fabricated, I assure you that the win that Catholic High had over Archbishop Rummel was very, very real, and the values that each of these schools instill upon their students is also very real.

I want to congratulate Coach Dale Weiner, Catholic High School Bears out of Baton Rouge, and Coach Weiner's over 300 wins in high school football.

□ 1215

RENEW THE ASSAULT WEAPONS BAN

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, just hours before last week's shooting, I stood in this very same spot and called on Congress to renew the assault weapons ban, which expired in 2004.

Shortly after the shooting in San Bernadino, we learned that one of the weapons used was an AR-15, capable of unloading 800 rounds per minute or 13 rounds per second. Just a week earlier, a gunman in Colorado Springs used an AK-47-style weapon.

We need to get these weapons of war out of the hands of terrorists and criminals. It is easy to say criminals and terrorists will always find a way to get a gun, but certainly we don't need to make it easier for these individuals to get guns capable of killing dozens of innocent people within seconds.

There are simple steps we can take today to address this issue without denying a person's Second Amendment rights. We can start by making sure someone convicted of a violent crime can't buy a gun by exploiting a loophole and prevent someone on the terrorist watch list from buying a gun. If you are too dangerous to get on a plane, you are too dangerous to walk into a gun store and buy an assault weapon or any other gun.

We need to start somewhere to address this epidemic if we have any hope of reducing gun violence in this country. Getting assault weapons out of the hands of criminals and potential terrorists is a good place to start.

COMPUTER SCIENCE EDUCATION WEEK

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

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of national Computer Science Education Week. Established in 2009 to coincide with the birthday of one of the first women in the field of computer science, Grace Murray Hopper, Computer Science Education Week provides a unique opportunity to connect students with opportunities in the computing fields. The Bureau of Labor Statistics predicts that in the year 2020, there will be roughly 10 million jobs in STEM fields. Of those, half are expected to be in computing and information technology.

Despite these opportunities, there is a substantial shortage of individuals with skills needed to fill computing jobs. The more we can expose and engage our students in computer science programs, the better prepared they will be for the jobs in the 21st century.

This week, Representative SUZAN DELBENE of Washington, my co-chair on the Congressional Women's High Tech Caucus, and I introduced House Resolution 554 to encourage schools, parents, and our colleagues to support computer science education, participate in an Hour of Code event this week, and join this national movement in computer science education.

GUN VIOLENCE AND THE TERRORIST WATCH LIST

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

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, mass shootings have become daily occurrences in this country. There were 355 mass shootings in the first 336 days of this year.

Americans are understandably shaken. As Members of Congress, it is our responsibility to enact policies to protect and defend them.

It is unbelievable that an individual on the terrorist watch list can walk into any gun shop and buy the firearm of their choice. That is completely legal right now, and law enforcement has no ability to stop it.

We all know that our weak gun laws in this country have failed for decades to protect innocent lives. We have a long way to go in reversing the deadly damage done by the lobbying efforts of the NRA, but this is a good place to start.

Closing this glaring loophole is common sense. It is not a cure-all for all gun violence in this Nation, but it is a step in the right direction.

I am calling on Speaker PAUL RYAN to bring H.R. 1076, the Denying Firearms and Explosives to Dangerous Terrorists Act of 2015, up for a vote immediately.

The American people are calling us to do something, and we can start now.

VENEZUELA ELECTIONS

(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, I rise today to congratulate the people of Venezuela on their democratic victory this weekend.

Voters at the polls sent a clear message to the corrupt Maduro regime: We reject your policies and support a return to true democracy, as well as an end to an economic system that has bankrupted an otherwise wealthy nation.

Despite lopsided electoral conditions, state-imposed censorship, and intimidation tactics, the democratic opposition overcame many obstacles to gain control of the National Assembly. But there is still much work that remains to be done. All political prisoners must be freed, including pro-democracy leader Leopoldo Lopez.

There are still a few contestant seats without a winner announced that are very important to the final outcome of the election.

I urge a speedy and transparent declaration of the winners and a full adjudication process for any disputed contests that can occur in certain races.

Congratulations to the people of Venezuela for a great victory.

CLOSE THE TERRORIST GUN LOOPHOLE

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

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, we shouldn't allow terrorists who want to kill innocent Americans to have easy access to guns. It is just that simple, and that is just common sense.

Yet, any individual on the no-fly list considered too dangerous to get on a plane can walk into any gun store in America and walk out with a weapon of their choice.

We are facing an epidemic of gun violence in this country, yet House Republican leadership is unwilling to even close the most dangerous loophole like this one that exists today.

Speaker RYAN has said that "keeping America safe should not be a partisan issue." I strongly agree. We should set politics aside and do what is right for the American people by passing commonsense gun laws and stopping senseless acts of violence in our communities.

The cost of inaction in Congress is borne by thousands of mourning families here in America.

It is time for Congress to step up and take meaningful action by closing the terrorist gun loophole and keeping dangerous people from buying guns.

GOLDEN SPOON

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize two outstanding

local businesses in my district recently recognized in Florida Trend magazine.

Local spots all over Florida help boost our economy and strengthen our communities.

Two weeks ago, we celebrated Small Business Saturday and encouraged people to support small, local businesses. It is important we continue to shop small and keep our local communities growing.

Two local establishments in my district recently received Florida Trend's Golden Spoon Awards and rank among the State's best restaurants. I would like to congratulate Dulcet Restaurant and Lounge in New Port Richey and Pearl in the Grove in Dade City.

These awards are very well deserved. I am grateful to have such outstanding businesses in my home district, and I will continue my efforts to help small businesses thrive.

PLANNED PARENTHOOD RESOLUTION

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as co-chair of the House Pro-Choice Caucus in strong support of the caucus' resolution condemning violence toward women.

This month, our Nation has seen unspeakable violence, including in a Planned Parenthood health center in Colorado and the awful things that happened in San Bernardino, California. I condemn this violence in the strongest possible way.

We get so used to it, don't we? Eighty-nine Americans are shot to death every day, over 300 mass killings already this year in this country, and we get up on the floor of the House and we go through our piety and we ask for a moment of silence. That is all we can give. We are not going to give any more relief to the people of the United States from gun culture, but take a moment of silence. Those of us who sit in this Chamber who can do something about it steadfastly refuse to do so.

For heaven's sake, many countries in this world don't have 89 killings in a month, much less every day.

No American should feel intimidated or threatened because of choosing to access health care. Violence is unconscionable and we have to stop it.

RECOGNIZING EDITH LANIER

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Edith Lanier.

Christmas came early this weekend for four disabled veterans. It came in the form of new wheelchairs. These were not just any wheelchairs. These were four custom sport wheelchairs. These more-than-deserving veterans

were given these wheelchairs by Ms. Edith Lanier.

Ms. Lanier was born in 1925. She tells stories about picking cotton, about milking cows, and pumping water from the well. She attended North Georgia College before moving to Savannah to build a business that she passed along to her daughter after 32 years of service.

Over the last two decades, she has also dedicated her time to philanthropy. She is an asset to the community and closes her prayers with: May we be ever mindful of the needs of others.

It comes as no surprise that the four custom sport wheelchairs were donated by Ms. Lanier.

Oh, by the way, did I mention that this young lady this week will be celebrating her 90th birthday? I commend Ms. Lanier for continued acts of selflessness, her devotion to the needy, and her continued hope for the greatness of this country.

Happy birthday, Ms. Lanier.

PASS LEGISLATION THAT PROHIBITS PEOPLE ON THE TERRORIST WATCH LIST FROM GETTING A WEAPON

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, since 9/11, 750,000 refugees have been resettled and welcomed into the United States of America. Not one of them has ever appeared on a terrorist watch list or been accused of terrorism. Yet, Republicans say that for homeland security, we should keep these refugees from Syria out of our country.

About 40,000 people in the United States of America are on the terrorist watch list right now and they are not allowed to get on an airplane. But they are allowed to go into any gun store and buy any weapon that they would like, a weapon that looks like this, for example. This is a picture of a Smith & Wesson .223-caliber assault rifle. This is the kind of weapon that the suspects fired in San Bernardino. Sixty-five to 75 rifle rounds were sent, and people are dead.

That was the 355th mass shooting in our country just this year. We need to pass legislation that prohibits people on the terrorist watch list from getting a weapon, and we should do it now. Prayers and thoughts are not enough.

CONGRESS WILL ALWAYS PUT THE SAFETY AND SECURITY OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE FIRST

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

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the very real and dangerous threat posed by the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria.

For too long, our Nation has stayed on the sidelines, claiming ISIS was a

junior varsity threat or that it had been contained. The unfortunate reality is that America and her allies are under attack by radical Islamic terrorists. Changing the subject or downplaying this threat gives aid and comfort to our enemy, which is bound and determined to strike innocent people around the world in their comfort zones.

As we have seen in Paris or in San Bernardino, these terrorists are emboldened by the President's failed foreign policy. Weakness invites aggression, and only through strength will we have peace.

This is a time for unity of purpose and strong leadership. We need our Commander in Chief to chart a course towards complete destruction of ISIS. Congress should quickly debate and authorize the resources necessary and military force to complete the mission.

Mr. Speaker, we stand ready and willing to work with the President, but Congress will always put the safety and security of the American people first.

VISA WAIVER PROGRAM

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

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 158, a bill that would improve the Visa Waiver Program and ensure better information sharing among intelligence and law enforcement agencies.

This is separate from the Republican proposal introduced last week that would have effectively halted refugee resettlement. Refugees already undergo the most stringent screening process of any individual entering the United States, with an extensive series of background checks.

Refugees are victims, not perpetrators of terrorism. Categorically refusing to take them only feeds the narrative of ISIS.

In contrast, H.R. 158 strengthens the screening of travelers who qualify for the Visa Waiver Program by increasing intelligence and law enforcement cooperation and by making it harder for extremists to falsify their identities and enter our borders.

Rather than betraying our timeless American values by scapegoating refugees, which only plays into ISIS' hands, we should focus on addressing real vulnerabilities to our homeland security.

I urge my colleagues to vote for H.R. 158.

□ 1230

SUPPORTING THE DENYING FIREARMS AND EXPLOSIVES TO DANGEROUS TERRORISTS ACT

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, just last week, another community joined the

growing list of those forever scarred by gun violence just as my community of Isla Vista was. It is far past time for Congress to recognize that it has the power to act, and we must.

At a minimum, we should pass H.R. 1076, the Denying Firearms and Explosives to Dangerous Terrorists Act. This bipartisan bill would close the loophole that allows terror suspects on the FBI's terror watch list to legally purchase a gun. In fact, in the last 11 years, more than 90 percent of all terror suspects who attempted to purchase a gun walked away with the weapon they wanted.

It is wrong to think we can do nothing to stop the violence. It is factually wrong. It is morally wrong. This bill is an important step in keeping the American people safe. We should all support it. It is the least we can do.

TERRORIST WATCH LIST AND GUN PURCHASES

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

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the horrific attack in San Bernardino shows us just how much damage can be done when terrorists have access to firearms; and while we discuss sensible policies that may have prevented this tragedy, I hope we can all agree—certainly, at the very least—that people our government suspects of having terrorist ties should not be allowed to walk into a store, pass a background check, and walk out with a gun.

So many Americans have been understandably amazed to hear that people on the FBI's terrorist watch list can legally purchase firearms and that it has happened over 2,000 times in the last 10 years.

I know that some have concerns about the accuracy of the watch list or worry that this bill may somehow prevent some law enforcement officers from obtaining guns. We should ensure that the watch list is as accurate as possible, and we can even start that today. But if we are concerned for our law enforcement officers, the least we can do is protect them from the threat of terrorists who are armed with guns.

Fixing this loophole is immediate. It is a step we can take to make our country safer. It is a commonsense reform that deserves a vote.

VIOLENCE

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

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about violence. Republicans may try, but you cannot separate our debate today on women's health clinic violence from our country's gun violence problem.

Since 1993, 11 individuals have lost their lives while seeking or providing

health care at women's health care facilities, and 10 of the 11 were victims of gun violence. Since January of this year, the House has voted 10 times to restrict women's health services. That is one vote for every person who died from gun violence at a women's health care clinic; yet there have been zero votes on gun control.

Stop this war on women's health and reproductive care, and start a sane regulatory process on guns.

TERRORIST GUN LOOPHOLE

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

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, it has been said before and it needs to be said again: It is time to get serious about gun violence in America.

Every day, 88 people die because of gun violence. It happens in schools, at work, in our movie theaters, and even in our churches. Making matters worse, in the wake of recent attacks in Paris and here on our own soil, we still have an age-old loophole that allows terrorists to legally get their hands on guns. More than 2,000 suspects on the FBI's terrorist watch list have purchased guns over the last decade.

My colleagues, we have an obligation to protect our communities by keeping guns out of the wrong hands. There are many changes that need to be made, but let's start by closing the gun-buying loophole for terrorists. We have a bipartisan solution in Representative PETER KING's and Representative MIKE THOMPSON's bill to close the loophole.

How many lives must we lose? Let's take a step in the right direction, and let's make sure terrorists can't slip through the cracks and purchase guns. Let's pass Representative KING's and Representative THOMPSON's bill.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana). 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.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, since the House won't take up legislation to prevent the senseless deaths of 30 people killed today by someone using a gun, I move that the House be adjourned.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not been recognized for debate.

Does the gentleman wish to offer a motion?

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON).

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 0, nays 399, not voting 34, as follows:

[Roll No. 674]

NAYS—399

Abraham	Crowley	Hensarling
Adams	Cuellar	Herrera Beutler
Aderholt	Culberson	Hice, Jody B.
Allen	Cummings	Higgins
Amash	Curbelo (FL)	Hill
Amodei	Davis (CA)	Himes
Ashford	Davis, Danny	Hinojosa
Babin	Davis, Rodney	Holding
Barletta	DeFazio	Honda
Barr	DeGette	Hoyer
Barton	Delaney	Hudson
Bass	DeLauro	Huelskamp
Beatty	DeBene	Huffman
Becerra	Denham	Huizenga (MI)
Benishek	Dent	Hultgren
Bera	DeSantis	Hunter
Beyer	DeSaulnier	Hurd (TX)
Bilirakis	Diaz-Balart	Hurt (VA)
Bishop (GA)	Dingell	Israel
Bishop (UT)	Doggett	Issa
Black	Dold	Jackson Lee
Blackburn	Doyle, Michael	Jeffries
Blumenauer	F.	Jenkins (KS)
Bonamici	Duckworth	Jenkins (WV)
Bost	Duffy	Johnson (GA)
Boustany	Duncan (SC)	Johnson (OH)
Boyle, Brendan	Duncan (TN)	Johnson, E. B.
F.	Edwards	Jolly
Brady (PA)	Ellison	Jones
Brady (TX)	Ellmers (NC)	Jordan
Brat	Emmer (MN)	Joyce
Brooks (IN)	Engel	Kaptur
Brown (FL)	Eshoo	Katko
Brownley (CA)	Esty	Keating
Buchanan	Farenthold	Kelly (IL)
Buck	Farr	Kelly (MS)
Bucshon	Fincher	Kelly (PA)
Burgess	Fitzpatrick	Kennedy
Bustos	Fleischmann	Kildee
Byrne	Fleming	Kilmer
Calvert	Flores	Kind
Capps	Forbes	King (IA)
Capuano	Fortenberry	King (NY)
Carney	Foster	Kinzinger (IL)
Carson (IN)	Fox	Kirkpatrick
Carter (GA)	Frankel (FL)	Kline
Carter (TX)	Franks (AZ)	Knight
Cartwright	Frelinghuysen	Kuster
Castor (FL)	Fudge	Labrador
Castro (TX)	Gabbard	LaHood
Chabot	Gallego	LaMalfa
Chaffetz	Garamendi	Lamborn
Chu, Judy	Garrett	Lance
Ciilline	Gibson	Langevin
Clark (MA)	Goodlatte	Larsen (WA)
Clarke (NY)	Gosar	Latta
Clawson (FL)	Gowdy	Lawrence
Clay	Graham	Lee
Cleaver	Granger	Levin
Clyburn	Graves (GA)	Lieu, Ted
Coffman	Graves (LA)	Lipinski
Cohen	Graves (MO)	LoBiondo
Cole	Grayson	Loeb sack
Collins (GA)	Green, Al	Lofgren
Collins (NY)	Green, Gene	Long
Comstock	Griffith	Loudermillk
Conaway	Grijalva	Love
Connolly	Grothman	Lowenthal
Conyers	Guinta	Lowe y
Cook	Guthrie	Lucas
Cooper	Gutiérrez	Luetkemeyer
Costa	Hahn	Lujan Grisham
Costello (PA)	Hanna	(NM)
Courtney	Hardy	Luján, Ben Ray
Cramer	Harper	(NM)
Crawford	Hartzler	Lummis
Crenshaw	Heck (NV)	Lynch
	Heck (WA)	MacArthur

Maloney, Carolyn	Poe (TX)	Stefanik
Maloney, Sean	Poliquin	Stewart
Marchant	Polis	Stivers
Marino	Pompeo	Stutzman
Massie	Price (NC)	Swalwell (CA)
Matsui	Price, Tom	Takano
McCarthy	Quigley	Thompson (CA)
McCaul	Rangel	Thompson (MS)
McClintock	Ratcliffe	Thompson (PA)
McCollum	Reed	Thornberry
McDermott	Reichert	Tiberi
McGovern	Renacci	Tipton
McHenry	Rice (NY)	Titus
McKinley	Rice (SC)	Tonko
McMorris	Rigell	Torres
Rodgers	Roby	Trott
McNerney	Roe (TN)	Tsongas
McSally	Rogers (AL)	Turner
Meadows	Rogers (KY)	Upton
Meehan	Rokita	Valadao
Meeks	Ros-Lehtinen	Van Hollen
Messer	Roskam	Vargas
Mica	Ross	Veasey
Miller (FL)	Rothfus	Vela
Miller (MI)	Rouzer	Velázquez
Moolenaar	Roybal-Allard	Visclosky
Moore	Royce	Wagner
Moulton	Ruiz	Walberg
Mullin	Russell	Walden
Mulvaney	Ryan (OH)	Walker
Murphy (FL)	Salmon	Walorski
Murphy (PA)	Sánchez, Linda T.	Walters, Mimi
Nadler	Sánchez, Loretta	Walz
Napolitano	Sanford	Wasserman
Neugebauer	Sarbanes	Schultz
Newhouse	Scalise	Waters, Maxine
Noem	Schakowsky	Watson Coleman
Nolan	Schrader	Weber (TX)
Norcross	Schweikert	Weber (FL)
Nugent	Scott (VA)	Welch
Nunes	Scott, Austin	Wenstrup
O'Rourke	Sensenbrenner	Westerman
Olson	Serrano	Westmoreland
Palazzo	Sessions	Whitfield
Pallone	Sewell (AL)	Williams
Palmer	Sherman	Wilson (FL)
Pascrell	Shimkus	Wilson (SC)
Paulsen	Shuster	Wittman
Pearce	Simpson	Womack
Pelosi	Sinema	Woodall
Perry	Slaughter	Yarmuth
Peters	Smith (MO)	Yoder
Peterson	Smith (NE)	Yoho
Pingree	Smith (NJ)	Young (IA)
Pittenger	Smith (TX)	Young (IN)
Pitts	Smith (WA)	Zeldin
Pocan	Speier	Zinke

NOT VOTING—34

Aguilar	Harris	Richmond
Bishop (MI)	Hastings	Rohrabacher
Bridenstine	Johnson, Sam	Rooney (FL)
Brooks (AL)	Larson (CT)	Ruppersberger
Butterfield	Lewis	Rush
Cárdenas	Meng	Schiff
DesJarlais	Mooney (WV)	Scott, David
Deutch	Neal	Sires
Donovan	Payne	Takai
Fattah	Perlmutter	Young (AK)
Gibbs	Posey	
Gohmert	Ribble	

□ 1310

Messrs. JEFFRIES, YARMUTH, JOLLY, COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, BILIRAKIS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Mr. WHITFIELD changed their votes from “yea” to “nay.”

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 674, I was at an off-campus event and delayed in traffic. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for rollcall vote 674. If I had been present for this vote, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall vote No. 674.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 674, had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING CENTERS REFORM AND IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2015

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3842) to improve homeland security, including domestic preparedness and response to terrorism, by reforming Federal Law Enforcement Training Centers to provide training to first responders, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3842

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 “Federal Law Enforcement Training Centers Reform and Improvement Act of 2015”.

SEC. 2. FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING CENTERS.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Section 884 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 464) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 884. FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING CENTERS.

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall maintain in the Department the Federal Law Enforcement Training Centers (FLETC), headed by a Director, who shall report to the Secretary.

“(b) POSITION.—The Director shall occupy a career-reserved position within the Senior Executive Service.

“(c) FUNCTIONS OF THE DIRECTOR.—The Director shall—

“(1) develop training goals and establish strategic and tactical organizational program plan and priorities;

“(2) provide direction and management for FLETC’s training facilities, programs, and support activities while ensuring that organizational program goals and priorities are executed in an effective and efficient manner;

“(3) develop homeland security and law enforcement training curricula, including curricula related to domestic preparedness and response to threats or acts of terrorism, for Federal, State, local, tribal, territorial, and international law enforcement and security agencies and private sector security agencies;

“(4) monitor progress toward strategic and tactical FLETC plans regarding training curricula, including curricula related to domestic preparedness and response to threats or acts of terrorism, and facilities;

“(5) ensure the timely dissemination of homeland security information as necessary to Federal, State, local, tribal, territorial, and international law enforcement and security agencies and the private sector to achieve the training goals for such entities, in accordance with paragraph (1);

“(6) carry out acquisition responsibilities in a manner that—

“(A) fully complies with—

“(i) Federal law;

“(ii) the Federal Acquisition Regulation, including requirements regarding agency obligations to contract only with responsible prospective contractors; and

“(iii) Department acquisition management directives; and

“(B) ensures that a fair proportion of Federal contract and subcontract dollars are

awarded to small businesses, maximizes opportunities for small business participation, and ensures, to the extent practicable, that small businesses which achieve qualified vendor status for security-related technologies have an opportunity to compete for contracts for such technologies;

“(7) coordinate and share information with the heads of relevant components and offices on digital learning and training resources, as appropriate;

“(8) advise the Secretary on matters relating to executive level policy and program administration of Federal, State, local, tribal, territorial, and international law enforcement and security training activities and private sector security agency training activities, including training activities related to domestic preparedness and response to threats or acts of terrorism;

“(9) collaborate with the Secretary and relevant officials at other Federal departments and agencies, as appropriate, to improve international instructional development, training, and technical assistance provided by the Federal Government to foreign law enforcement; and

“(10) carry out such other functions as the Secretary determines are appropriate.

“(d) TRAINING RESPONSIBILITIES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director is authorized to provide training to employees of Federal agencies who are engaged, directly or indirectly, in homeland security operations or Federal law enforcement activities, including such operations or activities related to domestic preparedness and response to threats or acts of terrorism. In carrying out such training, the Director shall—

“(A) evaluate best practices of law enforcement training methods and curriculum content to maintain state-of-the-art expertise in adult learning methodology;

“(B) provide expertise and technical assistance, including on domestic preparedness and response to threats or acts of terrorism, to Federal, State, local, tribal, territorial, and international law enforcement and security agencies and private sector security agencies; and

“(C) maintain a performance evaluation process for students.

“(2) RELATIONSHIP WITH LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES.—The Director shall consult with relevant law enforcement and security agencies in the development and delivery of FLETC’s training programs.

“(3) TRAINING DELIVERY LOCATIONS.—The training required under paragraph (1) may be conducted at FLETC facilities, at appropriate off-site locations, or by distributed learning.

“(4) STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIPS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Director may—

“(i) execute strategic partnerships with State and local law enforcement to provide such law enforcement with specific training, including maritime law enforcement training; and

“(ii) coordinate with the Under Secretary responsible for overseeing critical infrastructure protection, cybersecurity, and other related programs of the Department and with private sector stakeholders, including critical infrastructure owners and operators, to provide training pertinent to improving coordination, security, and resiliency of critical infrastructure.

“(B) PROVISION OF INFORMATION.—The Director shall provide to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, upon request, information on activities undertaken in the previous year pursuant to subparagraph (A).

“(5) FLETC DETAILS TO DHS.—The Director may detail employees of FLETC to positions

throughout the Department in furtherance of improving the effectiveness and quality of training provided by the Department and, as appropriate, the development of critical departmental programs and initiatives.

“(6) **DETAIL OF INSTRUCTORS TO FLETC.**—Partner organizations that wish to participate in FLETC training programs shall assign non-reimbursable detailed instructors to FLETC for designated time periods to support all training programs at FLETC, as appropriate. The Director shall determine the number of detailed instructors that is proportional to the number of training hours requested by each partner organization scheduled by FLETC for each fiscal year. If a partner organization is unable to provide a proportional number of detailed instructors, such partner organization shall reimburse FLETC for the salary equivalent for such detailed instructors, as appropriate.

“(7) **PARTNER ORGANIZATION EXPENSES REQUIREMENTS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Partner organizations shall be responsible for the following expenses:

“(i) Salaries, travel expenses, lodging expenses, and miscellaneous per diem allowances of their personnel attending training courses at FLETC.

“(ii) Salaries and travel expenses of instructors and support personnel involved in conducting advanced training at FLETC for partner organization personnel and the cost of expendable supplies and special equipment for such training, unless such supplies and equipment are common to FLETC-conducted training and have been included in FLETC's budget for the applicable fiscal year.

“(B) **EXCESS BASIC AND ADVANCED FEDERAL TRAINING.**—All hours of advanced training and hours of basic training provided in excess of the training for which appropriations were made available shall be paid by the partner organizations and provided to FLETC on a reimbursable basis in accordance with section 4104 of title 5, United States Code.

“(8) **PROVISION OF NON-FEDERAL TRAINING.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director is authorized to charge and retain fees that would pay for its actual costs of the training for the following:

“(i) State, local, tribal, and territorial law enforcement personnel.

“(ii) Foreign law enforcement officials, including provision of such training at the International Law Enforcement Academies wherever established.

“(iii) Private sector security officers, participants in the Federal Flight Deck Officer program under section 44921 of title 49, United States Code, and other appropriate private sector individuals.

“(B) **WAIVER.**—The Director may waive the requirement for reimbursement of any cost under this section and shall maintain records regarding the reasons for any requirements so waived.

“(9) **REIMBURSEMENT.**—The Director is authorized to reimburse travel or other expenses for non-Federal personnel who attend activities related to training sponsored by FLETC, at travel and per diem rates established by the General Services Administration.

“(10) **STUDENT SUPPORT.**—In furtherance of its training mission, the Director is authorized to provide the following support to students:

“(A) Athletic and related activities.

“(B) Short-term medical services.

“(C) Chaplain services.

“(11) **AUTHORITY TO HIRE FEDERAL ANNUITANTS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Director is authorized to appoint and maintain, as nec-

essary, Federal annuitants who have expert knowledge and experience to meet the training responsibilities under this subsection.

“(B) **NO REDUCTION IN RETIREMENT PAY.**—A Federal annuitant employed pursuant to this paragraph shall not be subject to any reduction in pay for annuity allocable to the period of actual employment under the provisions of section 8344 or 8468 of title 5, United States Code, or similar provision of any other retirement system for employees.

“(C) **RE-EMPLOYED ANNUITANTS.**—A Federal annuitant employed pursuant to this paragraph shall not be considered an employee for purposes of subchapter III of chapter 83 or chapter 84 of title 5, United States Code, or such other retirement system (referred to in subparagraph (B)) as may apply.

“(D) **COUNTING.**—Federal annuitants shall be counted on a full time equivalent basis.

“(E) **LIMITATION.**—No appointment under this paragraph may be made which would result in the displacement of any employee.

“(12) **TRAVEL FOR INTERMITTENT EMPLOYEES.**—The Director is authorized to reimburse intermittent Federal employees traveling from outside a commuting distance (to be predetermined by the Director) for travel expenses and to compensate such employees for time spent traveling from their homes to work sites.

“(e) **ON-FLETC HOUSING.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, individuals attending training at any FLETC facility shall, to the extent practicable and in accordance with FLETC policy, reside in on-FLETC or FLETC-provided housing.

“(f) **ADDITIONAL FISCAL AUTHORITIES.**—In order to further the goals and objectives of FLETC, the Director is authorized to—

“(1) expend funds for public awareness and to enhance community support of law enforcement training, including the advertisement of available law enforcement training programs;

“(2) accept and use gifts of property, both real and personal, and to accept gifts of services, for purposes that promote the functions of the Director pursuant to subsection (c) and the training responsibilities of the Director under subsection (d);

“(3) accept reimbursement from other Federal agencies for the construction or renovation of training and support facilities and the use of equipment and technology on government owned-property;

“(4) obligate funds in anticipation of reimbursements from agencies receiving training at FLETC, except that total obligations at the end of a fiscal year may not exceed total budgetary resources available at the end of such fiscal year;

“(5) in accordance with the purchasing authority provided under section 505 of the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2004 (Public Law 108-90; 6 U.S.C. 453a)—

“(A) purchase employee and student uniforms; and

“(B) purchase and lease passenger motor vehicles, including vehicles for police-type use;

“(6) provide room and board for student interns; and

“(7) expend funds each fiscal year to honor and memorialize FLETC graduates who have died in the line of duty.

“(g) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

“(1) **BASIC TRAINING.**—The term ‘basic training’ means the entry-level training required to instill in new Federal law enforcement personnel fundamental knowledge of criminal laws, law enforcement and investigative techniques, laws and rules of evidence, rules of criminal procedure, constitutional rights, search and seizure, and related issues.

“(2) **DETAILED INSTRUCTORS.**—The term ‘detailed instructors’ means personnel who are assigned to the Federal Law Enforcement Training Centers for a period of time to serve as instructors for the purpose of conducting basic and advanced training.

“(3) **DIRECTOR.**—The term ‘Director’ means the Director of the Federal Law Enforcement Training Centers.

“(4) **DISTRIBUTED LEARNING.**—The term ‘distributed learning’ means education in which students take academic courses by accessing information and communicating with the instructor, from various locations, on an individual basis, over a computer network or via other technologies.

“(5) **EMPLOYEE.**—The term ‘employee’ has the meaning given such term in section 2105 of title 5, United States Code.

“(6) **FEDERAL AGENCY.**—The term ‘Federal agency’ means—

“(A) an Executive Department as defined in section 101 of title 5, United States Code;

“(B) an independent establishment as defined in section 104 of title 5, United States Code;

“(C) a Government corporation as defined in section 9101 of title 31, United States Code;

“(D) the Government Printing Office;

“(E) the United States Capitol Police;

“(F) the United States Supreme Court Police; and

“(G) Government agencies with law enforcement related duties.

“(7) **LAW ENFORCEMENT PERSONNEL.**—The term ‘law enforcement personnel’ means an individual, including criminal investigators (commonly known as ‘agents’) and uniformed police (commonly known as ‘officers’), who has statutory authority to search, seize, make arrests, or to carry firearms.

“(8) **LOCAL.**—The term ‘local’ means—

“(A) of or pertaining to any county, parish, municipality, city, town, township, rural community, unincorporated town or village, local public authority, educational institution, special district, intrastate district, council of governments (regardless of whether the council of governments is incorporated as a nonprofit corporation under State law), regional or interstate government entity, any agency or instrumentality of a local government, or any other political subdivision of a State; and

“(B) an Indian tribe or authorized tribal organization, or in Alaska a Native village or Alaska Regional Native Corporation.

“(9) **PARTNER ORGANIZATION.**—The term ‘partner organization’ means any Federal agency participating in FLETC's training programs under a formal memorandum of understanding.

“(10) **STATE.**—The term ‘State’ means any State of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and any possession of the United States.

“(11) **STUDENT INTERN.**—The term ‘student intern’ means any eligible baccalaureate or graduate degree student participating in FLETC's College Intern Program.

“(h) **PROHIBITION ON NEW FUNDING.**—No funds are authorized to carry out this section. This section shall be carried out using amounts otherwise appropriated or made available for such purpose.”

(b) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 is amended by amending the item relating to section 884 to read as follows:

“Sec. 884. Federal Law Enforcement Training Centers.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KELLY of Mississippi). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER) and the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TORRES) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. 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 gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3842, the Federal Law Enforcement Training Centers Reform and Improvement Act of 2015. This important bipartisan legislation reforms and improves the Federal Law Enforcement Training Centers, FLETC, in the Department of Homeland Security.

Established in 1970, FLETC aimed at providing basic and advanced training to Federal law enforcement personnel.

FLETC now serves as an interagency law enforcement training organization for Federal, State, local, rural, tribal, territorial, and international law enforcement personnel with over 90 partner organizations.

Since 2003 and FLETC's transfer from the Treasury Department, no legislation has been introduced to reauthorize FLETC within the Department of Homeland Security.

□ 1315

H.R. 3842 amends section 884 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to improve domestic preparedness, prevention, and response to terrorism by establishing FLETC to provide consolidated and shared training to law enforcement agencies and partner organizations.

H.R. 3842 strengthens the role of the Director of FLETC and improves training practices by codifying important authorities, including, but not limited to, listing functions and training responsibilities to be carried out by the Director, FLETC, and partner organizations.

With daily threats nationwide, this legislation supports FLETC's mission of providing world-class, expert training that can quickly adapt to emerging threats and training needs.

I wish to thank my colleague, Mrs. TORRES, for her hard work and collaboration on this bill. I also appreciate Chairmen GOODLATTE and SHUSTER for their cooperation.

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

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

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND
INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REP-
RESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, December 8, 2015.

Hon. MICHAEL T. MCCAUL,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCCAUL: I write concerning H.R. 3842, the "Federal Law Enforcement Training Centers Reform and Improvement Act of 2015". This legislation includes matters that I believe fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

In order to expedite Floor consideration of H.R. 3842, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure agrees to forgo action on this bill. However, this is conditional on our mutual understanding that forgoing consideration of the bill would not prejudice the Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation that fall within the Committee's Rule X jurisdiction.

I request that you please place a copy of this letter and your response acknowledging our jurisdictional interest into the Congressional Record.

Sincerely,

BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,
Washington, DC, December 8, 2015.

Hon. BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman, Transportation and Infrastructure
Committee, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SHUSTER, Thank you for your interest in H.R. 3842, the "Federal Law Enforcement Training Centers Reform and Improvement Act of 2015." I appreciate your cooperation in allowing the bill to move expeditiously under suspension of the House Rules on December 8, 2015. Because your assertion of jurisdictional interest was raised after the report for H.R. 3842 was filed, the Parliamentarians were not able to render an official decision as to any jurisdictional claim the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee may have had.

I agree that the absence of a decision on this bill will not prejudice any claim the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee may have had, or may have with respect to similar measures in the future.

A copy of this letter will be entered into the Congressional Record.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL T. MCCAUL,
Chairman.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3842, the Federal Law Enforcement Training Centers Reform and Improvement Act of 2015.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3842 amends the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide specific authorities for the Director of the Federal Law Enforcement Training Centers, or FLETC. I am proud to join Mr. CARTER in introducing this very important legislation.

FLETC, established in 1975 and transitioned from the Treasury Department to the Department of Homeland Security in 2002, provides Federal and other law enforcement agencies with high-quality, cost-effective training. Training is carried out by a group of experienced instructors who use modern facilities and standardized course content at locations in Georgia, Maryland, New Mexico, and South Carolina.

FLETC also has a unique relationship with the Maritime Law Enforcement Training Center at the Port of Los Angeles, where together they have developed comprehensive maritime security training for State and local agencies. Together, this partnership between FLETC and the Port of Los Angeles helps ensure our local law enforcement get the training they need to protect America's critical ports and waterways, particularly important at a port that accounts for more than 40 percent of the goods that enter the United States.

H.R. 3842 was reported favorably from the Homeland Security Committee with bipartisan approval last month.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note that, during the committee's November 4 markup of H.R. 3842, members unanimously adopted three Democratic amendments to the bill.

The first amendment underscores FLETC's responsibility to conduct acquisition activities in accordance with existing law and regulation, which include both a requirement that FLETC's Director evaluate contractors' integrity and business ethics in performance of previous contracts and vests FLETC's Director with the responsibility of ensuring that a fair proportion of contracting dollars are awarded to small businesses.

The second amendment authorizes strategic partnerships between FLETC and local law enforcement agencies, including the existing partnership between FLETC and the Maritime Law Enforcement Training Center operated by the Port of Los Angeles.

This amendment also authorizes FLETC to work with the DHS National Protection and Programs Directorate to make training available to security professionals in the private sector, particularly those involved with protecting critical infrastructure.

The final amendment authorizes FLETC's Director to detail employees to various components in the Department to assist in the development of critical Departmental programs and initiatives.

The urgency to pass this bill has only grown in the last week. Last Wednesday a shooting just outside of my district, in an area I represented as a State senator, in California, San Bernardino County, affirmed that our local law enforcement are our first line of defense in the fight against terror. We must ensure that they have the most up-to-date training as possible.

I know firsthand how important this kind of coordination is between all levels of enforcement. As a 911 dispatcher for nearly 20 years, I can't tell you how important it is to ensure that our first responders have the tools and resources they need to keep us safe.

Earlier this year I held a roundtable meeting with local law enforcement, the FBI, Homeland Security, and other Federal officials to discuss emergency coordination and emerging threats to our communities. As a part of this discussion, our local police stressed the

need for additional resources and better information sharing and training to combat these threats.

During last week's attack, we saw San Bernardino law enforcement respond effectively to protect our community, but there is so much more we can do. If our Nation is to address the threat of future attacks, we must ensure that law enforcement personnel throughout the Nation not only have the tools they need to do so, but also the training, to effectively address the diverse terrorism landscape.

With this in mind, Mr. Speaker, I would commend this bill to the House for consideration.

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

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

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is a Homeland Security bill. We have a number of these bills coming to the floor today. But it is hard to ignore the fact that there is a glaring weakness in what is being brought here to the floor when it comes to protecting the American people.

Right now at this very moment an individual who is on the FBI terrorist watch list could walk into any gun store and purchase the weapon of their choice. The American people understand this makes absolutely no sense.

In the last 11 years, 2,000 people who are on the terrorist watch list have gone in to purchase weapons and 91 percent of them have walked away with the weapon of their choice. Inexplicably, a piece of legislation authorized by Republican Congressman PETER KING is ready for this House to act. It would close this ridiculous loophole.

When I have talked to people back home about this, they expect that this is already law. They almost have to have it pointed out to them that, no, this is actually not the case. A person on the terrorist watch list can go to a gun store and purchase a weapon.

If we are serious about protecting the safety of the American people, it would seem that the commonsense thing to do would be to take up Representative KING's legislation and close this dangerous loophole.

So we are coming to the floor with important bills. I don't deny that. Right now we have in our hands the ability to act to take guns out of the hands of people who are on the terrorist watch list. If you can't be trusted to fly, you certainly shouldn't be trusted to walk in and just get a weapon of your choice.

Because of this body's failure to bring up this important legislation, I as a Member of Congress can't sit idly by.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 0, nays 405, answered "present" 2, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 675]
NAYS—405

Abraham	Costello (PA)	Grothman
Adams	Courtney	Guinta
Aderholt	Cramer	Guthrie
Allen	Crawford	Gutiérrez
Amash	Crenshaw	Hahn
Amodei	Crowley	Hanna
Ashford	Cuellar	Hardy
Babin	Culberson	Harper
Barletta	Cummings	Heck (NV)
Barr	Curbelo (FL)	Heck (WA)
Barton	Davis (CA)	Hensarling
Bass	Davis, Danny	Herrera Beutler
Beatty	DeFazio	Hice, Jody B.
Becerra	DeGette	Higgins
Benishek	Delaney	Hill
Bera	DeLauro	Himes
Beyer	DeBene	Hinojosa
Bilirakis	Denham	Holding
Bishop (GA)	Dent	Honda
Bishop (UT)	DeSantis	Hoyer
Black	DeSaunier	Hudson
Blackburn	DesJarlais	Huelskamp
Blum	Deutch	Huffman
Blumenauer	Diaz-Balart	Huizenga (MI)
Bonamici	Dingell	Hultgren
Bost	Doggett	Hunter
Boustany	Dold	Hurd (TX)
Boyle, Brendan	Doyle, Michael	Hurt (VA)
F.	F.	Israel
Brady (PA)	Duckworth	Issa
Brady (TX)	Duffy	Jackson Lee
Brat	Duncan (SC)	Jeffries
Brooks (AL)	Duncan (TN)	Jenkins (KS)
Brooks (IN)	Edwards	Jenkins (WV)
Brown (FL)	Ellison	Johnson (GA)
Brownley (CA)	Ellmers (NC)	Johnson (OH)
Buchanan	Emmer (MN)	Jolly
Buck	Engel	Jones
Bucshon	Eshoo	Jordan
Burgess	Esty	Joyce
Bustos	Farenthold	Kaptur
Butterfield	Farr	Katko
Byrne	Fincher	Keating
Calvert	Fitzpatrick	Kelly (MS)
Capps	Fleischmann	Kelly (PA)
Cárdenas	Fleming	Kennedy
Carney	Flores	Kildee
Carson (IN)	Forbes	Kilmer
Carter (GA)	Fortenberry	Kind
Carter (TX)	Foster	King (NY)
Cartwright	Foxx	Kinzinger (IL)
Castor (FL)	Frankel (FL)	Kirkpatrick
Castro (TX)	Frelinghuysen	Kline
Chabot	Fudge	Knight
Chaffetz	Gabbard	Kuster
Chu, Judy	Gallego	Labrador
Cicilline	Garamendi	LaHood
Clark (MA)	Garrett	LaMalfa
Clarke (NY)	Gibbs	Lamborn
Clawson (FL)	Gibson	Lance
Clay	Gohmert	Langevin
Cleaver	Goodlatte	Larsen (WA)
Clyburn	Gosar	Larson (CT)
Coffman	Gowdy	Latta
Cohen	Graham	Lawrence
Cole	Granger	Lee
Collins (GA)	Graves (GA)	Levin
Collins (NY)	Graves (LA)	Lieu, Ted
Conaway	Graves (MO)	Lipinski
Connolly	Grayson	LoBiondo
Conyers	Green, Al	Loebsock
Cook	Green, Gene	Lofgren
Cooper	Griffith	Long
Costa	Grijalva	Lowenthal

Lowey	Perry	Sires
Lucas	Peters	Slaughter
Luetkemeyer	Peterson	Smith (MO)
Lujan Grisham	Pingree	Smith (NE)
(NM)	Pittenger	Smith (NJ)
Luján, Ben Ray	Pitts	Smith (TX)
(NM)	Pocan	Smith (WA)
Lummis	Poe (TX)	Speier
Lynch	Poliquin	Stefanik
MacArthur	Polis	Stewart
Maloney,	Pompeo	Stivers
Carolyn	Posey	Stutzman
Maloney, Sean	Price (NC)	Swalwell (CA)
Marchant	Price, Tom	Thompson (CA)
Marino	Quigley	Thompson (MS)
Massie	Rangel	Thompson (PA)
Matsui	Ratcliffe	Thornberry
McCarthy	Reed	Tiberi
McCaul	Reichert	Tipton
McClintock	Renacci	Titus
McCollum	Ribble	Tonko
McDermott	Rice (NY)	Torres
McGovern	Rice (SC)	Trott
McHenry	Richmond	Tsongas
McKinley	Rigell	Turner
McMorris	Roby	Upton
Rodgers	Roe (TN)	Valadao
McNerney	Rogers (AL)	Van Hollen
McSally	Rogers (KY)	Vargas
Meadows	Rohrabacher	Veasey
Meehan	Rokita	Vela
Meeks	Rooney (FL)	Velázquez
Meng	Ros-Lehtinen	Visclosky
Messer	Ross	Wagner
Mica	Rothfus	Walberg
Miller (FL)	Rouzer	Walden
Miller (MI)	Roybal-Allard	Walker
Moolenaar	Royce	Walorski
Moore	Ruiz	Walters, Mimi
Moulton	Russell	Walz
Mullin	Ryan (OH)	Wasserman
Mulvaney	Salmon	Schultz
Murphy (FL)	Sánchez, Linda	T.
Murphy (PA)	T.	Sanchez, Loretta
Nadler	Sanford	Sanchez, Loretta
Napolitano	Sarbanes	Sanchez, Loretta
Neal	Scalise	Sanchez, Loretta
Neugebauer	Schakowsky	Sanchez, Loretta
Newhouse	Schiff	Sanchez, Loretta
Noem	Schrader	Sanchez, Loretta
Nolan	Schweikert	Sanchez, Loretta
Norcross	Scott (VA)	Sanchez, Loretta
Nugent	Scott, Austin	Sanchez, Loretta
Nunes	Scott, David	Sanchez, Loretta
O'Rourke	Sensenbrenner	Sanchez, Loretta
Olson	Serrano	Sanchez, Loretta
Duffy	Sessions	Sanchez, Loretta
Palazzo	Sewell (AL)	Sanchez, Loretta
Pallone	Sherman	Sanchez, Loretta
Palmer	Shimkus	Sanchez, Loretta
Pascarell	Shuster	Sanchez, Loretta
Paulsen	Simpson	Sanchez, Loretta
Payne	Sinema	Sanchez, Loretta
Pearce		Sanchez, Loretta
Pelosi		Sanchez, Loretta

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Johnson, E. B. Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—26

Aguilar	Harris	Mooney (WV)
Bishop (MI)	Hartzler	Perlmutter
Bridenstine	Hastings	Roskam
Capuano	Johnson, Sam	Ruppersberger
Comstock	Kelly (IL)	Rush
Davis, Rodney	King (IA)	Takai
Donovan	Lewis	Takano
Fattah	Loudermilk	Wittman
Franks (AZ)	Love	

□ 1351

Messrs. WALKER and HUNTER changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska changed his vote from "yea" to "present."

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 675, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING CENTERS REFORM AND IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have no more speakers. If the gentlewoman from California has no more speakers, I am prepared to close.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3842 is bipartisan at its core. It was introduced by my colleague on the committee, Representative BUDDY CARTER, and me and would ensure that the authorities for the Federal Law Enforcement Training Centers are updated and that the centers' ability to train people who play critical roles in the Nation's homeland security is enhanced.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of this bipartisan legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I once again urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3842.

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 Georgia (Mr. CARTER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3842, as amended.

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. CARTER of Georgia. 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.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. SWALWELL).

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

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 3, nays 399, answered "present" 2, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 676]

YEAS—3

Cleaver DeFazio Lipinski

NAYS—399

Abraham Aderholt Amash
Adams Allen Amodei

Ashford Ellmers (NC) LaHood
Babin Emmer (MN) LaMalfa
Barletta Engel Lamborn
Barr Eshoo Lance
Barton Esty Langevin
Bass Farenthold Larsen (WA)
Beatty Farr Larson (CT)
Becerra Fattah Latta
Benishek Fincher Lawrence
Bera Fitzpatrick Lee
Beyer Fleischmann Levin
Bilirakis Fleming Lieu, Ted
Bishop (GA) Flores LoBiondo
Bishop (UT) Forbes Loebsock
Black Fortenberry Lofgren
Blackburn Foster Long
Blum Foxx Loudermilk
Blumenauer Frankel (FL) Love
Bonamici Frelinghuysen Lowenthal
Bost Fudge Lowey
Boustany Gabbard Lucas
Boyle, Brendan Gallego Luetkemeyer
F. Garamendi Lujan Grisham
Brady (PA) Garrett (NM)
Brady (TX) Gibbs Lujan, Ben Ray
Brat Gibson (NM)
Brooks (AL) Gohmert MacArthur
Brooks (IN) Goodlatte Maloney,
Brown (FL) Gosar Carolyn
Brownley (CA) Gowdy Maloney, Sean
Buchanan Granger Marino
Buck Graves (GA) Massie
Bucshon Graves (LA) Matsui
Burgess Graves (MO) McCarthy
Bustos Grayson McCaul
Butterfield Green, Al McClintock
Byrne Green, Gene McCollum
Calvert Griffith McDermott
Capps Grijalva McGovern
Capuano Grothman McHenry
Carney Guinta McKinley
Carson (IN) Guthrie McMorris
Carter (GA) Gutierrez Rodgers
Carter (TX) Hahn McNERNEY
Cartwright Hanna McSally
Castor (FL) Hardy Meadows
Castro (TX) Harper Meehan
Chabot Harris Meeke
Chaffetz Hartzler Meng
Chu, Judy Hastings Messer
Ciilline Heck (NV) Mica
Clark (MA) Heck (WA) Miller (FL)
Clarke (NY) Hensarling Miller (MI)
Clawson (FL) Herrera Beutler Moolenaar
Clay Hice, Jody B. Moore
Clyburn Higgins Moulton
Coffman Hill Mullin
Cohen Himes Mulvaney
Coles Hinojosa Murphy (FL)
Collins (GA) Holding Murphy (PA)
Collins (NY) Honda Nadler
Comstock Hoyer Napolitano
Conaway Hudson Neal
Connolly Huelskamp Neugebauer
Conyers Huffman Newhouse
Cook Huizenga (MI) Noem
Cooper Hultgren Nolan
Costello (PA) Hurd (TX) Norcross
Courtney Hurt (VA) Nugent
Cramer Israel Nunes
Crawford Issa O'Rourke
Crenshaw Jackson Lee Olson
Crowley Jeffries Palazzo
Cuellar Jenkins (KS) Pallone
Culberson Jenkins (WV) Palmer
Cummings Johnson (GA) Pascrell
Curbelo (FL) Johnson (OH) Paulsen
Davis (CA) Jolly Payne
Davis, Rodney Jones Pearce
DeGette Jordan Pelosi
Delaney Joyce Perry
DeLauro Kaptur Peters
DeBene Katko Peterson
Denham Keating Pingree
Dent Kelly (IL) Pittenger
DeSantis Kelly (MS) Pitts
DeSaulnier Kelly (PA) Pocan
DesJarlais Kennedy Poe (TX)
Deutch Kildee Poliquin
Dingell Kilmer Polis
Doggett Kind Pompeo
Dold King (IA) Posey
Doyle, Michael King (NY) Price (NC)
F. Kinzinger (IL) Price, Tom
Duckworth Kirkpatrick Quigley
Duffy Kline Rangel
Duncan (SC) Knight Ratcliffe
Duncan (TN) Kuster Reed
Ellison Labrador Reichert

Renacci Sensenbrenner Vargas
Rice (NY) Serrano Veasey
Rice (SC) Sessions Vela
Richmond Sewell (AL) Velázquez
Rigell Sherman Visclosky
Robby Shimkus Wagner
Roe (TN) Shuster Walberg
Rogers (AL) Simpson Walden
Rogers (KY) Sinema Walker
Rohrabacher Slaughter Walorski
Rokita Smith (MO) Walters, Mimi
Rooney (FL) Smith (NE) Walz
Ros-Lehtinen Smith (TX) Wasserman
Roskam Smith (WA) Schultz
Ross Speler Waters, Maxine
Rothfus Stefanik Watson Coleman
Rouzer Stewart Weber (TX)
Roybal-Allard Stivers Webster (FL)
Royce Stutzman Welch
Ruiz Swalwell (CA) Wenstrup
Ruppersberger Takano Westerman
Russell Thompson (CA) Westmoreland
Ryan (OH) Thompson (MS) Whitfield
Salmon Thompson (PA) Williams
Sanchez, Linda Thornberry Wilson (FL)
T. Tiberi Wilson (SC)
Sanchez, Loretta Titus Wittman
Sanford Tonko Womack
Sarbanes Torres Woodall
Scalise Trott Yarmuth
Schakowsky Tsongas Yoder
Schiff Turner Yoho
Schweikert Upton Young (IA)
Scott (VA) Valadao Zeldin
Scott, Austin Van Hollen

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Johnson, E. B. Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—29

Aguilar Graham Rush
Bishop (MI) Hunter Schrader
Bridenstine Johnson, Sam Scott, David
Cárdenas Lewis Sires
Costa Lummis Smith (NJ)
Davis, Danny Lynch Takai
Diaz-Balart Marchant Tipton
Donovan Mooney (WV) Young (IN)
Edwards Perlmutter Zinke
Franks (AZ) Ribble

□ 1421

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

HSA TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS ACT

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3859) to make technical corrections to the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3859

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 "HSA Technical Corrections Act".

SEC. 2. REFERENCES TO THE HOMELAND SECURITY ACT OF 2002.

Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or a repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-296; 6 U.S.C. 101 et seq.).

SEC. 3. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS TO THE HOMELAND SECURITY ACT OF 2002.

(a) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents in section 1(b) (6 U.S.C. 101 note) is amended as follows:

(1) By striking the items relating to each of the following:

(A) Section 401.
 (B) Section 416.
 (C) Section 430.
 (D) Section 431.
 (E) Section 445.
 (F) Section 446.
 (G) Section 455.
 (H) Section 456.
 (I) Section 459.
 (J) Section 460.
 (K) Section 461.
 (L) Section 472.
 (M) Section 473.
 (N) Section 474.
 (O) Section 475.
 (P) Section 477.
 (Q) Section 706.
 (R) Section 857.
 (S) Section 878.
 (T) Section 881.
 (U) Section 893.
 (V) Section 1204.
 (W) Title XIV.
 (X) Section 1401.
 (Y) Section 1402.
 (Z) Section 1403.
 (AA) Section 1404.
 (BB) Section 1405.
 (CC) Section 1406.
 (DD) Section 1502.

(2) By striking the items relating to the second section 226 and sections 227 and 228 and inserting the following new items:

“Sec. 227. National Cybersecurity and Communications Integration Center.

“Sec. 228. Cyber incident response plan.
 “Sec. 229. Clearances.”.

(3) By striking the item relating to title IV and the item relating to subtitle A of title IV and inserting the following new items:

“TITLE IV—BORDER, MARITIME, AND TRANSPORTATION SECURITY
 “SUBTITLE A—BORDER, MARITIME, AND TRANSPORTATION SECURITY RESPONSIBILITIES AND FUNCTIONS”.

(4) By striking the item relating to section 402 and inserting the following new item:

“Sec. 402. Border, maritime, and transportation responsibilities.”.

(5) By striking the item relating to subtitle B of title IV and inserting the following new item:

“Subtitle B—United States Customs and Border Protection”.

(6) By striking the item relating to section 411 and inserting the following new item:

“Sec. 411. Establishment of United States Customs and Border Protection.”.

(7) By striking the item relating to section 441 and inserting the following new item:

“Sec. 441. Transfer of functions.”.

(8) By striking the item relating to section 442 and inserting the following new item:

“Sec. 442. United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement.”.

(9) By striking the item relating to section 451 and inserting the following new item:

“Sec. 451. Establishment of United States Citizenship and Immigration Services.”.

(10) By striking the item relating to section 2103 and inserting the following new item:

“Sec. 2103. Protection and sharing of information.”.

(b) TITLE I.—Title I (6 U.S.C. 111 et seq.) is amended as follows:

(1) In section 102(f)(10) (6 U.S.C. 112(f)(10)), by striking “Directorate of Border and Transportation Security” and inserting “Commissioner of United States Customs and Border Protection”.

(2) In section 103(a)(1) (6 U.S.C. 113(a)(1))—

(A) by striking the enumerator, the paragraph heading, and the matter preceding subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided under paragraph (2), there are the following officers, appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate:”;

(B) by moving the margins of subparagraphs (A) through (J) two ems to the right;

(C) in subparagraph (C), by striking “An Under Secretary for Border and Transportation Security” and inserting “A Commissioner of United States Customs and Border Protection”;

(D) in subparagraph (E), by striking “the Bureau of” and inserting “United States”;

(E) in subparagraph (G), by striking “A Director of the Office of Counternarcotics Enforcement” and inserting “A Director of United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement”;

(F) by inserting after subparagraph (J) the following new subparagraphs:

“(K) An Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration.
 “(L) A Commandant of the Coast Guard.”.

(c) TITLE II.—Title II (6 U.S.C. 121 et seq.) is amended as follows:

(1) In section 202 (6 U.S.C. 122)—

(A) in subsection (c), by striking “Director of Central Intelligence” and inserting “Director of National Intelligence”; and

(B) in subsection (d)(2), by striking “Director of Central Intelligence” and inserting “Director of National Intelligence”.

(2) In section 210E (6 U.S.C. 124I)—

(A) by striking subsection (e); and

(B) by redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (e).

(3) In section 223 (6 U.S.C. 143)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(B)—

(i) by striking “in coordination with the Under Secretary for Emergency Preparedness and Response,”; and

(ii) by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “, in coordination with the Under Secretary for Emergency Preparedness and Response,”.

(4) In section 225 (6 U.S.C. 145)—

(A) by striking subsection (c); and

(B) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (c).

(5) By redesignating sections 227 (6 U.S.C. 149) and 228 (6 U.S.C. 150) as sections 228 and 229, respectively.

(6) By redesignating the second section 226 (6 U.S.C. 148) (relating to “National Cybersecurity and Communications Integration Center”) as section 227.

(7) In section 228 (6 U.S.C. 149), as redesignated by paragraph (6), by striking “section 226” and inserting “section 227(a)(1)”.

(d) TITLE III.—Section 302 (6 U.S.C. 182) is amended by striking “biological,” both places it appears and inserting “biological,”.

(e) TITLE IV.—Title IV (6 U.S.C. 201 et seq.) is amended as follows:

(1) By striking the title heading and inserting the following:

“TITLE IV—BORDER, MARITIME, AND TRANSPORTATION SECURITY”.

(2) By striking the heading for subtitle A and inserting the following:

“Subtitle A—Border, Maritime, and Transportation Security Responsibilities and Functions”.

(3) By striking section 401 (6 U.S.C. 201).

(4) In section 402 (6 U.S.C. 202)—

(A) by striking the section heading and inserting the following: “BORDER, MARITIME, AND TRANSPORTATION RESPONSIBILITIES.”; and

(B) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “, acting through the Under Secretary for Border and Transportation Security,”.

(5) By striking the heading for subtitle B and inserting the following:

“Subtitle B—United States Customs and Border Protection”.

(6) In section 411 (6 U.S.C. 211)—

(A) by striking the section heading and inserting the following: “ESTABLISHMENT OF UNITED STATES CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION.”;

(B) in subsection (a)—

(i) by striking “the United States Customs Service” and inserting “the United States Customs and Border Protection”; and

(ii) by striking “the Under Secretary for Border and Transportation Security” and inserting “the Secretary”; and

(C) in subsection (b)—

(i) in the subsection heading, by striking “OF CUSTOMS”;

(ii) in paragraph (1), by striking “the Customs Service a Commissioner of Customs” and inserting “United States Customs and Border Protection a Commissioner”; and

(iii) by striking paragraph (3).

(7) In section 412(b)(1) (6 U.S.C. 212), by striking “United States Customs Service” and inserting “United States Customs and Border Protection”.

(8) In section 413 (6 U.S.C. 213), by striking “available to the United States Customs Service or”.

(9) In section 414 (6 U.S.C. 214), by striking “the United States Customs Service” and inserting “United States Customs and Border Protection”.

(10) By striking section 416 (6 U.S.C. 216).

(11) In section 418 (6 U.S.C. 218)—

(A) by striking “(a) CONTINUING REPORTS.—”; and

(B) by striking subsection (b).

(12) In section 423 (6 U.S.C. 233)—

(A) by striking subsection (b); and

(B) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (b).

(13) In section 424(a) (6 U.S.C. 234(a)), by striking “Under Secretary for Border Transportation and Security” and inserting “Secretary”.

(14) In section 427 (6 U.S.C. 235), by striking subsection (c).

(15) In section 428 (6 U.S.C. 236)—

(A) in subsection (e), by striking paragraphs (7) and (8);

(B) by striking subsections (g) and (h); and

(C) by redesignating subsection (i) as subsection (g).

(16) By striking section 430 (6 U.S.C. 238).

(17) By striking section 431 (6 U.S.C. 239).

(18) In section 441 (6 U.S.C. 251)—

(A) in the section heading, by striking “TO UNDER SECRETARY FOR BORDER AND TRANSPORTATION SECURITY”; and

(B) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “the Under Secretary for Border and Transportation Security” and inserting “the Secretary”.

(19) In section 442 (6 U.S.C. 252)—

(A) in the section heading, by striking “ESTABLISHMENT OF BUREAU OF BORDER SECURITY” and inserting “UNITED STATES IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT”;

(B) by striking “the Bureau of Border Security” each place it appears and inserting “United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement”;

(C) by striking “Bureau of Border Security” each place it appears and inserting “United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement”;

(D) by striking “the Bureau” each place it appears and inserting “United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement”;

(E) by striking “Under Secretary for Border and Transportation Security” each place it appears and inserting “Secretary”;

(F) by striking “the Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services” both places it appears and inserting “United States Citizenship and Immigration Services”;

(G) in subsection (a)—

(i) in the subsection heading, by striking “OF BUREAU”;

(ii) in paragraph (1) by striking “a bureau to be known as the ‘Bureau of Border Security’” and inserting “the Bureau of Border Security”;

(iii) in paragraph (2), in the paragraph heading, by striking “ASSISTANT SECRETARY” and inserting “DIRECTOR”; and

(iv) by striking paragraph (5) and inserting the following:

“(5) MANAGERIAL ROTATION PROGRAM.—Not later than 1 year after the date on which the transfer of functions specified under section 441 takes effect, the Director of United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement shall design and implement a managerial rotation program under which employees of United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement holding positions involving supervisory or managerial responsibility and classified, in accordance with chapter 51 of title 5, United States Code, as a GS–14 or above, shall—

“(A) gain some experience in all the major functions performed by United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement; and

“(B) work in at least one local office of United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement.”; and

(H) by striking “Assistant Secretary” each place it appears and inserting “Director”.

(20) In section 443 (6 U.S.C. 253)—

(A) by striking “Under Secretary for Border and Transportation Security” and inserting “Secretary”; and

(B) by striking “the Bureau of Border Security” each place it appears and inserting “United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement”.

(21) In section 444 (6 U.S.C. 254)—

(A) by striking “Under Secretary for Border and Transportation Security” and inserting “Secretary”; and

(B) by striking “pursuant to policies and procedures applicable to employees of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.”; and

(C) by striking “the Bureau of Border Security” and inserting “United States Customs and Border Protection”.

(22) By striking section 445.

(23) By striking section 446.

(24) In section 451—

(A) in the section heading, by striking “BUREAU OF” and inserting “UNITED STATES”;

(B) by striking “the Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services” each place it appears and inserting “United States Citizenship and Immigration Services”;

(C) by striking “Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services” each place it appears and inserting “United States Citizenship and Immigration Services”;

(D) by striking “the Bureau of Border Security” each place it appears and inserting “United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement”;

(E) in subsection (a)—

(i) in the subsection heading, by striking “OF BUREAU”;

(ii) in paragraph (1)—

(I) by striking “a bureau to be known as the ‘Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services’” and inserting “the Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services”; and

(II) by striking “the ‘Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services’” and inserting “the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services”;

(iii) in paragraph (2)(C), by striking “Assistant Secretary” and inserting “Director”; and

(iv) by striking paragraph (4) and inserting the following:

“(4) MANAGERIAL ROTATION PROGRAM.—Not later than 1 year after the effective date specified in section 455, the Director of United States Citizenship and Immigration Services shall design and implement a managerial rotation program under which employees of United States Citizenship and Immigration Services holding positions involving supervisory or managerial responsibility and classified, in accordance with chapter 51 of title 5, United States Code, as a GS–14 or above, shall—

“(A) gain some experience in all the major functions performed by United States Citizenship and Immigration Services; and

“(B) work in at least one field office and one service center of United States Citizenship and Immigration Services.”; and

(F) by striking subsection (g).

(25) In section 452 (6 U.S.C. 272)—

(A) by striking “the Bureau of” each place it appears and inserting “United States”; and

(B) in subsection (f), in the subsection heading, by striking “BUREAU OF” and inserting “UNITED STATES”.

(26) In section 453 (6 U.S.C. 273)—

(A) by striking “the Bureau of” each place it appears and inserting “United States”; and

(B) in subsection (a)(2), by striking “such bureau” and inserting “United States Citizenship and Immigration Services”.

(27) In section 454 (6 U.S.C. 274)—

(A) by striking “the Bureau of” each place it appears and inserting “United States”; and

(B) by striking “pursuant to policies and procedures applicable to employees of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.”.

(28) By striking section 455 (6 U.S.C. 271 note).

(29) By striking section 456 (6 U.S.C. 275).

(30) By striking section 459 (6 U.S.C. 276).

(31) By striking section 460 (6 U.S.C. 277).

(32) By striking section 461 (6 U.S.C. 278).

(33) In section 462(b)(2)(A) (6 U.S.C. 279(b)(2)(A))—

(A) by striking “the Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services” and inserting “United States Citizenship and Immigration Services”;

(B) by striking “Assistant Secretary” and inserting “Director”; and

(C) by striking “the Bureau of Border Security” and inserting “United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement”.

(34) By striking section 472 (6 U.S.C. 292).

(35) By striking section 473 (6 U.S.C. 293).

(36) By striking section 474 (6 U.S.C. 294).

(37) By striking section 475 (6 U.S.C. 295).

(38) In section 476 (6 U.S.C. 296)—

(A) by striking “the Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services” each place it appears and inserting “United States Citizenship and Immigration Services”; and

(B) by striking “the Bureau of Border Security” each place it appears and inserting “United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement”.

(39) By striking section 477 (6 U.S.C. 297).

(40) By amending section 478 (6 U.S.C. 298) to read as follows:

“SEC. 478. IMMIGRATION FUNCTIONS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—One year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and each year thereafter, the Secretary shall submit a report to the President, to the Committees on the Judiciary and Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives, and to the Committees on the Judiciary and Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, on the impact the transfers made by this subtitle has had on immigration functions.

“(b) MATTER INCLUDED.—The report shall address the following with respect to the period covered by the report:

“(1) The aggregate number of all immigration applications and petitions received, and processed, by the Department.

“(2) Region-by-region statistics on the aggregate number of immigration applications and petitions filed by an alien (or filed on behalf of an alien) and denied, disaggregated by category of denial and application or petition type.

“(3) The quantity of backlogged immigration applications and petitions that have been processed, the aggregate number awaiting processing, and a detailed plan for eliminating the backlog.

“(4) The average processing period for immigration applications and petitions, disaggregated by application or petition type.

“(5) The number and types of immigration-related grievances filed with any official of the Department of Justice, and if those grievances were resolved.

“(6) Plans to address grievances and improve immigration services.

“(7) Whether immigration-related fees were used consistent with legal requirements regarding such use.

“(8) Whether immigration-related questions conveyed by customers to the Department (whether conveyed in person, by telephone, or by means of the Internet) were answered effectively and efficiently.”.

(f) TITLE V.—Title V (6 U.S.C. 311 et seq.) is amended as follows:

(1) In section 501(8) (6 U.S.C. 311(8)), by striking “section 502(a)(6)” and inserting “section 504(a)(6)”.

(2) In section 504(a)(3)(B) (6 U.S.C. 314(a)(3)), by striking “, the National Disaster Medical System.”.

(g) TITLE VI.—Section 601 (6 U.S.C. 331) is amended by striking “Director of Central Intelligence” each place it appears and inserting “Director of National Intelligence”.

(h) TITLE VII.—Title VII (6 U.S.C. 341 et seq.) is amended as follows:

(1) In section 701(b)(1) (6 U.S.C. 341(b)(1))—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking “the Bureau of Border Security and the Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services” and inserting “United States Citizenship and Immigration Services and United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement”; and

(ii) by striking “such bureau” and inserting “United States Citizenship and Immigration Services”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking “such bureaus” and inserting “United States Citizenship and Immigration Services and United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement”.

(2) By striking section 706 (6 U.S.C. 346).

(i) TITLE VIII.—Title VIII (6 U.S.C. 361 et seq.) is amended as follows:

(1) In section 833 (6 U.S.C. 393), by striking subsection (e).

(2) In section 843(b)(1)(B) (6 U.S.C. 413(b)(1)(B)), by striking “as determined by” and all that follows through “; and” and inserting “as determined by the Secretary; and”.

(3) By amending section 844 (6 U.S.C. 414) to read as follows:

“SEC. 844. HOMELAND SECURITY ROTATION PROGRAM.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall establish the Homeland Security Rotation Program (in this section referred to as the “Rotation Program”) for employees of the Department. The Rotation Program shall use applicable best practices, including those from the Chief Human Capital Officers Council.

“(b) GOALS.—The Rotation Program established by the Secretary shall—

“(1) be established in accordance with the Human Capital Strategic Plan of the Department;

“(2) provide middle and senior level employees in the Department the opportunity to broaden their knowledge through exposure to other components of the Department;

“(3) expand the knowledge base of the Department by providing for rotational assignments of employees to other components;

“(4) build professional relationships and contacts among the employees in the Department;

“(5) invigorate the workforce with exciting and professionally rewarding opportunities;

“(6) incorporate Department human capital strategic plans and activities, and address critical human capital deficiencies, recruitment and retention efforts, and succession planning within the Federal workforce of the Department; and

“(7) complement and incorporate (but not replace) rotational programs within the Department in effect on the date of enactment of this section.

“(c) ADMINISTRATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Chief Human Capital Officer shall administer the Rotation Program.

“(2) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The Chief Human Capital Officer shall—

“(A) provide oversight of the establishment and implementation of the Rotation Program;

“(B) establish a framework that supports the goals of the Rotation Program and promotes cross-disciplinary rotational opportunities;

“(C) establish eligibility for employees to participate in the Rotation Program and select participants from employees who apply;

“(D) establish incentives for employees to participate in the Rotation Program, including promotions and employment preferences;

“(E) ensure that the Rotation Program provides professional education and training;

“(F) ensure that the Rotation Program develops qualified employees and future leaders with broadbased experience throughout the Department;

“(G) provide for greater interaction among employees in components of the Department; and

“(H) coordinate with rotational programs within the Department in effect on the date of enactment of this section.

“(d) ALLOWANCES, PRIVILEGES, AND BENEFITS.—All allowances, privileges, rights, seniority, and other benefits of employees participating in the Rotation Program shall be preserved.”

(4) By striking section 857 (6 U.S.C. 427).

(5) By striking section 878 (6 U.S.C. 458).

(6) By striking section 881 (6 U.S.C. 461).

(7) In section 882(a)(1) (6 U.S.C. 462(a)(1)), by striking “Office of the Secretary” and inserting “Federal Emergency Management Agency”.

(8) In section 888 (6 U.S.C. 468), by striking subsection (h).

(9) In section 892 (6 U.S.C. 482)—

(A) in subsection (b)(7), by striking “Director of Central Intelligence” and inserting “Director of National Intelligence”; and

(B) in subsection (c)(3)(D), by striking “Director of Central Intelligence” and inserting “Director of National Intelligence”.

(10) By striking section 893 (6 U.S.C. 483).

(j) TITLE IX.—Section 903(a) (6 U.S.C. 493(a)) is amended in the subsection heading by striking “MEMBERS—” and inserting “MEMBERS.—”.

(k) TITLE X.—Section 1001(c)(1) (6 U.S.C. 511(c)(1)) is amended by striking “Director of Central Intelligence” and inserting “Director of National Intelligence”.

(l) TITLE XII.—Title XII is amended by striking section 1204.

(m) TITLE XIV.—Strike title XIV (49 U.S.C. 40101 note et seq.).

(n) TITLE XV.—Title XV (6 U.S.C. 541 et seq.) is amended by striking section 1502.

(o) TITLE XVIII.—Title XVIII (6 U.S.C. 571 et seq.) is amended as follows:

(1) In section 1801(c)(12) (6 U.S.C. 571(c)(12)), by striking “Assistant Secretary for Grants and Training” and inserting “Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency”.

(2) In section 1804(b)(1) (6 U.S.C. 574(b)(1)), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “Assistant Secretary for Grants and Planning” and inserting “Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency”.

(p) TITLE XIX.—Section 1902(b)(3) (6 U.S.C. 592(b)(3)) is amended—

(1) in the paragraph heading, by striking “HAWAIIAN NATIVE-SERVING” and inserting “NATIVE HAWAIIAN-SERVING”; and

(2) by striking “Hawaiian native-serving” and inserting “Native Hawaiian-serving”.

(q) TITLE XX.—Title XX (6 U.S.C. 601 et seq.) is amended as follows:

(1) In section 2006(b)(4)—

(A) in subparagraph (D), by inserting “and” after the semicolon;

(B) in subparagraph (E), by striking “; and” and inserting a period; and

(C) by striking subparagraph (F).

(2) In section 2021 (6 U.S.C. 611)—

(A) by striking subsection (c); and

(B) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (c).

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3859, the HSA Technical Corrections Act.

This important, commonsense legislation amends the Homeland Security Act of 2002, the HSA, by updating obsolete language and by striking outdated offices and reporting requirements.

In the aftermath of September 11, 2001, Congress passed the HSA, the organizing document of the Department of Homeland Security, or DHS, to enhance the ability of the Federal Government to prevent future acts of domestic terrorism.

The passage of this legislation marked one of the most dramatic reorganizations of the Federal Government in decades and introduced a number of new offices and reporting requirements. In the intervening years, agencies have changed; names, roles, and responsibilities have shifted; and a number of reporting requirements have

expired. This legislation updates the HSA to ensure it more accurately reflects the mission of DHS, and thereby allows Congress to conduct more effective oversight of the Department.

I urge all Members to join me in supporting 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.

I rise in support of H.R. 3859, the HSA Technical Corrections Act of 2015.

Let me, first of all, thank the chairperson and ranking member of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee on H.R. 3859 and thank the ranking member, Mr. THOMPSON, and the chairman of the full committee. The American people are looking for homeland security. They are looking for us to be secure.

Before I briefly discuss H.R. 3859, let me applaud the Carter-Torres bill, which was just passed, giving further authority to train law enforcement all over America. As we can see, law enforcement is a part of our first responders on homeland security.

H.R. 3859 is a technical corrections bill. It updates and revises the Homeland Security Act of 2002 by, among other things, eliminating onetime reporting requirements, removing antiquated positions that no longer exist or have evolved, and striking provisions that were inserted in 2002 before the Department of Homeland Security was officially constituted in 2003.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note that during the Homeland Security Committee's November 4 markup of H.R. 3859, members favorably and unanimously reported this bill.

I acknowledge Mr. PERRY for his leadership on these issues as well as the collaboration we have on this committee. With this in mind, I commend this bill for House consideration.

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

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER).

Ms. SPEIER. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman just referred to H.R. 3859 as a unanimous bill that came out of Homeland Security. She spoke about how this measure is going to get rid of reporting requirements and antiquated elements regarding homeland security.

Meanwhile, Members, we have a travesty on our hands, and we are doing nothing about it. We just witnessed the 353rd mass shooting of the year in this country. We are all concerned about homegrown terrorists. We had a homegrown terrorist who annihilated 14 people and injured many more just last week.

We have a huge loophole in the law that allows persons who are on the no-fly list to purchase guns in this country. If we believe that they should not

have the right to fly, why should they have the right to own a gun? People like Faisal Shahzad was already on the no-fly list when he attempted to bomb Times Square on May 1, 2010. If he had decided to walk into a gun store that day and purchase a gun, he would have been able to do so. This makes no sense.

It is time for us to engage in common sense. It is time for the Homeland Security Committee to come together in a unanimous fashion and pass H.R. 1076. There is a discharge petition on the floor. This bill should come before the full House. Vote however you want to, but give each and every Member of this House the opportunity to be recorded on whether or not one wants people who are on suspected terrorist lists to be able to buy a gun.

□ 1430

For those who may be on that list for purposes that are wrong or in error, so they have to wait 3 days before they get the gun. Better to have safety in this country for all Americans, better to have persons who do not belong in a position of owning a gun, but belong on the list not to fly, to not be able to buy a gun.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER).

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 4, nays 394, answered “present” 2, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 677]

YEAS—4

DeFazio Johnson, E. B.
Harris Peterson

NAYS—394

Abraham	Boyle, Brendan	Castor (FL)
Adams	F.	Castro (TX)
Aderholt	Brady (PA)	Chabot
Allen	Brady (TX)	Chaffetz
Amash	Brat	Chu, Judy
Ashford	Bridenstine	Clark (MA)
Babin	Brooks (AL)	Clarke (NY)
Barletta	Brooks (IN)	Clawson (FL)
Barr	Brown (FL)	Cleaver
Barton	Brownley (CA)	Clyburn
Beatty	Buchanan	Coffman
Becerra	Buck	Cole
Benishek	Bucshon	Collins (GA)
Bera	Burgess	Comstock
Beyer	Bustos	Conaway
Bilirakis	Butterfield	Connolly
Bishop (GA)	Byrne	Hurd (TX)
Bishop (UT)	Calvert	Hurt (VA)
Black	Capps	Cook
Blackburn	Capuano	Cooper
Blum	Cárdenas	Costello (PA)
Blumenauer	Carney	Courtney
Bonamici	Carson (IN)	Cramer
Bost	Carter (GA)	Crawford
Boustany	Carter (TX)	Crenshaw
	Cartwright	Crowley
		Cuellar

Culberson	Jordan	Pearce
Cummings	Joyce	Pelosi
Curbelo (FL)	Kaptur	Perry
Davis (CA)	Katko	Peters
Davis, Rodney	Keating	Pingree
DeGette	Kelly (IL)	Pitts
DeLaney	Kelly (MS)	Pocan
DeLauro	Kelly (PA)	Poe (TX)
DelBene	Kennedy	Poliquin
Denham	Kildee	Polis
Dent	Kilmer	Pompeo
DeSantis	Kind	Posey
DeSaulnier	King (IA)	Price (NC)
DesJarlais	King (NY)	Price, Tom
Diaz-Balart	Kinzinger (IL)	Quigley
Doggett	Kirkpatrick	Rangel
Dold	Kline	Ratcliffe
Doyle, Michael	Knight	Reed
F.	Kuster	Reichert
Duckworth	Labrador	Renacci
Duffy	LaHood	Ribble
Duncan (SC)	LaMalfa	Rice (NY)
Duncan (TN)	Lamborn	Rice (SC)
Ellison	Lance	Richmond
Elmrs (NC)	Langevin	Rigell
Emmer (MN)	Larsen (WA)	Roby
Engel	Larson (CT)	Roe (TN)
Eshoo	Latta	Rogers (AL)
Esty	Lawrence	Rogers (KY)
Farenthold	Lee	Rohrabacher
Farr	Levin	Rokita
Fattah	Lieu, Ted	Rooney (FL)
Fincher	LoBiondo	Ros-Lehtinen
Fitzpatrick	Loebsock	Roskam
Fleischmann	Lofgren	Ross
Fleming	Long	Rothfus
Flores	Loudermilk	Rouzer
Forbes	Love	Roybal-Allard
Fortenberry	Lowenthal	Royce
Foster	Lowe	Ruiz
Foxx	Lucas	Ruppersberger
Frankel (FL)	Luetkemeyer	Ryan (OH)
Franks (AZ)	Lujan Grisham	Salmon
Frelinghuysen	(NM)	Sánchez, Linda
Fudge	Luján, Ben Ray	T.
Gabbard	(NM)	Sanchez, Loretta
Gallego	Lynch	Sanford
Garamendi	MacArthur	Sarbanes
Garrett	Maloney,	Scalise
Gibbs	Carolyn	Schakowsky
Gibson	Maloney, Sean	Schiff
Gohmert	Marchant	Schweikert
Goodlatte	Marino	Scott (VA)
Gosar	Massie	Scott, Austin
Gowdy	Matsui	Sensenbrenner
Graham	McCarthy	Serrano
Graves (GA)	McCaul	Sessions
Graves (LA)	McClintock	Sewell (AL)
Graves (MO)	McCollum	Sherman
Grayson	McDermott	Shimkus
Green, Al	McGovern	Shuster
Green, Gene	McHenry	Simpson
Griffith	McKinley	Sinema
Grothman	McMorris	Sires
Guinta	Rodgers	Slaughter
Guthrie	McNerney	Smith (MO)
Hahn	McSally	Smith (NE)
Hanna	Meadows	Smith (NJ)
Hardy	Meehan	Smith (TX)
Harper	Meeks	Smith (WA)
Hastings	Meng	Speier
Heck (NV)	Messer	Stefanik
Heck (WA)	Mica	Stewart
Hensarling	Miller (FL)	Stivers
Herrera Beutler	Miller (MI)	Stutzman
Hice, Jody B.	Moolenaar	Swalwell (CA)
Higgins	Moore	Takano
Hill	Moulton	Thompson (CA)
Himes	Mullin	Thompson (MS)
Hinojosa	Mulvaney	Thompson (PA)
Holding	Murphy (FL)	Thornberry
Honda	Nadler	Tiberi
Hoyer	Napolitano	Tipton
Hudson	Neal	Tonko
Huelskamp	Neugebauer	Torres
Huizenga (MI)	Newhouse	Trott
Hultgren	Noem	Tsongas
Hunter	Nolan	Turner
Hurt (TX)	Norcross	Upton
Hurt (VA)	Nugent	Valadao
Issa	Nunes	Van Hollen
Isaiah	O'Rourke	Vargas
Jackson Lee	Olson	Veasey
Jenkins (KS)	Palazzo	Vela
Jenkins (WV)	Pallone	Velázquez
Johnson (GA)	Palmer	Visclosky
Johnson (OH)	Pascrell	Wagner
Jolly	Paulsen	Walberg
Jones	Payne	Walden

Walker	Welch	Woodall
Walorski	Wenstrup	Yarmuth
Walters, Mimi	Westerman	Yoder
Walz	Westmoreland	Yoho
Wasserman	Whitfield	Young (IA)
Schultz	Williams	Young (IN)
Waters, Maxine	Wilson (FL)	Zeldin
Watson Coleman	Wilson (SC)	Zinke
Weber (TX)	Wittman	
Webster (FL)	Womack	

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—2

Cohen Lipinski

NOT VOTING—33

Aguilar	Donovan	Mooney (WV)
Amodei	Edwards	Murphy (PA)
Bass	Granger	Perlmutter
Bishop (MI)	Grijalva	Pittenger
Cicilline	Gutiérrez	Rush
Clay	Hartzler	Russell
Collins (NY)	Huffman	Schrader
Costa	Jeffries	Scott, David
Davis, Danny	Johnson, Sam	Takai
Deutch	Lewis	Titus
Dingell	Lummis	Young (AK)

□ 1452

Messrs. MEEHAN, POMPEO, ELLISON, and BABIN changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, December 8, 2015, I was unable to vote. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: on rollcall No. 675, “nay,” on rollcall No. 677, “nay.”

HSA TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YOUNG of Iowa). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say thank you to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN), my good friend, for the fine work they did on this bipartisan, noncontroversial bill that is common sense and does the right thing. But, unfortunately, it has been hijacked, Mr. Speaker.

It has been hijacked for this ruse. They set it aside. They said: Well, we have got this discharge petition. We want to get this bill on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, they don't have the names to get the bill on the floor. Furthermore, I contend they don't even want to vote for it. They don't want to vote on it. They just want to talk about this. These are the folks who tell everybody that they are here to protect your rights.

Mr. Speaker, they talk about they want the people on the no-fly list to have their right to firearms taken away from them, understanding—hopefully, they understand—they have no idea what it takes to get on the no-fly list. These people on the no-fly list have no idea half the time that they are on it.

Furthermore, the no-fly list is maintained by bureaucrats, the same administration that persecutes its citizens and has them audited by the IRS

for their beliefs and what they say at a prayer breakfast.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY), my friend, and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), my friend, for having a bill that would actually clean up some problems within Homeland Security.

But, as I listen to the debate, including the last gentlewoman who moved for adjournment, I wonder if people who speak on this floor, Mr. Speaker, sometimes listen to themselves. As the gentlewoman pointed out—we could have the words read back, but she actually said that the Times Square bomber, the guy that was trying to blow up people with a bomb in Times Square, could have gone in and bought a gun. Obviously, he wasn't using a gun.

We also know that, as our friends across the aisle have proposed more stringent background checks and more extensive gun control laws, that not one of the proposals of this administration would have stopped the killings in Colorado, in Oregon at the community college, or at San Bernardino. This body ought to be about doing things that make a difference, not doing things for show.

As far as the no-fly list, when we have a process that is conducted behind closed doors, a process that was not formulated and voted on by the elected Members of Congress, that puts people on a no-fly list, my friends who support that idea are telling people around the country, including the 200,000 people buying guns in the last month, that we want an arbitrary process by a President, who a Muslim Brotherhood publication in Egypt says is advised by six of their top Muslim brothers, to formulate a list—it is not my words. That is the Egyptian publication back in December of 2012. They want that President formulating behind closed doors a list of Americans who can never buy a gun. This is the same administration that has gone after conservative organizations with the IRS.

Let me also point out that, before you try to clean out the homes of honest, law-abiding Americans, including a general who is a constituent who keeps ending up on the no-fly list, why don't you get rid of the 72 Department of Homeland Security employees who were on the no-fly list before you try to take guns away from law-abiding Americans.

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

Mr. GOHMERT. May I have 30 more seconds?

Mr. PERRY. No. I need to keep moving. I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1500

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

Let me just say this: I am not sure if the gentleman from Texas, a dear

friend, was asking us to get rid of the no-fly list or the watch list.

Our point today, Mr. Speaker, is very narrow. We are just asking that terrorists not be able to walk into a gun shop and buy a gun. This is a loophole that is most glaring. Eighty percent of the American people believe that this is impossible; it must not be true. We are trying to prevent suspected terrorists from walking into a gun store and buying a deadly weapon.

The investigation, tragically, in California is not yet finished, so we don't have the final answer as to what would have prevented that. But it is astonishing that the loophole has allowed more than 2,000 suspects on the FBI terrorist watch list to buy guns in the U.S. over the past 11 years.

When I started this debate, I was happy that we had come to the floor to deal with Homeland Security bills. The American people want the homeland safe and secure. They don't want demagoguery. They want safety and security.

Legislation blocking terrorists from getting guns makes America no more safer and secure than apple pie. This is a time when more than 90 percent of all suspected terrorists who tried to buy guns in America walked away and bought them. They got the weapon they wanted. This is not criminals, gangs, or others. We are dealing with those individuals who are terrorists. They have the right to get a gun.

Can we do something this week, Mr. Speaker? Can we add to the safety and security of the American people? As we pass this bill, H.R. 3859, which I applaud its correcting technicalities, can we join together and can we pass closing the gun loophole that allows terrorists to go and buy a gun to terrorize innocent Americans? I think we can do better.

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

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

We have talked a lot in the last couple of weeks about the visa waiver program, visas in general, and Syrian refugees. Let me remind this body and the American people that 49 percent of all illegals in this country didn't cross our southern border; they came here with a permission slip in their hand, known as a visa. And they chose to overstay that visa. Now they are categorized as visa overstays. These overstays are people that we trusted by giving them a permission slip to come into our great country.

There are six words that ought to be brought up as we talk about this issue: secure the border, enforce the laws. That is how you keep America safe.

I want to tell you, national security is at stake here. Americans are concerned. I won't say Americans are

afraid, but they are concerned. They expect us to do our job to secure this great Nation. They expect us to look into the visa waiver program. They expect us to look into the refugees and the vetting process. They expect us to keep them safe.

We ought to talk about securing the border and enforcing the laws. We are not chasing footprints in the desert with regard to the visa overstays. We know who these people are. They have had an interview at a consulate or embassy. We probably have a thumbprint, a picture, a name. We probably have an address of where they are going.

Let's keep our eye on the ball here. Americans expect us to keep them safe, and that is by reviewing the visa waiver program, that is considering the vetting process, and that is enforcing the law. Let's secure our Nation.

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

Mr. Speaker, I started by saying that the American people are looking to us to secure the homeland.

As we look at these series of bills that we have on the floor, H.R. 3859 is a technical corrections bill. This is a bill that should be passed. Americans expect clarity from this body. Clarity from this body means that at the same time as we pass H.R. 3859, we should also be concerned about making sure that we close gun show loopholes so as to avoid having terrorists buy guns.

I believe that that is the appropriate and direct way to handle this question of securing the Nation. Do the obvious to secure the Nation: stop terrorists from getting guns.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I, once again, urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3859, which is really the issue at hand.

Regarding the other issue that is being discussed here, this is an issue of failure of foreign policy: an open border and a visa waiver program that allows terrorists to come into our Nation unfettered. Other than the issue at hand, that is the issue that we are really talking about.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support H.R. 3859, the HSA Technical Corrections Act. Again, it is important, commonsense legislation. It amends the Homeland Security Act of 2002 by updating obsolete language and striking outdated offices and reporting requirements.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of New York). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3859, 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.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 7, nays 398, answered “present” 4, not voting 24, as follows:

	[Roll No. 678]	
	YEAS—7	
DeFazio	Johnson, E. B.	Peterson
Farr	Labrador	
Harris	Massie	
	NAYS—398	
Abraham	Collins (NY)	Garrett
Adams	Comstock	Gibbs
Aderholt	Conaway	Gibson
Allen	Connolly	Gohmert
Amash	Conyers	Goodlatte
Ashford	Cook	Gosar
Babin	Cooper	Gowdy
Barletta	Costa	Graham
Barr	Costello (PA)	Granger
Barton	Courtney	Graves (GA)
Bass	Cramer	Graves (LA)
Beatty	Crawford	Graves (MO)
Becerra	Crenshaw	Grayson
Benishkek	Crowley	Green, Al
Bera	Cuellar	Green, Gene
Beyer	Culberson	Griffith
Billirakis	Cummings	Grithman
Bishop (GA)	Curbelo (FL)	Guinta
Black	Davis (CA)	Guthrie
Blackburn	Davis, Danny	Gutiérrez
Blum	Davis, Rodney	Hahn
Blumenauer	DeGette	Hanna
Bonamici	Delaney	Hardy
Bost	DeLauro	Harper
Boustany	DelBene	Hartzler
Boyle, Brendan	Denham	Hastings
F.	Dent	Heck (NV)
Brady (PA)	DeSantis	Heck (WA)
Brady (TX)	DeSaulnier	Hensarling
Brat	DesJarlais	Herrera Beutler
Bridenstine	Deutch	Hice, Jody B.
Brooks (AL)	Diaz-Balart	Higgins
Brooks (IN)	Doggett	Hill
Brown (FL)	Dold	Himes
Brownley (CA)	Doyle, Michael	Hinojosa
Buchanan	F.	Holding
Buck	Duckworth	Honda
Bucshon	Duffy	Hoyer
Burgess	Duncan (SC)	Hudson
Bustos	Duncan (TN)	Huelskamp
Butterfield	Edwards	Huffman
Byrne	Ellison	Huizenga (MI)
Calvert	Elmrs (NC)	Hultgren
Capus	Emmer (MN)	Hunter
Capuano	Engel	Hurd (TX)
Carney	Eshoo	Hurt (VA)
Carson (IN)	Esty	Israel
Carter (GA)	Farenthold	Issa
Carter (TX)	Fattah	Jackson Lee
Cartwright	Fincher	Jeffries
Castor (FL)	Fitzpatrick	Jenkins (KS)
Castro (TX)	Fleischmann	Jenkins (WV)
Chabot	Fleming	Johnson (GA)
Chaffetz	Flores	Johnson (OH)
Chu, Judy	Forbes	Jolly
Cicilline	Fortenberry	Jones
Clark (MA)	Foster	Jordan
Clarke (NY)	Fox	Joyce
Clawson (FL)	Frankel (FL)	Kaptur
Clay	Franks (AZ)	Katko
Cleaver	Frelinghuysen	Keating
Clyburn	Fudge	Kelly (IL)
Coffman	Gabbard	Kelly (MS)
Collins (GA)	Gallego	Kelly (PA)

Kennedy	Neal	Sewell (AL)
Kildee	Neugebauer	Sherman
Kilmer	Newhouse	Shimkus
Kind	Noem	Shuster
King (IA)	Nolan	Sinema
King (NY)	Norcross	Sires
Kinzinger (IL)	Nugent	Slaughter
Kirkpatrick	Nunes	Smith (MO)
Kline	O'Rourke	Smith (NE)
Knight	Olson	Smith (NJ)
Kuster	Palazzo	Smith (TX)
LaHood	Pallone	Smith (WA)
LaMalfa	Palmer	Speier
Lamborn	Pascrell	Stefanik
Lance	Paulsen	Stewart
Langevin	Payne	Stivers
Larson (CT)	Pearce	Stutzman
Latta	Pelosi	Swalwell (CA)
Lawrence	Perry	Takano
Lee	Peters	Thompson (CA)
Levin	Pingree	Thompson (MS)
Lieu, Ted	Pittenger	Thompson (PA)
LoBiondo	Pitts	Thornberry
Loeb	Pocan	Tiberi
Loeb	Poe (TX)	Tipton
Loeb	Poliquin	Titus
Long	Polis	Tonko
Loudermilk	Pompeo	Torres
Love	Posey	Trott
Lowenthal	Price (NC)	Tsongas
Lowe	Price, Tom	Turner
Lucas	Quigley	Upton
Luetkemeyer	Rangel	Valadao
Lujan Grisham	Ratcliffe	Van Hollen
(NM)	Reed	Vargas
Lujan, Ben Ray	Reichert	Veasey
(NM)	Renacci	Vela
Lynch	Ribble	Velázquez
MacArthur	Rice (NY)	Visclosky
Maloney,	Rice (SC)	Wagner
Carolyn	Rigell	Walberg
Maloney, Sean	Roby	Walden
Marchant	Roe (TN)	Walker
Marino	Rogers (AL)	Walorski
Matsui	Rogers (KY)	Walters, Mimi
McCarthy	Rohrabacher	Walz
McCaull	Rokita	Wasserman
McClintock	Rooney (FL)	Schultz
McCollum	Ros-Lehtinen	Ross
McDermott	Rothfus	Waters, Maxine
McGovern	Rouzer	Watson Coleman
McHenry	Roybal-Allard	Weber (TX)
McKinley	Royce	Webster (FL)
McMorris	Ruiz	Welch
Rodgers	Ruppersberger	Wenstrup
McNeerney	Ryan (OH)	Westerman
McSally	Salmon	Westmoreland
Meadows	Sánchez, Linda	Whitfield
Meehan	T.	Williams
Meeks	Sanchez, Loretta	Wilson (FL)
Meng	Sanford	Wilson (SC)
Messer	Sarbanes	Wittman
Mica	Scalise	Womack
Miller (FL)	Schakowsky	Woodall
Miller (MI)	Schiff	Yarmuth
Moolenaar	Schweikert	Yoder
Moore	Scott (VA)	Yoho
Moulton	Scott, Austin	Young (IA)
Mullin	Sensenbrenner	Young (IN)
Murphy (FL)	Serrano	Zeldin
Murphy (PA)	Sessions	Zinke
Nadler		
Napolitano		

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—4

Cohen	Richmond
Lipinski	Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—24

Aguilar	Garamendi	Perlmutter
Amodei	Grijalva	Roskam
Bishop (MI)	Johnson, Sam	Rush
Bishop (UT)	Larsen (WA)	Russell
Cárdenas	Lewis	Schrader
Cole	Lummis	Scott, David
Dingell	Mooney (WV)	Simpson
Donovan	Mulvaney	Takai

□ 1535

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. MASSIE changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

VISA WAIVER PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT AND TERRORIST TRAVEL PREVENTION ACT OF 2015

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 158) to clarify the grounds for ineligibility for travel to the United States regarding terrorism risk, to expand the criteria by which a country may be removed from the Visa Waiver Program, to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to submit a report on strengthening the Electronic System for Travel Authorization to better secure the international borders of the United States and prevent terrorists and instruments of terrorism from entering the United States, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 158

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 “Visa Waiver Program Improvement and Terrorist Travel Prevention Act of 2015”.

SEC. 2. ELECTRONIC PASSPORT REQUIREMENT.

(a) REQUIREMENT FOR ALIEN TO POSSESS ELECTRONIC PASSPORT.—Section 217(a)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1187(a)(3)) is amended to read as follows:

“(3) PASSPORT REQUIREMENTS.—The alien, at the time of application for admission, is in possession of a valid unexpired passport that satisfies the following:

“(A) MACHINE READABLE.—The passport is a machine-readable passport that is tamper-resistant, incorporates document authentication identifiers, and otherwise satisfies the internationally accepted standard for machine readability.

“(B) ELECTRONIC.—Beginning on April 1, 2016, the passport is an electronic passport that is fraud-resistant, contains relevant biographic and biometric information (as determined by the Secretary of Homeland Security), and otherwise satisfies internationally accepted standards for electronic passports.”

(b) REQUIREMENT FOR PROGRAM COUNTRY TO VALIDATE PASSPORTS.—Section 217(c)(2)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1187(c)(2)(B)) is amended to read as follows:

“(B) PASSPORT PROGRAM.—

“(i) ISSUANCE OF PASSPORTS.—The government of the country certifies that it issues to its citizens passports described in subparagraph (A) of subsection (a)(3), and on or after April 1, 2016, passports described in subparagraph (B) of subsection (a)(3).

“(ii) VALIDATION OF PASSPORTS.—Not later than October 1, 2016, the government of the country certifies that it has in place mechanisms to validate passports described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of subsection (a)(3) at each key port of entry into that country. This requirement shall not apply to travel between countries which fall within the Schengen Zone.”

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 303(c) of the Enhanced Border Security and Visa Entry Reform Act of 2002 is repealed (8 U.S.C. 1732(c)).

SEC. 3. RESTRICTION ON USE OF VISA WAIVER PROGRAM FOR ALIENS WHO TRAVEL TO CERTAIN COUNTRIES.

Section 217(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1187(a)), as amended by this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(12) NOT PRESENT IN IRAQ, SYRIA, OR ANY OTHER COUNTRY OR AREA OF CONCERN.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraphs (B) and (C)—

“(i) the alien has not been present, at any time or after March 1, 2011—

“(I) in Iraq or Syria;

“(II) in a country that is designated by the Secretary of State under section 6(j) of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. 2405) (as continued in effect under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.)), section 40 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2780), section 620A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2371), or any other provision of law, as a country, the government of which has repeatedly provided support of acts of international terrorism; or

“(III) in any other country or area of concern designated by the Secretary of Homeland Security under subparagraph (D); and

“(ii) regardless of whether the alien is a national of a program country, the alien is not a national of—

“(I) Iraq or Syria;

“(II) a country that is designated, at the time the alien applies for admission, by the Secretary of State under section 6(j) of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. 2405) (as continued in effect under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.)), section 40 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2780), section 620A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2371), or any other provision of law, as a country, the government of which has repeatedly provided support of acts of international terrorism; or

“(III) any other country that is designated, at the time the alien applies for admission, by the Secretary of Homeland Security under subparagraph (D).

“(B) CERTAIN MILITARY PERSONNEL AND GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.—Subparagraph (A)(i) shall not apply in the case of an alien if the Secretary of Homeland Security determines that the alien was present—

“(i) in order to perform military service in the armed forces of a program country; or

“(ii) in order to carry out official duties as a full time employee of the government of a program country.

“(C) WAIVER.—The Secretary of Homeland Security may waive the application of subparagraph (A) to an alien if the Secretary determines that such a waiver is in the law enforcement or national security interests of the United States.

“(D) COUNTRIES OR AREAS OF CONCERN.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this paragraph, the Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Secretary of State and the Director of National Intelligence, shall determine whether the requirement under subparagraph (A) shall apply to any other country or area.

“(ii) CRITERIA.—In making a determination under clause (i), the Secretary shall consider—

“(I) whether the presence of an alien in the country or area increases the likelihood that the alien is a credible threat to the national security of the United States;

“(II) whether a foreign terrorist organization has a significant presence in the country or area; and

“(III) whether the country or area is a safe haven for terrorists.

“(iii) ANNUAL REVIEW.—The Secretary shall conduct a review, on an annual basis, of any determination made under clause (i).

“(E) REPORT.—Beginning not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this paragraph, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security,

the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Select Committee on Intelligence, and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate a report on each instance in which the Secretary exercised the waiver authority under subparagraph (C) during the previous year.”

SEC. 4. DESIGNATION REQUIREMENTS FOR PROGRAM COUNTRIES.

(a) REPORTING LOST AND STOLEN PASSPORTS.—Section 217(c)(2)(D) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1187(c)(2)(D)), as amended by this Act, is further amended by striking “within a strict time limit” and inserting “not later than 24 hours after becoming aware of the theft or loss”.

(b) INTERPOL SCREENING.—Section 217(c)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1187(c)(2)), as amended by this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(G) INTERPOL SCREENING.—Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this subparagraph, except in the case of a country in which there is not an international airport, the government of the country certifies to the Secretary of Homeland Security that, to the maximum extent allowed under the laws of the country, it is screening, for unlawful activity, each person who is not a citizen or national of that country who is admitted to or departs that country, by using relevant databases and notices maintained by Interpol, or other means designated by the Secretary of Homeland Security. This requirement shall not apply to travel between countries which fall within the Schengen Zone.”

(c) IMPLEMENTATION OF PASSENGER INFORMATION EXCHANGE AGREEMENT.—Section 217(c)(2)(F) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1187(c)(2)(F)), as amended by this Act, is further amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, and fully implements such agreement”.

(d) TERMINATION OF DESIGNATION.—Section 217(f) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1187(f)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(6) FAILURE TO SHARE INFORMATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—If the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Secretary of State jointly determine that the program country is not sharing information, as required by subsection (c)(2)(F), the Secretary of Homeland Security shall terminate the designation of the country as a program country.

“(B) REDESIGNATION.—In the case of a termination under this paragraph, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall redesignate the country as a program country, without regard to paragraph (2) or (3) of subsection (c) or paragraphs (1) through (4), when the Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Secretary of State, determines that the country is sharing information, as required by subsection (c)(2)(F).

“(7) FAILURE TO SCREEN.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Beginning on the date that is 270 days after the date of the enactment of this paragraph, if the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Secretary of State jointly determine that the program country is not conducting the screening required by subsection (c)(2)(G), the Secretary of Homeland Security shall terminate the designation of the country as a program country.

“(B) REDESIGNATION.—In the case of a termination under this paragraph, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall redesignate

the country as a program country, without regard to paragraph (2) or (3) of subsection (c) or paragraphs (1) through (4), when the Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Secretary of State, determines that the country is conducting the screening required by subsection (c)(2)(G).”

SEC. 5. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 217(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1187(c)), as amended by this Act, is further amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)(C)(iii)—

(A) by striking “and the Committee on International Relations” and inserting “, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Committee on Homeland Security”; and

(B) by striking “and the Committee on Foreign Relations” and inserting “, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs”; and

(2) in paragraph (5)(A)(i)—

(A) in subclause (III)—

(i) by inserting after “the Committee on Foreign Affairs,” the following: “the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence;”

(ii) by inserting after “the Committee on Foreign Relations,” the following: “the Select Committee on Intelligence”; and

(iii) by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in subclause (IV), by striking the period at the end and inserting the following: “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(V) shall submit to the committees described in subclause (III), a report that includes an assessment of the threat to the national security of the United States of the designation of each country designated as a program country, including the compliance of the government of each such country with the requirements under subparagraphs (D) and (F) of paragraph (2), as well as each such government’s capacity to comply with such requirements.”

(b) DATE OF SUBMISSION OF FIRST REPORT.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit the first report described in subclause (V) of section 217(c)(5)(A)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. (c)(5)(A)(i)), as added by subsection (a), not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 6. HIGH RISK PROGRAM COUNTRIES.

Section 217(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1187(c)), as amended by this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(12) DESIGNATION OF HIGH RISK PROGRAM COUNTRIES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence and the Secretary of State, shall evaluate program countries on an annual basis based on the criteria described in subparagraph (B) and shall identify any program country, the admission of nationals from which under the visa waiver program under this section, the Secretary determines presents a high risk to the national security of the United States.

“(B) CRITERIA.—In evaluating program countries under subparagraph (A), the Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence and the Secretary of State, shall consider the following criteria:

“(i) The number of nationals of the country determined to be ineligible to travel to the United States under the program during the previous year.

“(ii) The number of nationals of the country who were identified in United States Government databases related to the identities of known or suspected terrorists during the previous year.

“(iii) The estimated number of nationals of the country who have traveled to Iraq or Syria at any time on or after March 1, 2011 to engage in terrorism.

“(iv) The capacity of the country to combat passport fraud.

“(v) The level of cooperation of the country with the counter-terrorism efforts of the United States.

“(vi) The adequacy of the border and immigration control of the country.

“(vii) Any other criteria the Secretary of Homeland Security determines to be appropriate.

“(C) SUSPENSION OF DESIGNATION.—The Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Secretary of State, may suspend the designation of a program country based on a determination that the country presents a high risk to the national security of the United States under subparagraph (A) until such time as the Secretary determines that the country no longer presents such a risk.

“(D) REPORT.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this paragraph, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence and the Secretary of State, shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Select Committee on Intelligence, and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate a report, which includes an evaluation and threat assessment of each country determined to present a high risk to the national security of the United States under subparagraph (A).”.

SEC. 7. ENHANCEMENTS TO THE ELECTRONIC SYSTEM FOR TRAVEL AUTHORIZATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 217(h)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1187(h)(3)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (C)(i), by inserting after “any such determination” the following: “or shorten the period of eligibility under any such determination”;

(2) by striking subparagraph (D) and inserting the following:

“(D) FRAUD DETECTION.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall research opportunities to incorporate into the System technology that will detect and prevent fraud and deception in the System.

“(E) ADDITIONAL AND PREVIOUS COUNTRIES OF CITIZENSHIP.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall collect from an applicant for admission pursuant to this section information on any additional or previous countries of citizenship of that applicant. The Secretary shall take any information so collected into account when making determinations as to the eligibility of the alien for admission pursuant to this section.

“(F) REPORT ON CERTAIN LIMITATIONS ON TRAVEL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this subparagraph and annually thereafter, the Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security, the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate a report on the number of individuals who were denied eligibility to travel under the program, or whose eligibility for such travel was revoked during the previous year, and the

number of such individuals determined, in accordance with subsection (a)(6), to represent a threat to the national security of the United States, and shall include the country or countries of citizenship of each such individual.”.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security, the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate a report on steps to strengthen the electronic system for travel authorization authorized under section 217(h)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1187(h)(3)) in order to better secure the international borders of the United States and prevent terrorists and instruments of terrorism from entering the United States.

SEC. 8. PROVISION OF ASSISTANCE TO NON-PROGRAM COUNTRIES.

The Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall provide assistance in a risk-based manner to countries that do not participate in the visa waiver program under section 217 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1187) to assist those countries in—

(1) submitting to Interpol information about the theft or loss of passports of citizens or nationals of such a country; and

(2) issuing, and validating at the ports of entry of such a country, electronic passports that are fraud-resistant, contain relevant biographic and biometric information (as determined by the Secretary of Homeland Security), and otherwise satisfy internationally accepted standards for electronic passports.

SEC. 9. CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.

(a) SECRETARY OF HOMELAND SECURITY.—Section 217 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1187), as amended by this Act, is further amended by striking “Attorney General” each place such term appears (except in subsection (c)(11)(B)) and inserting “Secretary of Homeland Security”.

(b) ELECTRONIC SYSTEM FOR TRAVEL AUTHORIZATION.—Section 217 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1187), as amended this Act, is further amended—

(1) by striking “electronic travel authorization system” each place it appears and inserting “electronic system for travel authorization”;

(2) in the heading in subsection (a)(11), by striking “ELECTRONIC TRAVEL AUTHORIZATION SYSTEM” and inserting “ELECTRONIC SYSTEM FOR TRAVEL AUTHORIZATION”; and

(3) in the heading in subsection (h)(3), by striking “ELECTRONIC TRAVEL AUTHORIZATION SYSTEM” and inserting “ELECTRONIC SYSTEM FOR TRAVEL AUTHORIZATION”.

SEC. 10. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that the International Civil Aviation Organization, the specialized agency of the United Nations responsible for establishing international standards, specifications, and best practices related to the administration and governance of border controls and inspection formalities, should establish standards for the introduction of electronic passports (referred to in this section as “e-passports”), and obligate member countries to utilize such e-passports as soon as possible. Such e-passports should be a combined paper and electronic passport that contains biographic and biometric information that can be used to authenticate the identity of travelers through an embedded chip.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

□ 1530

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 H.R. 158 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 ask unanimous consent that debate on this motion be extended by 10 minutes on each side.

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, I support H.R. 158, the Visa Waiver Program Improvement and Terrorist Travel Prevention Act of 2015.

The Visa Waiver Program allows nationals of 38 countries to travel to the United States for a maximum of 90 days for business or tourism purposes without obtaining a visa. The travelers must present a valid machine-readable passport and meet certain other immigration and security requirements.

In order to be designated a VWP country, a nation must offer reciprocal visa-free travel to U.S. citizens, agree to share security-related information such as whether citizens of that country traveling to the U.S. represent a threat to U.S. security or welfare, agree to timely report lost and stolen passports, and have less than a 3 percent visa refusal rate in the year prior to designation years, among other requirements.

The VWP was created in 1986 as a way to promote and facilitate travel and tourism to the United States. It has done just that, with hundreds of millions of foreign nationals traveling to the U.S. since the program's implementation. So the positive effects of the VWP on the U.S. economy should not be understated.

Yet no amount of economic stimulation is worth risking the lives of our constituents, and recent events around the world necessitate changes to the VWP in order to help ensure its safety. Of particular concern is the rise of ISIS in the Middle East and the large number of Europeans and other nationalities who have gone to Syria, Iraq, and other countries of concern in order to train and fight alongside ISIS and the radical Islamist terrorists.

With their VWP country passports, those terrorists can board a plane

bound for the U.S. and can reach U.S. shores with relative ease. In VWP cases, there is no in-person interview with a U.S. consular officer, and there is no pretravel enhanced screening. So we must help make sure that the VWP is as secure as possible.

H.R. 158 takes constructive steps in this direction with provisions preventing dual nationals of, or those who have recently traveled to, Iraq, Syria, or other countries of concern, from visa-free travel to the U.S. Among other security enhancements, the bill requires VWP countries to issue e-Passports to their nationals and continuously share terrorism and foreign traveler data with us.

The VWP is only one part of the national discussion that we should be having. There are Islamist terrorists looking at all aspects of our immigration policy to find any way possible to exploit it. We learned that lesson on 9/11, and we learned that lesson last week in San Bernardino.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this body continues to address deficiencies in U.S. immigration policy by taking up and passing additional House Judiciary Committee bills, including those reported out of the Judiciary Committee to reform the U.S. asylum process, to change the way unaccompanied alien minors are treated when they cross the U.S. border so that there is no longer an incentive to run across the border, and to finally prevent the interior immigration enforcement switch from being turned off at the whim of whoever resides at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) and the chairman of the Homeland Security Committee, as well as their staff members, for their work on the bill.

Much more needs to be done to prevent exploitation of U.S. immigration policy by terrorists, but H.R. 158 is another good step in helping to ensure the safety of Americans, and I support it.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, today we come together to address vulnerabilities in our Visa Waiver Program to make our country safer.

What is the Visa Waiver Program? It was established long before 9/11. In order for a country to be admitted to the Visa Waiver Program, fewer than 3 percent of its applicants for a visitor visa can be denied. Often, the denial of a visitor's visa has nothing to do with security. Rather, it is frequently based on a judgment of whether the applicant is likely to return to his home country.

It is fair to say that persons who are poor are often judged to be less likely to return to their home country than a more affluent applicant with extensive financial ties to his or her home. That is the reason why there are no impoverished countries in the Visa Waiver Program.

Most of Europe, Japan, Singapore, Australia, South Korea, and the like are in the program—38 countries in all. The 38 countries agree to share security information with the United States.

The Visa Waiver Program also is reciprocal, allowing Americans to travel to these 38 countries without getting a visitor's visa. For these 38 countries, visitors fill out a form in advance that is then checked against databases. An ePassport is required for travel, but no visa. However, at the point of entry, an intending visitor from a visa waiver country can be turned away if he is not found admissible under immigration law. For example, a visa waiver visitor who reveals he intends to study in the United States or to marry and remain in the U.S. will be denied entry at the airport by a Customs and Border Protection officer.

Mr. Speaker, people who do not reside in these 38 countries can still visit the United States, but they have to obtain a visitor's visa to do so, and this is exactly the same for those who are ineligible for the Visa Waiver Program under this bill.

The Visa Waiver Program enables millions of tourists and business travelers to come to the U.S. every year for short trips that altogether bring over \$190 billion a year in business and tax revenue. This program is important to our economy and the country.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, in the wake of the November 13 terrorist attacks, we must review this program to make sure it meets our present-day security needs since it was designed prior to 9/11. This bipartisan bill incorporates simple changes to enhance security in the Visa Waiver Program.

The most important parts of the legislation provide for specific, concrete changes to ensure better information sharing among intelligence and law enforcement agencies.

□ 1545

It requires screening of all travelers against INTERPOL databases. It makes it harder to falsify identity by requiring fraud-resistant e-Passports that contain biometric information. It compels U.S. security agencies to conduct more frequent threat assessments of visa waiver countries, something not currently part of the law.

For those who have traveled to or are nationals of certain high-threat countries, a visa interview, rather than visa-free travel, will be required. These individuals are not barred from traveling to the United States.

We know that thousands of European citizens have traveled to Syria. Some are there on humanitarian missions, like Doctors Without Borders, and we thank them. Some went to fight with ISIS. The visa interview, conducted by a U.S. consular official, will establish the circumstances of the visit. If you are a German citizen who visited Syria last year, you will have the same visa process that every Israeli, every Pole,

every Ethiopian, and every Mexican has. None of us has said it is unreasonable that people in Thailand, India, or Brazil undergo interviews for visitor visas. And this change in the Visa Waiver Program is not unreasonable either.

This visa waiver legislation stands in stark contrast to the Republican-led refugee bill that was rushed to the floor 3 weeks ago. That ineffective and mean-spirited bill would shut down the U.S. refugee program for Syrians and Iraqis fleeing civil war and the brutality of ISIS. And it does so notwithstanding the fact that refugees are subject to 18 to 24 months of thorough screening before ever setting foot on U.S. soil, a more rigorous process than any other immigrant or traveler to the United States is subject to.

The refugee bill does absolutely nothing to make us safer, and it is a betrayal of our values. It would have us turn our back on refugee women and children and on our proud history as a country that provides safe haven to the world's most vulnerable. I will continue to do everything in my power to see that it never becomes law.

While the refugee bill showed our country and this body at its worst, today's bill makes sensible improvements to the security of the Visa Waiver Program. I thank my colleagues for working with me and the Department of Homeland Security, the State Department, and the White House to craft this targeted legislation. I strongly urge its support.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER), the chief sponsor of this legislation, who is also the chairman of the House Administration Committee.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the 9/11 Commission said that "For terrorists, travel documents are as important as weapons." And I couldn't agree more. We simply cannot give people from other countries special access to our country if we don't have all of the information that we absolutely need to ensure that they are not a threat to our national security.

I believe that the bill that we are considering today is the first of many, quite frankly, aimed at improving our security protocols. We need to have a comprehensive, complete review of all of our visa programs, including K1 visas, the so-called "fiance visa," which was used by the female terrorist in the San Bernardino attack to enter the United States. As well, the issue of visa overstays also needs to be addressed.

Today, the House is taking a very important step forward by considering this bill, which is focused on those traveling to the U.S. without a visa.

As was said, the Visa Waiver Program actually was established back in

the eighties to expedite tourism and trade as well, and it has worked very, very well economically for our country. Today there are 38 companies that participate; and their citizens, although they are required to have a passport, are not required to go to a U.S. Embassy or to a consulate to obtain a visa.

Obviously, the world is a much different place today, and our security measures must evolve to meet any and all threats, which is why I introduced this bill.

This bill has gone through regular order. As chairman of the Border and Maritime Security Subcommittee, I have held two hearings on this. It actually passed out of the full Homeland Security Committee as well on a unanimous vote, every Republican, every Democrat. Because before we are anything else, we are all Americans first, and we all recognize the vulnerabilities of our current program.

Information sharing, especially with our European allies, is vital, absolutely vital to help combat the threat of foreign fighters bound for the United States. There is absolutely no second for having good information. We need to be certain that participating countries are giving us all of the information that we need from either their own terror watch list or travel manifests, and that all of the information protocols are being shared.

As we know, sometimes it is not until after the fact that some of the participating countries actually provide us the names of individuals who they knew were a terror threat. That is unacceptable.

This bill will change that because what this bill does is it gives the authority to the Secretary of Homeland Security to either suspend or terminate a country's participation in this program if we don't feel confident that we are getting all the critical information that we need to stop terrorists from exploiting this program to travel into the U.S.

So, at this time, we still have an information sharing problem with some of our closest allies. And as the 9/11 Commission also accurately noted, we need to move from the mindset of the need-to-know information to the need-to-share information.

Information sharing must happen, and this bill gives America the leverage that it needs to make sure that the information critical to our homeland security is being shared appropriately.

It will also disqualify anyone who has traveled to Syria, Iraq, Sudan, and Iran within the past 5 years from participating in this program. In an abundance of caution, we will now require those individuals to apply for a visa and go through the formal visa screening process.

It will also give the Secretary of Homeland Security the discretion to designate other countries that have significant terror concerns, or become terror safe havens in the future.

Additionally, we will be requiring all participating countries to adopt e-Passports, like we have here in the United States, so that we are able to eliminate passport fraud.

Mr. Speaker, as Americans, we live in a free and open society, and enemies of freedom are looking to use our freedoms against us. This bill will stop the enemies' ability to move internationally by strengthening the Visa Waiver Program. It is a critical component of keeping our homeland safe.

I want to thank the House leadership for ensuring prompt consideration of this bill on the floor. I certainly want to thank Chairman MCCAUL and Chairman GOODLATTE for working as well. And I also want to give a special thanks as well to Representative KATKO from New York, who is the chairman of the Foreign Fighter Task Force, which really helped make this bill a much stronger product.

It is my hope that a very strong, bipartisan vote on this bill today will send a message to terrorists that America is prepared to take any and all measures to protect our homeland.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), the ranking member of the full committee.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, as much as any Member in this body, I appreciate the unique situation our Nation is in as we struggle to effectively combat terrorism, while adhering to our Nation's commitment to freedom and liberty.

I fully recognize and appreciate that the bill before us today represents an effort to craft a more bipartisan response to recent terrorist incidents, particularly when compared to the seriously flawed refugee bill that this body voted on only several weeks ago.

I commend the office for including many commonsense improvements to the Visa Waiver Program that will improve the system in a neutral and non-discriminatory manner. However, I believe that provisions in the legislation restricting the use of the Visa Waiver Program to individuals who have traveled to Syria or Iraq or are dual nationals are discriminatory. I understand that these individuals are not banned from traveling to our Nation and are simply subject to increased questioning and scrutiny before they can travel here.

However, history has shown us that arbitrary across-the-board judgments based on broad characteristics such as these do nothing to enhance our security and only cast a cloud of suspicion over entire communities here in our country.

Equally problematic is the provision's overbreadth. It contains no exceptions for journalists, researchers, human rights investigators, or other professionals. This will make it harder, not easier, to document and respond to human rights violations and other

abuses. I also believe the provision should have included a sunset date so that we can assess its efficacy. I am further concerned that the new requirement will result in our partner nations placing new limits on travel by United States citizens to their own countries.

It is because of these problems that numerous civil rights and civil liberties groups have expressed serious concerns or outright opposition to the overall legislation, including the American Civil Liberties Union, the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, the NAACP, the American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee, the American Immigration Lawyers Association, the Council on American-Islamic Relations, the Arab-American Civil Rights League, Human Rights Watch, and the League of United Latin American Citizens, among others.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD letters from those groups.

DECEMBER 8, 2015.

Re: Visa Waiver Improvement and Terrorism Travel Prevention Act of 2015, H.R. 158

U.S. SENATE,

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

DEAR LEGISLATOR: The Arab-American Civil Rights League ("ACRL") writes with grave concern regarding H.R. 158, the Visa Waiver Improvement and Terrorism Travel Prevention Act of 2015 ("HR 158"). HR 158 would amend the Visa Waiver Program by mandating that individuals who have traveled to Syria or Iraq in the past five years be barred from participation in the Visa Waiver Program. The ACRL strongly opposes such legislation on the grounds that it is both discriminatory and ineffective—an ill-conceived legislative backlash to recent tragedies.

HR 158's blanket ban upon persons who have visited the countries of Iraq and Syria in the past five years will only harm those who have legitimate reasons to visit the United States, and will not effectively deter or prevent terrorists and criminals from seeking to enter this country and do us harm. Simply put, nefarious individuals seeking to enter the United States to commit illegal acts of terror, will not be dissuaded by federal law. It is nothing less than absurd to think that an individual trying to enter the United States to commit acts of terror will abide by our laws.

On the other hand, HR 158 will ban individuals who have visited Syria and Iraq for legitimate reasons in the last five years, for no other reason than their physical presence in said countries. Consider the types of individuals that would be banned: journalists, members of the clergy, family visitors, and myriad others. HR 158 targets and punishes entire swathes of people who have done nothing wrong, while failing to effectively target those who seek to harm this country. In all essence, HR 158 presumes that there are no reasons for people to visit Syria and Iraq, and that anyone who has been to those two countries should be suspected of terrorism.

Far from enhancing our safety and security, HR 158 will only further isolate and alienate people of Arab, Middle Eastern, and South Asian descent. In this sense, HR 158 is a victory for the terrorists, whose true goal is to disrupt our society through acts of shocking violence and barbarism. Far from playing into their hands, we should reaffirm our national commitment to liberty, and continue to embrace pluralism. At our core, we remain a nation of many cultures,

ethnicities, and faiths, and are far stronger when we defend our core values and refuse to act in fear. Federal policy must be carefully drafted and deliberated given its wide-ranging scope and effect. As we have seen in the past with other pieces of national security legislation, such legislative acts can lead to slippery slopes. We at the ACRL urge you to oppose HR 158, and specifically its mandatory exclusion provisions, because they are ineffective, ill-conceived, and un-American.

Respectfully submitted,

ARAB-AMERICAN CIVIL
RIGHTS LEAGUE (ACRL).

AILA: CONGRESS SHOULD REJECT H.R. 158 UNTIL ITS VISA WAIVER PROGRAM CHANGES ARE MORE CAREFULLY WEIGHED

WASHINGTON, DC.—The American Immigration Lawyers Association (AILA) expressed concerns regarding the Visa Waiver Program Improvement and Terrorist Prevention Act, H.R. 158, and recommended Congress vote “NO” on the bill unless modifications and clarifications are made.

“Protecting our nation from terrorists is absolutely essential, and AILA understands and supports efforts to strengthen the Visa Waiver Program, but Congress must consider any legislative proposal carefully, and this bill is getting rushed to the House floor without ever being reviewed in Committee. In fact, the bill was not even made public until just a day or two ago,” said AILA President Victor Nieblas Pradis.

“AILA has serious concerns that H.R. 158 would broadly target descendants of Syrian or Iraqi nationals, or those from other countries alleged to be supporting terrorism, who may have little or no connection to those countries except by parentage,” Mr. Nieblas continued, referring to the bill’s blanket termination of participation in the Visa Waiver Program (VWP) for anyone who is a “national” of Iraq or Syria, or other designated countries. “As written, the bill could result in discrimination that will exclude people without consideration of legitimate risk factors. For instance, a child who has never been to Syria, but was born in France to Syrian parents, would be ineligible for the VWP.”

H.R. 158 also excludes from the program anyone who travelled to countries alleged to be supporting terrorism within the past five years, without sufficient authority to waive revocation for those who clearly pose no threat. “This per se ban will hurt humanitarian workers and journalists who are traveling to Iraq and Syria or other designated countries to do life-saving work or to report on international events. The bill’s waiver will not help any of these people who have visited for legitimate, even compelling reasons,” Mr. Nieblas noted, referring to a provision that allows the Secretary of Homeland Security to waive the exclusion if the waiver is in the interest of law enforcement or national security, but makes no mention of humanitarian or other grounds.

“History has shown overbroad programs that target people based on nationality, race, ethnic origin or religion are not effective at combatting terrorism. After 9/11, our government forced thousands of people from Middle-Eastern countries, and countries with predominantly Arab and Muslim populations, to undergo special processes to register themselves with the federal immigration authorities,” Mr. Nieblas said, referring to the 2002 special-registration program under National Security Entry-Exit Registration System (NSEERS). The U.S. government described special-registration as an “inconvenience” in the same way some are now justifying H.R. 158’s exclusion from VWP. He continued, “Not a single known

terrorism-related conviction ever came out of NSEERS. NSEERS is a stain on our nation’s history that we should never repeat.”

H.R. 158 would also establish additional reporting requirements to Congress regarding use of the program, additional eligibility requirements for VWP countries, and enhancements to the Electronic System for Travel Authorization (ESTA). The agencies involved in the VWP have sought to continually improve and adapt the program as circumstances change. As Congress aims to enhance the program, it is essential that any changes are both workable and effective.

“Standing by our founding principles of freedom and liberty is what keeps us strong. AILA urges Congress to show leadership by ensuring any legislation it passes is consistent with our values as a nation, and is crafted in a way that is workable, sensible, and based on good policy, not political expediency,” Mr. Nieblas concluded.

THE LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE ON
CIVIL AND HUMAN RIGHTS,
Washington, DC, December 8, 2015.
Oppose H.R. 158, the Visa Waiver Program
Improvement Act of 2015

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, a coalition of more than 200 national civil and human rights advocacy organizations, we urge you to oppose H.R. 158, the Visa Waiver Program Improvement Act of 2015. Section 3 of H.R. 158 would open the door to the use of profiling on the basis of national origin, while doing little, if anything, to promote national security.

While H.R. 158 calls for a number of bipartisan improvements to the visa waiver program (VWP), Section 3 would make two significant and unhelpful changes. First, it would bar travelers from utilizing the process if they are dual nationals of a VWP country and also of Iraq, Syria, or other countries that are named as state sponsors of terrorism. Its overly-broad language would apply to nationals of those countries even if they have never set foot there, and are only dual citizens because of the nationality of their parents.

Second, it would exclude visitors from the VWP if they have traveled to Iraq, Syria, or other designated countries, even if they did so to provide medical or humanitarian assistance or many other legitimate purposes. The effect of this on national security is negligible at best, because it would only affect people who entered those countries through legitimate channels and accurately reported their travels—not those who snuck in through the poorly-secured borders in those countries to work with terrorist groups. In other words, it would simply penalize travelers for being honest.

While Iraqi or Syrian dual nationals, or people who have visited those countries, could still apply at a U.S. consulate for a nonimmigrant visa, they would be subjected to a process that raises concerns about ethnic and national origin profiling and other arbitrary practices. Under current procedures, consular decisions are not reviewable, which raises the likelihood that low-risk individuals would be barred from traveling to the United States altogether, while high-risk individuals would simply find other ways of doing harm.

We would support amendments to Section 3 that add due process protections for affected travelers. Because the bill is coming up on the suspension calendar, however, no such amendments will be allowed. We recognize that Congress is highly motivated to enact greater national security protections in the wake of the Paris and San Bernadino terrorist attacks, but we hope that you will

reject this bill in its current form and demand that it be improved.

Thank you for your consideration. If you have any questions, please contact either of us or Rob Randhava, Senior Counsel.

Sincerely,

WADE HENDERSON,
President & CEO.
NANCY ZIRKIN,
Executive Vice President.

DECEMBER 7, 2015.

Re ACLU Concerns With the “Visa Waiver Program Improvement and Terrorist Travel Prevention Act of 2015” (H.R. 158)

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), we urge you to amend the “Visa Waiver Program Improvement and Terrorist Travel Prevention Act of 2015” (H.R. 158).

I. H.R. 158 ARBITRARILY DISCRIMINATES AGAINST NATIONALS OF IRAQ, SYRIA, IRAN, OR SUDAN WHO ARE CITIZENS OF VISA WAIVER PROGRAM (“VWP”) COUNTRIES—BASED ON THEIR NATIONALITY AND PARENTAGE.

The VWP is a long-established program that permits nationals of certain countries to enter the U.S. as visitors (tourists or business) without a visa, for up to 90 days. H.R. 158 terminates travel privileges for all citizens of VWP countries who are dual nationals of Iraq, Syria, Iran, or Sudan. This revocation of VWP privileges would apply to all nationals of Iraq, Syria, Iran, or Sudan even if they have never resided in or traveled to Iraq or Syria. By singling out these four nationalities to the exclusion of other dual nationals in VWP countries, H.R. 158 amounts to blanket discrimination based on nationality and national origin without a rational basis.

There is no sufficient reason to justify the differential treatment of VWP citizens who are nationals of Iraq, Syria, Iran, or Sudan. There is no evidence to support assertion that citizens of VWP countries, who are dual nationals of these four are more likely to engage in terrorist acts against the U.S.

Not only is H.R. 158 discriminatory, it is arbitrary. Unlike the U.S. which grants citizenship to all children born on U.S. soil, birth within Syria does not automatically confer citizenship. Rather Syrian citizenship is conferred by naturalization or descent. With respect to descent, Syrian citizenship is conferred to children “born of a Syrian father, regardless of the child’s country of birth” or children “born of a Syrian mother and an unknown or stateless father.” The proposal would yield the untenable result of folding such gender-based distinctions into U.S. law.

Therefore, if H.R. 158 were to become law, the following types of travelers would automatically lose their VWP privileges, even if they have never been to Iraq or Syria:

Dual-national French citizen (born to Syrian father) traveling to U.S. for business conferences and meetings;

Dual-national German citizen (born to Syrian father) traveling to U.S. with vacation tour group;

Dual-national Austrian citizen (born to Syrian father) traveling to the U.S. to take care of grandchild.

It is wrong and un-American to punish groups without reason solely based on their nationality, national origin, religion, gender, or other protected grounds.

II. H.R. 158 WOULD END VWP PRIVILEGES FOR ALL RECENT TRAVELERS TO IRAQ OR SYRIA, INCLUDING THOSE WHO TRAVELED THERE FOR PROFESSIONAL PURPOSES

H.R. 158 would terminate VWP travel privileges for all who have been present in Iraq or Syria at any time on or after March 1, 2011. This broad travel restriction contains a very

narrow exception for certain military personnel and government officials. All other travelers would automatically lose their VWP privileges. Affected travelers would include journalists, scholars, refugee case-workers, humanitarian aid workers, human rights investigators, and many others.

Under H.R. 158, the following types of travelers would automatically lose their VWP privileges based on their travel to Syria or Iraq since March 2011:

British citizen, working as a reporter for the London-based Daily Telegraph who traveled to Syria to cover the civil war;

Swiss citizen, working as a social worker in a Kurdish refugee camp in northern Iraq;

Belgian citizen, working as a human rights investigator to document abuses committed by ISIL against Syrians.

Many of these VWP travelers have gone to Syria or Iraq for professional purposes and are producing reports and providing services that the U.S., indeed the whole world, depends upon, now more than ever. They should not lose their VWP travel privileges for their work in Syria or Iraq.

III. CONGRESS MUST PLACE A TIME LIMIT ON MEASURES TO REVOKE VWP TRAVEL PRIVILEGES

When Congress created the VWP years ago, Congress authorized the Attorney General, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to designate certain countries as VWP countries. Congress has never codified any nationality-based prohibitions for VWP program designation. If the House passes this bill, it will be enshrining into statute that VWP citizens, who happen to be Iraqi or Syrian nationals, are categorically ineligible for VWP travel privileges even if they have never been to Iraq or Syria.

In view of this extraordinary discriminatory measure, Congress should limit the duration of this VWP restriction and place a two-year sunset on this travel restriction. A sunset provision would require Congress to reassess in two years whether nationals of Iraq and Syria warrant such selective targeting for VWP travel restriction purposes.

IV. CONCLUSION

While the ACLU recognizes the importance of a Congressional response to the increase in recent terrorist attacks, we urge Congress to exercise caution and to avoid passing legislation that would broadly scapegoat groups based on nationality, and would fan the flames of discriminatory exclusion, both here and abroad. We, therefore, urge the House to amend H.R. 158 by: (1) Deleting the language that categorically strips VWP privileges from all Iraqi and Syrian nationals; (2) Expanding the exemption to include journalists, researchers, human rights investigators, and other professionals; and (3) Inserting a two-year sunset date to the travel restrictions on the use of VWP.

In the absence of such changes, we have grave reservations about this proposal.

For more information, please contact ACLU Legislative Counsel Joanne Lin or Policy Counsel Chris Rickerd.

Sincerely,

KARIN JOHANSON,
*Director, Washington
Legislative Office.*

JOANNE LIN,
Legislative Counsel.

CHRIS RICKERD,
Policy Counsel.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
December 7, 2015.

Re Visa Waiver Program Improvement and Terrorist Travel Prevention Act, H.R. 158.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Com-

mittee (ADC), I write to strongly urge you to Vote No on the Visa Waiver Program Improvement and Terrorist Travel Prevention Act, H.R. 158. We have serious concerns on the application and enforcement of this bill if it were to become law, specifically Section 3 which 1) imposes a mandatory and categorically bar to the Visa Waiver Program (VWP) on any individual who is a dual citizen of Syria, Iraq, Sudan, and Iran; and 2) prohibits any person whom has traveled to Syria, Iraq, Iran, and Sudan since March 1, 2011.

We understand that the U.S. House of Representatives may push forward H.R. 158 through the omnibus appropriations bill, and strongly request you to Vote No to H.R. 158 and/or its inclusion in an omnibus bill because H.R. 158 is: 1) ineffective to actually secure safety; and 2) intentionally discriminates and profiles persons based on their national origin.

Section 3's blanket exclusion of visitors to Iraq and Syria would not be an effective security measure as it relies on self-reporting accurate tracking of who visits those countries that could be circumvented by someone intending to do harm—the persons who are intent on engaging in terror activities are not getting their passports stamped, they are sneaking into Syria and Iraq. The provision is more likely to screen out health and aid workers, clergymen, journalists, teachers, military personnel, translators, family visitors and others who are helping protect Americans or have legitimate or completely innocent reasons to visit Syria or Iraq—essentially penalizing them for their honesty and performing humanitarian work.

It is not black and white, nor simple to suggest that H.R. 158 just requires individuals to get a visa. H.R. 158 is not just a visa requirement, H.R. 158 is discriminatory. Section 3 imposes a mandatory bar to all persons whom are dual citizens of Syria, Iraq, Sudan, and Iran is blatant profiling on its face. Only nationals of particular countries regardless of whether they have traveled to a terrorist support country or not, have to meet additional requirements they would not otherwise have to go through if they were not Arab. It is premised on the unreliable assumption that Arabs are more prone to terrorism and to commit terrorist acts, and further perpetuates stereotypes that Arabs are terrorists. There is no separate assessment and/or security review is done that determines that specific person on a case by case basis is a security threat, non-related to their identity, place of birth, or country of national origin.

The fact is that terrorism is not limited to one particular race, country of national origin, or religion, nor bound by country borders. However, this bill paints Arabs as the enemy, and makes VWP Arab nationals second class citizens in their own country—they are not afforded the same benefits as their fellow nationals. Many VWP nationals will be arbitrarily denied entry by Customs and Border Patrol with little to no notice of change in VWP requirements and no review if that person actually presents a threat to national security. Currently, Arabs face enormous scrutiny and security checks to enter the U.S. and many have been denied entry even with valid non-immigrant and immigrant visas, based on no other reason but their national origin. You should not support the further arbitrary exclusion of a group of people based on nothing but that person's national origin.

Historically programs with sweeping powers to exclude people based on nationality, race, ethnic origin or religion have proven to be ineffective. In 2002, the U.S. government established the special-registration program under National Security Entry-Exit Reg-

istration System (NSEERS) requiring heightened registration and scrutiny of people in the U.S. who came from mostly Arab and Muslim countries. NSEERS was initially portrayed as an anti-terrorism measure which required male visitors to the U.S. from 25 Arab and Muslim countries to be fingerprinted, photographed, and questioned by immigration officers. Many whom complied with registration were arbitrarily detained and deported. NSEERS proved to be an ineffective counter-terrorism tool, and has not resulted in a single known terrorism-related conviction. We also should not forget the detrimental ramifications of blanket immigration exclusion and discrimination against Asians with the Chinese Exclusion Act.

Rather than imposing an ineffective ban from VWP on people who set foot in Syria and Iraq and excluding groups of people based on their national origin, Congress should consider other security measures that would more effectively enhance the Department of Homeland Security's screening process overall. We must also be weary of how VWP countries will treat Americans of Arab and Middle Eastern background, and may single out and exclude our citizens from entry in their respective immigration processes.

ADC strongly urges you to Vote No to H.R. 158 and stand up against profiling. The automatic exclusion of dual citizens of VWP countries and the designated Arab countries, and recent visitors to Iraq and Syria is discriminatory. The reactionary government actions following the Pearl Harbor attack—Japanese Internment camps and 9/11—arbitrary detention and surveillance of Arabs—are cautionary tales that we must heed to now and remember that we cannot let fear erode respect and protection of civil and human rights.

Respectfully Submitted,

SAMER KHALAF, ESQ.;
ADC National President.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

December 4, 2015.

Re Visa Waiver Program Security Enhancement Act, S. 2337.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The undersigned organizations write to express our concern regarding the Visa Waiver Program Security Enhancement Act, S. 2337, specifically Section 2 of the bill which imposes a mandatory and categorical bar to the Visa Waiver Program (VWP) on any individual who has traveled to Syria or Iraq within the previous five years. We understand that the House of Representatives may look to S. 2337 as it related to pushing forward on H.R. 158, the Visa Waiver Program Improvement Act. In any discussions regarding reforms to the VWP, including the omnibus appropriations bill, we urge you to remove provisions that specifically target people who visit or are from Syria or Iraq.

The bill's blanket exclusion of visitors to Iraq and Syria would not be an effective security measure as it relies on self-reporting accurate tracking of who visits those countries that could be circumvented by someone intending to do harm—the persons who are intent on engaging in terror activities are not getting their passports stamped, they are sneaking into Syria and Iraq. The provision is more likely to screen out health and aid workers, clergymen, journalists, military personnel, translators, family visitors and others who are helping protect Americans or have legitimate or completely innocent reasons to visit Syria or Iraq essentially penalizing them for their honesty.

The provision is premised on the unreliable assumption that people from those countries are more likely to commit terrorist acts, and

it makes anyone who visits those countries automatically suspect of terrorism. While the draft legislation on its face applies to all persons who have traveled to Syria or Iraq, in reality the legislation will have a disparate impact on people of Syrian and Iraqi descent. Historically programs with sweeping powers to exclude people based on nationality, race, ethnic origin or religion have proven to be ineffective. In 2002, the U.S. government established the special-registration program under National Security Entry-Exit Registration System (NSEERS) requiring heightened registration and scrutiny of people in the U.S. who came from mostly Arab and Muslim countries. NSEERS proved to be an ineffective counter-terrorism tool, and has not resulted in a single known terrorism-related conviction. Department of Homeland Security (DHS) suspended NSEERS in 2011.

Rather than imposing an ineffective ban from VWP on people who set foot in Syria and Iraq, Congress should consider other security measures that would more effectively enhance the Department of Homeland Security's ability to identify and screen out terrorists and dangerous individuals who pose threats to our nation.

The automatic exclusion of recent visitors to Iraq and Syria is discriminatory and will alienate Americans of Arab, Muslim, Middle Eastern and South Asian descent. The better way to combat terrorism in the U.S. is to ensure strong relations with these communities. With respect to Syrian refugees, former Sec. of State Madeleine Albright said "Our enemies have a plan. They want to divide the world between Muslims and non-Muslims, and between the defenders and attackers of Islam. In the aftermath of recent terrorist attacks, America must show its leadership by ensuring we remain an open society that welcomes people of all nationalities, faiths and backgrounds.

Respectfully Submitted,

American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee (ADC), American Immigration Lawyers Association (AILA), Asian Americans Advancing Justice (AAJC), Asian Law Caucus, Council on American-Islamic Relations (CAIR), Human Rights Watch, Iraq Veterans Against the War, Just Foreign Policy, League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC), The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, NAACP, National Immigration Law Center, National Network for Arab American Communities, Student-Led Movement to End Mass Atrocities (STAND), SustainUS.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, while there are many positive aspects to the legislation, I believe, in the end, we cannot countenance anything in our laws that judges individuals based on their nationality rather than their character.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. McCAUL), the chairman of the Homeland Security Committee.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman GOODLATTE and Chairman MILLER for their leadership.

I rise in support of this bill, the Visa Waiver Program Improvement and Terrorist Travel Prevention Act.

Our Nation faces the highest terror threat environment since 9/11, and we must do everything possible to shut down terrorist pathways into this country. We are working hard to do just that with this bill. Last month, the House voted overwhelmingly to pass bipartisan legislation I drafted to

prevent terrorists from entering the United States posing as refugees.

They have already done this to attack Paris. And this year, the Office of the Director of National Intelligence warned me that the National Counterterrorism Center has identified individuals with ties to terrorist groups in Syria attempting to gain entry to the U.S. through the U.S. refugee program.

I am concerned that terrorists are attempting to exploit the U.S. refugee program to enter our country and that we currently lack the ability to confidently vet Syria refugees to weed out individuals with potential terrorist ties. Top law enforcement and intelligence officials have testified before my Committee that terrorist groups have expressed a desire to infiltrate refugee programs to enter the United States and Europe, and ISIS has said in their own words that they intend to do so. In Paris, we saw them follow through on those pledges, sneaking at least two operatives into Europe posing as refugees. It also appears that individuals with extremist links have already tried to gain entry to our country as refugees. This year the Office of the Director of National Intelligence informed me in writing that the National Counterterrorism Center has identified ". . . individuals with ties to terrorist groups in Syria attempting to gain entry to the U.S. through the U.S. refugee program." This is deeply troubling. At this time, I am concerned that serious intelligence gaps preclude us from conducting comprehensive screening to detect all Syrian refugees with terrorist ties, and as a result I have proposed adding additional national security checks to the process before the United States approves any further admissions. Naturally, the States are concerned that the refugees being resettled in their communities may not have been effectively screened—especially given the volume of refugees the Administration has committed to accepting. Refugee resettlement is within the purview of the federal government. However, the Administration must be transparent in sharing information with the States about the people being resettled within their borders. The Refugee Act of 1980 requires that the federal government "shall consult regularly" with state and local governments and private nonprofit voluntary agencies concerning the intended distribution of refugees. In Texas, it appears the federal government has not fully held-up its end of the bargain.

But we must go further. More than 30,000 individuals from 100 countries have gone to Syria to join jihadist groups, and 5,000 of them have Western passports. This includes several of the Paris attackers, who could have traveled to the United States without a visa.

That is why this legislation is so important before us here today. It will close security gaps in the Visa Waiver Program to keep terrorists from entering our country undetected. It also includes several recommendations from the bipartisan Task Force on Combating Terrorist and Foreign Fighter Travel, which I created earlier this year.

This Member-led panel uncovered gaping security weaknesses overseas, including the fact that some countries are not sharing intelligence on terror-

ists, many are not screening travelers against critical counterterrorism databases, and too few of them are cracking down on passport fraud.

This bill would help close those security gaps to keep terrorists from crossing borders. And it would implement several of the task force's top recommendations to ensure Visa Waiver Program countries are living up to their obligations and ramping up security.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman of the Judiciary Committee. I also want to thank those on the other side of the aisle for working in a bipartisan spirit, in a cooperative nature on what I consider to be one of the biggest security gaps we have facing this country after the Paris attacks and after San Bernardino. And I want to thank our colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

□ 1600

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), a member of the Judiciary Committee as well as of the Homeland Security Committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Let me thank the gentlewoman for her leadership. As well, I thank the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON), the chairman of the Border and Maritime Security Subcommittee, of which I am a member—Chairman MILLER—and Messrs. McCAUL and GOODLATTE.

Mr. Speaker, as I have indicated, in my having been on the floor today, America is looking for the homeland to be secure, and they are looking for it to be done in a thoughtful manner.

Just a week ago, I did not vote for a bill that would have stopped innocent refugees who had been in camps for 2 years or more—mothers and fathers and seniors and children—because I knew there was a 21-list vetting system that would ensure that those refugees who had languished in refugee camps and who had been suffering would be a small number—an infinitesimal number—coming into the United States.

We heard debate earlier today about another loophole that could be ended, and that is to stop terrorists from getting guns—a thoughtful proposal. Most Americans didn't realize the loophole existed.

Now we come to a program that is, likewise, a thoughtful program. It has nothing to do with refugees. It has nothing to do with ending the Visa Waiver Program of 38 nations. What it has to do with is, if you have been in the areas where the caliphate is, where the fight has been taken to, Syria and Iraq, we just ask for an added interview. I might imagine that, in the course of that, there will be human rights activists and journalists. I would imagine, as well, that our officials who will be doing the interviews will be sensitive to the fact of legitimate journalists who have gone to do their reporting.

I think it is very important that the American people know that we are working to craft a thoughtful approach. This is a thoughtful approach. It simply asks for individuals to go for an interview who are part of the Visa Waiver Program in the countries that they have them or who are dual nationals.

Likewise, I have introduced legislation, H.R. 48, No Fly for Foreign Fighters, that asks for an added vetting for the terrorist watch list to make sure that no one on that list who is coming from overseas gets on an airplane. This will protect the American people.

In the course of trying to be constructive, I think the hearings that we had in Homeland Security indicated another layer, another level, of just making sure that those who are trying to use the Visa Waiver Program are not abusing the Visa Waiver Program. That is our effort here today, that they not abuse it and, by some ill fate, allow someone who comes to this Nation to do us harm. Homeland security, protecting the national security, is a layer that is constructive and constitutional. This is constructive, and it is constitutional.

I ask my colleagues to support the underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, this has been a stressful year in our country and our world with past senseless gun violence and terroristic acts against Americans and citizens the world over.

I rise in support of H.R. 158—the Visa Waiver Program Improvement and Terrorist Travel Prevention Act” because it facilitates a rigorous vetting of tourists seeking to enter into our country.

In addition to the steps laid out by the President, I also believe there are additional steps the Congress should take, including bringing to the floor for debate and vote H.R. 48, the “No Fly for Foreign Fighters Act,” that I introduced earlier this year.

My legislation would require the TSA to check the Terrorist Screening Database and the terrorist watch list used in determining whether to permit a passenger to board a U.S.-bound or domestic flight and to take appropriate steps to ensure that those who pose a threat to aviation safety or national security are included in the Terrorism Database.

From San Bernardino to Paris, to Nigeria, to Mali, to Beirut, the carnage of violence has been perpetrated on the human family by those who should never be in possession of violent weapons or power.

But we cannot allow these atrocities to dissuade us from interacting with and welcoming those interested in traveling to and learning more about our country.

Mr. Speaker, as a Member of Congress and senior member on the homeland security and ranking member on the Judiciary subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism and Homeland, my top priority is the safety of the American people.

In times of conflict and stress and trauma, our natural inclination is to point fingers and seek to cast blame as we have seen Mr. Donald Trump do.

But we all know that deep down, this does us no good and that it runs afoul of our American ideals.

What we must do is focus our efforts on the most likely security threats to our homeland and not scapegoat the thoroughly screened individuals who seek to come to the U.S. through the Waiver Program.

We cannot throw a net of suspicion over an entire nation, even as the United States accepts more refugees—including Syrians.

Our system facilitates the most rigorous screening and security vetting of ANY category of traveler or immigrant to the United States before the refugee sets foot on U.S. soil.

Indeed, the Republican bill, H.R. 4038, that passed the House in November would immediately shut down refugee resettlement from the Syria and Iraq region and severely handicap refugee resettlement in the future.

To date, there is no reliable evidence that the individuals who committed the heinous attacks in Paris on November 13th were refugees.

Currently, the Visa Waiver Program allows citizens from 38 countries from around the world, including the United Kingdom, France, Belgium and Japan, to enter the United States without a visa.

One of the main intents of the Visa Waiver Program is to stimulate the U.S.’ economy by encouraging tourism, cultural exchange, business, and job growth between the United States and our international partners.

The travel industry estimates that the VWP contributed \$190 billion to our economy in 2014.

It should be noted that Visa waiver travelers cannot simply grab their passports and hop on the next flight to the United States.

Rather, under current law, citizens from participating Visa Waiver Program countries are required to complete a U.S government online security screening form prior to their admission to the United States.

These participants also undergo an additional level of screening at the port of entry by a Customs and Border Patrol official.

This bipartisan bill provides for specific, concrete changes that will ensure better information-sharing among intelligence and law enforcement agencies.

The Program requires screening of all travelers against INTERPOL databases to identify high-risk travelers.

The Program makes it challenging for extremists to falsify their identities by requiring fraud-resistant e-passports that contain biometric information.

The Program compels U.S. security agencies to conduct more frequent threat assessments of VWP countries.

The bill also requires nationals of Iraq, Syria, and other designated countries, or those who have visited such countries, to have an in-person interview with a U.S. Department of State Consular official and undergo more lengthy screenings prior to travel to the United States.

This bill employs intelligent measures to enhance the security of the American people by improving information sharing between VWP country partners and the United States, including a requirement that WP countries report theft/loss of their citizens’ passports to the United States within 24 hrs.

This bill is a more appropriate response than the Republican drafted the “American SAFE Act of 2015.”

It deserves a vote in the House.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the majority whip.

Mr. SCALISE. I thank my colleague from Virginia for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this important legislation by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER).

To defeat ISIS, it is going to take strong leadership, and it is going to take a strong strategy. I think it is clear that the President’s approach isn’t working. In fact, our intelligence officials tell us that ISIS is not only not being contained, but now we are seeing that they are coming to America, that they are attacking America, and that has been their stated goal. It is incumbent upon us to do everything we can. Frankly, the American people deserve to know that their government is doing everything in its power to protect them from the threat of terrorists. These are very real threats.

In the House, we have been taking decisive action. We have already passed a bill to address the problems of the lack of vetting in the refugee program, a program that ISIS, itself, has said it plans to exploit in order to bring terrorists into America. The FBI Director has even confirmed those concerns that we have expressed, and we have passed legislation to address that.

Today, Mr. Speaker, we are bringing forth strong, bipartisan legislation to reform the troubled Visa Waiver Program. We have seen that thousands of people with Western passports, including from the Visa Waiver Program nations, have been going to some of the troubled regions, like Syria, like Iraq, like other countries. There ought to be a higher level of scrutiny. This bill requires the Department of Homeland Security to work with those nations in order to have a higher level of scrutiny so as to ultimately lead to a more secure United States of America.

I encourage all of my colleagues to pass this legislation. Let’s continue to do what we need to do in the House of Representatives to protect the American people from the real threat that ISIS poses.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON), the ranking member of the Homeland Security Committee.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. I thank the gentlewoman from California for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 158, the Visa Waiver Program Improvement and Terrorist Travel Prevention Act of 2015.

This bipartisan legislation will help better secure the Visa Waiver Program, which facilitates travel to the U.S. for 20 million visitors from 38 participating countries for both business and pleasure.

While the program provides important security benefits through information-sharing agreements between participating countries and significant

economic benefits from tourism, the potential security vulnerabilities of this program have been a concern.

I was a primary author of provisions in the Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007, which bolstered the security of the Visa Waiver Program by requiring an Electronic System for Travel Authorization, called ESTA. Through the ESTA program, Visa Waiver travelers are vetted prior to their departure to the U.S.

I applaud the Department of Homeland Security for its recent efforts to make further enhancements to the ESTA program. These improvements will better secure the Visa Waiver Program, but Congress needs to do its part. That is why I am pleased to support H.R. 158. The bill was reported unanimously by voice vote from the Committee on Homeland Security earlier this year, and additional security-related provisions were added on a bipartisan basis in recent days.

H.R. 158 would strengthen passport requirements for Visa Waiver travelers and require Visa Waiver participants to report lost or stolen passports within 24 hours. Enhanced information-sharing requirements would also be in place for Visa Waiver countries. In addition to that, it would mandate that Visa Waiver countries screen arriving and departing noncitizens against INTERPOL databases. Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill. Its time has come.

I thank Mrs. MILLER of Michigan for her diligence in bringing it before our committee, and I thank Ms. LOFGREN for her work in this effort. I look forward to the passage of this bill.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we all know that ISIS is not contained. ISIS, in fact, is expanding its reign of terror. Its fighters hold passports from different countries around the world. We know they are embedded in Western countries, are able to travel freely, and are hard to track down—and they want to do us harm.

Under the current Visa Waiver Program, individuals from 38 countries are exempt from the standard vetting process to get a visa and come to America. Hold a passport from one of these 38 countries, and you can just jump on a plane and come here. Those 38 countries are supposed to share their watch lists with us, but some of them don't. That makes it easier for the bad guys to fly to America.

So this bill fixes that real loophole in the current system. Those 38 countries will now be required to share their watch lists with us. If they don't, they are prohibited from being in the Visa Waiver Program. Foreign citizens who have recently traveled to Iraq and Syria will also be required to go through additional screening.

Mr. Speaker, terrorist fighters have America in their hateful, evil sights.

We must do all we can to stop them from coming here, and the status quo just won't keep us safe. As chairman of the Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade Subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I totally support this commonsense legislation.

And that is just the way it is.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), our whip.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation.

I want to thank Ranking Member BENNIE THOMPSON, Ms. LOFGREN, who worked very hard on this, and Democrats on the Homeland Security Committee and on the immigration policy and enforcement Judiciary subcommittee for their hard work to ensure that this bill will protect Americans from the threat of terror while we remain true to our highest principles and ideals.

House Democrats and House Republicans have no greater priority than keeping Americans safe. That is neither a partisan issue nor is it a partisan difference.

Many Americans are frustrated with the pace of progress against ISIS in Iraq and Syria. I want to see the administration and Congress working together to protect our Nation. The reforms in this bill are an excellent start. What we have before us today, Mr. Speaker, is an example of what we can achieve when both sides work together to craft responsible reforms in a spirit of unity and common purpose, which is: in the face of the threats we challenge, we ought to summons.

I want to thank the majority leader, Mr. MCCARTHY, for working with me and our side of the aisle, and I want to thank those on the Republican side of the aisle for working together to get this bill done.

The Visa Waiver Program has long been a tool to promote business ties and tourism, both of which are vital to our economy. We cannot—nor should we—simply shut our doors to the world if we want to continue to lead the world. This legislation will make it easier for law enforcement to vet those visitors who are coming from Visa Waiver countries, such as in Europe, to ensure that we are not admitting those who have traveled to places like Iraq and Syria and link up with ISIS.

This is now the third major bipartisan piece of legislation to come to the floor in the past 2 weeks after the highway bill, which included a provision to reopen the Export-Import Bank, and the Elementary and Secondary Education Reauthorization Act. I hope—and I think the American people would expect—again, in light of the challenges that confront us, that we can build on this progress and complete a bipartisan agreement to keep government open before the week is done.

I want to thank, once more, Ranking Member ZOE LOFGREN, who knows so

much about this issue and who has been so faithful in her attention to both our values and the protection of the American people. I thank BENNIE THOMPSON as well, the ranking member of the Homeland Security Committee, on our side of the aisle. I also want to thank the chairman of the Judiciary Committee for his leadership on this issue as well as all of those who have worked on a number of issues.

This will not be the last word, but it is a good word, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE).

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Visa Waiver Program Improvement and Terrorist Travel Prevention Act, which will strengthen the Visa Waiver Program in order to help prevent foreign terrorists from entering the United States.

This legislation comes at a critical time. The heinous acts of terror and mass murder perpetrated in Paris and San Bernardino demonstrate the alarming strength and reach of ISIS and its allies.

□ 1615

This threat is certainly not contained, and our fight against radical jihadists at home and abroad must be the Nation's most pressing issue.

Passing H.R. 158 will close a dangerous loophole that we know terrorists will exploit to carry out acts of terror here in the United States. Terrorists such as the September the 11th so-called 20th hijacker, Zacarias Moussaoui, and the shoe bomber, Richard Reid, both used a Visa Waiver Program to enter the United States.

We must be ever vigilant in the face of these great threats. I urge a "yes" vote on H.R. 158.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF), the ranking member of the Intelligence Committee.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 158, the Visa Waiver Program Improvement and Terrorist Travel Prevention Act.

The Visa Waiver Program is overall an excellent program that facilitates the travel of more than 20 million people to the United States each year, travelers who encourage cultural exchange and contribute significantly to our economy through tourism and job growth.

The overwhelming majority of travelers who utilize the program are not a threat in any way. However, even a small number of individuals can do us grave harm. Among those of greatest concern are European citizens who return to countries like France and Belgium after traveling to Iraq and Syria to train with terror forces.

It is incumbent upon us to take every precaution to ensure these individuals cannot exploit the Visa Waiver Program to enter the United States.

The reforms we are voting on today are reasonable, and they are appropriately targeted improvements to this important program. Specifically, they will require that nationals of Iraq and Syria as well as other designated countries and those who have traveled to these countries since 2011 undergo an in-person interview with a U.S. official and more rigorous security screening processes prior to traveling to the United States. It will also require DHS to strengthen its background check procedures and ensure improved information sharing among intelligence and law enforcement agencies.

In the wake of the recent terror attacks, we must continue to review our existing security efforts to ensure we are doing all we can to protect the country. Rather than focus on the refugee resettlement program, which is the most heavily screened and lengthy process to enter the United States, Congress should focus our energy on closing known vulnerabilities that could allow those who mean us harm to enter the United States quickly and with little scrutiny. This bill does just that.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this legislation.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for working together with others to bring this bill forward.

I rise in full support of H.R. 158, which is the Visa Waiver Program Improvement and Terrorist Travel Prevention Act of 2015.

We all know that it takes a lot of pieces of legislation to fill some of the holes that exist, but I am pleased that this bipartisan effort has come to the floor of the House of Representatives, Mr. Speaker.

I will say that, as I look at the language that is in here and the pieces of it, to recognize that as the tighter scrutiny to the Visa Waiver Program, which I have had some concern about over the years, 38 countries enjoy the relationship with the United States of a Visa Waiver Program.

The way it functions is, if an individual of one of the participating countries has a valid passport from their own country and they sit down in front of the Internet, they can input that information and essentially clear themselves to be able to travel to the United States without further bureaucracy.

That is a good thing on balance, but a bad thing when we have people that have dual nationalities or people who give indicators, such as having traveled back and forth to some of the countries that we have concerns about as being those countries where terrorists are, let's say, radicalized or sponsored.

I am a little concerned that our list isn't a little longer than this. The countries that are covered with this bill are Iraq, Syria, and, by definition,

Sudan and Iran. I am hopeful that the Secretary of Homeland Security will take a look at some other countries to tighten this up a little bit more.

I just returned from that part of the world, Mr. Speaker, probably about a month ago, perhaps a little less. I traveled into Turkey, into Iraq, into the Kurdish region, Erbil, and then west as far as I could go up towards the ISIS lines.

I visited a refugee camp there and then back into Turkey, up to Hungary, down to Serbia, into Croatia, back out of there again, and then determined to skip Germany and Austria this time, but traveled up to Sweden to look at the other end of this.

There I sat with a briefing of our State Department. Some of that in that room is confidential, but we are working with these countries to tighten up our security. We are offering the expertise that we have developed here because we deal with a lot more people and a lot more travel than they do. I am hopeful that we will be able to share more of our intelligence also with the countries that are participating in a Visa Waiver Program.

This will help tighten it up. Mr. Speaker, it will identify those who have traveled to some of these terrorist-sponsoring countries, and it will also require that they exchange information with us so that we can monitor them more closely.

If someone travels and essentially lies about their travel—if they have, say, traveled to Iran, traveled to Iraq, maybe Sudan or Syria, and they apply for a visa waiver—we will either have a software program that will kick that out because it shows up on their passport or we will catch up with that and cancel their visa waiver. In any case, it is heightened scrutiny and heightened security for us. We need to do a lot of things to tighten this up, and this is one.

It is one also that respects our relationship with the visa waiver countries, those 38. It is prudent. It is careful. It puts authority into the hands of the Secretary of Homeland Security. It is the right bill. It is bipartisan. I urge its adoption.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I do support the fact that we are looking at the Visa Waiver Program. However, after scrutinizing this bill, I think that it is not the right bill and I don't plan on supporting it.

It is not that I can't support any part of it. There are key things that I cannot abide, but I urge the parties to keep on working on it because I think the effort is proper.

Here is what I think is specifically wrong with this. If it were to change, I might reconsider my position. The categorical stripping of the Visa Waiver Program privileges from all Iraqi and Syrian nationals I think is problematic. I think it is overbroad. I don't think it is necessary.

Number two, I think there should be exemptions for people who do clearly recognized legitimate work, such as journalists, researchers, human rights investigators, and other such professionals.

Number three, I think the 5-year sunset is too long. I think it should be shorter. I do think 3 years would work just fine.

I just want to say that the Visa Waiver Program Improvement and Terrorist Travel Prevention Act of 2015 does contain, as we stand here, discriminatory elements, which I don't believe will effectively stop terrorism. In fact, I think it sends a wrong message to dual nationals and Iraqi and Syrian tourists.

This bill bars people who are dual nationals from Syria, Iraq, Iran, and Sudan from participating in the Visa Waiver Program even if there is no evidence that they are a security risk. I think our focus should be on behavior, not just country of origin.

This bill would also end visa waiver eligibility for people who traveled to Iraq or Syria in the last 5 years. For example, this bill would make an elderly French citizen who is a dual national of Syria go through an often lengthy visa approval process simply because she wanted to travel to the U.S. to attend a wedding or a birthday or something. What does this provision mean for a Swiss doctor who traveled to Iraq to work in a refugee camp providing medical care, but wants to come to the U.S. for a conference or something like that?

While this bill does not restrict entry to the U.S., it creates additional barriers. It should be worked on a little more to fix these problems. I do thank the parties for working in a bipartisan way to bring greater safety to our country.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Communications of the Homeland Security Committee.

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairwoman MILLER for this thoughtful legislation. I rise today in support of H.R. 159.

I was a proud member of the Committee on Homeland Security's task force on combatting terrorists and foreign fighter travel. The task force bipartisan report, which was a culmination of 6 months of investigative activities, contained many troubling findings related to the ease with which foreign fighters from Visa Waiver Program-participating countries could seek entry into the United States.

Of the estimated 30,000 foreign fighters that we are aware of, at least 4,500 hold western passports. This is made even more alarming by the fact that 30 of the 38 Visa Waiver Programs are in Europe.

I am pleased that this legislation that we are considering today takes

steps to address many of the task force's findings related to this program. The bill prohibits individuals that travel to Iraq and Syria from using the program. It requires termination of a participating country for failing to screen against INTERPOL's criminal and terrorism databases. It authorizes the Secretary of Homeland Security to suspend participating countries when it is determined that they pose a high risk to the national security of the United States.

ISIS has better resources and is more brutal and more organized than any terrorist organization to date. We must use all the tools at our disposal to defeat them. I am particularly pleased that this bill recognizes the need to continually update and secure the Electronic System for Travel Authorization, or ESTA, a key task force recommendation.

As part of this effort, we must leverage new and innovative technologies. The bill requires the Secretary of Homeland Security to explore opportunities to incorporate technology into ESTA that will detect deception and fraud.

A number of promising deception detection technologies have been developed, including one developed at the University of Arizona in my district. Deception can be difficult to detect when you are interviewing an individual face to face. It is even more difficult to detect the deception in online forums like ESTA uses.

The technology developed at the University of Arizona called Neuro-Screen identifies typing, scrawling, and other computer-use patterns to capture motor nervous system signals associated with deceptive and suspicious behavior. We must leverage technology, such as Neuro-Screen, to enhance screening programs like ESTA.

Mr. Speaker, we all want to ensure that people from around the world can travel here to experience all the wonders and the freedoms of the United States. As we welcome travelers here, we must do so in a way that keeps us safe.

That is why I support H.R. 1158. I urge all our Members to support this thoughtful bipartisan legislation.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS).

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, as the Representative from Las Vegas, one of the world's greatest tourist and business travel destinations, I, too, rise in favor of H.R. 158.

This bill strengthens the Visa Waiver Program to help ensure that potential terrorists are not able to abuse it to bypass security checks and come to the U.S. to do us harm.

We must remain cognizant, however, of the fact that the VWP program is not only a significant aspect of our Homeland Security, but it is also critical to expediting and welcoming tourists and business travelers to the United States.

In 2014, more than 20.4 million visitors arrived in the U.S. through the VWP, representing almost 60 percent of all overseas visitors. These travelers stayed an average of 18 nights and spent \$4,400 per visit, generating \$190 billion, which supported nearly 1 million jobs. In Las Vegas, 20 percent of our visitors come from foreign countries, many of whom use this program.

So, in short, yes, we must be cautious. We cannot afford to unnecessarily crush the growing tourism industry or risk retaliatory measures by other countries, which would make it difficult for Americans to travel abroad for business or a holiday.

I believe H.R. 158 strikes the right balance between security and accommodation. I urge my colleagues to support it. I also caution against carrying xenophobia too far.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee.

□ 1630

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I am recently back from London, where I had an opportunity to speak to British authorities about the challenge that Europeans find themselves in at this point in time. There are literally 5,000 Europeans who have gone to fight in Syria and in Iraq and have come back. Part of the problem here is a manpower problem of managing to be able to have a handle on that.

Now, we cannot have people automatically coming to the United States without being vetted. They should not be allowed to just get on a plane and fly here. This bill is going to bolster our defenses because what it is going to do is to ensure that those who have traveled to a terror hotspot, like Syria, and then come back into Europe or another Visa Waiver country will get that thorough investigation before they are being cleared to travel. That will allow our authorities to prevent that travel.

It is going to give our law enforcement a new tool as well in terms of detecting fraud and stolen passports. You also saw the story in Honduras of five Syrians with stolen passports trying to get into the United States.

So the Visa Waiver Program is good for America's economy and good for our leadership overseas. We can strengthen it. Let's urge our colleagues in the Senate to get this soon to the President's desk.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time remains.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California has 6½ minutes remaining.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY), a former member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Visa Waiver Program plays an absolutely essential role in growing the American economy. If we don't have foreign trav-

el, it is just going to be Michigan competing against Wisconsin, Las Vegas competing against Orlando; and while Chicago has no peer, we are really not being productive. Also, over the last decade, we have successfully used the incentives of this program to require participating countries to implement the strictest security standards and increase vital intelligence sharing with U.S. law enforcement.

As a member of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, I can't stress enough the value of intelligence we gather from the 38 Visa Waiver countries in thwarting terror plots and preventing attacks on our homeland. That is why I have been a longtime supporter of the Visa Waiver Program and for including important allies like Poland. But I have also led the effort to strengthen the security requirements of the program to respond to the evolving threats we face.

The bipartisan JOLT Act, sponsored by myself and Mr. HECK, includes many of the security programs and reforms included in this bill we are debating today. It will also strengthen the security of the program and reduce fraud and also provide the U.S. with greater intelligence capacity.

As policymakers, we must continuously reevaluate the reforms that are necessary to respond to keep America safe. The bill before us provides that proper balance by making the Visa Waiver Program even more secure and reaffirming our commitment to the program for the future.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. KATKO), the chairman of our Foreign Fighter Task Force.

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 158, the Visa Waiver Program Improvement and Terrorist Travel Prevention Act of 2015.

This bill, which I cosponsored, will close a critical gap in our Nation's security that is vulnerable to exploitation by terrorists and other nefarious actors seeking to do us harm. This bill strengthens the security of the Visa Waiver Program by requiring participating nations to increase counterterrorism information sharing, screen travelers against INTERPOL's databases, and enhance passport security features.

As chair of the Committee on Homeland Security's Foreign Fighter Task Force, I spent countless hours with my colleagues examining weaknesses in our Nation's defenses against the threat posed by foreign fighters. The provisions in this bill address several of the key findings in that report. I thank Mrs. MILLER for her leadership on this important issue.

I also want to thank and note the continuing bipartisan cooperation that is part of the Committee on Homeland Security. I commend my colleagues on the other side of the aisle for their continuing good work on that committee.

In closing, I would like to urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, there are some 6 billion people in the world who aren't from one of the 38 favored countries and have to go through an in-person interview to visit the United States. It is not unfair for us to impose the same requirement on those Europeans who have visited ISIS-infested areas.

This bill will do some good, but it is mostly evadable. Most ISIS foreign fighters go to Turkey. Their passport is stamped in Turkey, and then they walk into Syria. ISIS does not stamp their passport, and so they are free to say that they never went to Iraq or Syria. This bill will make sense only if it applies to those who visited Turkey.

Even if they did get their passport stamped, say they flew to Baghdad, got it stamped by the Iraqi Government, all they have to do is go back to Europe and say, "I want a new passport. My hair style has changed, I want a different picture." They get a new passport. Their old passport, holes are punched in it. It is returned to them, and so there is no record that they ever visited Iraq.

Most of our European friends don't have a list of which of their citizens have visited Syria, Iraq, or Iran. If they did have such a list, they wouldn't share it with us because they have privacy laws. Now, they will cooperate with us on individual suspects, but not a list of tens of thousands of people who have visited Iraq, Syria, or Iran, and certainly not the millions who have visited Turkey. So they don't have a list. They won't share a list.

Looking at a passport only tells you that somebody got a new passport. Seeing that it was stamped only in Turkey but not stamped in Syria just shows you that they walked into Syria and ISIS didn't stamp their passport.

I look forward to passing this bill, and then getting serious on a bill that will accomplish its purposes.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI).

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 158. In order to protect our national security and the safety of Americans, we must also adapt our policies to prevent terrorists from entering U.S. soil.

As we have heard earlier, approximately 5,000 Europeans have traveled to Syria and Iraq to join ISIS, many of whom are from countries that participate in the Visa Waiver Program. Many of these countries fail to provide the U.S. intelligence community with critical information needed to ensure those traveling under the program are not a threat to the U.S. Today's legislation addresses and helps fix the vulnerabilities of this program.

Before an individual is permitted to enter the United States, additional vetting is required. This includes enhanced screening of individuals who

have visited or are citizens of Iraq, Syria, and terrorist hotspots like Iran and Sudan, or other nations that have seen a rise in significant terrorist activities.

It strengthens intelligence and information sharing with our allies. It cracks down on passport fraud by requiring Visa Waiver countries to upgrade to biometrics and electronic passports and forces Visa Waiver countries to ramp up counterterrorism screenings of travelers.

As our enemies continue to evolve, we must do the same to protect the American people from the risks posed by this threat. I thank Congresswoman MILLER for her hard work on this important piece of legislation.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA).

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairwoman MILLER for introducing this legislation to address the serious security gaps in the Visa Waiver Program, and I thank Congresswoman LOFGREN for putting our country's security over partisanship to advance this commonsense measure.

I am a cosponsor of this legislation because it makes sensible, bipartisan changes to address the security gaps in the Visa Waiver Program and prevent Islamic State and other terrorist networks from using the program to gain access to the United States.

The Islamic State is one of the world's most violent and dangerous terrorist groups. To keep our country safe, we must be one step ahead of them, preventing them from entering the United States and stopping their efforts.

The Visa Waiver Program allows travelers from approved countries to visit the United States for up to 90 days without a visa. This program is an important tool that grows our economy and supports ease of travel for American citizens.

The reasonable changes included in this bill strengthen the Visa Waiver Program. This bill requires partner nations to issue electronic passports, strengthening the screening process of program participants.

It also addresses the concerns raised by my bill, H.R. 4122, introduced with Congressman MATT SALMON, to suspend the Visa Waiver Program for individuals who have traveled in the last 5 years to Syria and Iraq, to countries that are state sponsors of terrorism, or to countries with active terrorist networks. I thank Chairman MILLER for including this important provision. I thank Congresswomen MILLER and LOFGREN for advancing this important legislation.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia has 5½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from California has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, this legislation is a step in the right direction. The changes that I like particularly to the Visa Waiver Program are a requirement to share counterterrorism information with the United States and that all visa waiver countries must submit lost and stolen passport information to INTERPOL's database within 24 hours.

In May of 2014, a foreign fighter, radicalized on the battlefield in Syria after 1 year, traveled back to Europe. He traveled through Turkey and through Germany. It is believed that Germany had information on this individual, but it failed to share that information with its neighbors France and Belgium. He arrived in Brussels. In a 90-second attack with an automatic weapon on a Jewish museum, he killed 4 people before fleeing to France, making it all the way to the south of France, to the city of Marseille, where he hoped to cross the Mediterranean and disappear into the African continent.

Why do I tell you this story? It is because of the freedom of travel in the Schengen region, or the open borders region in Europe, the radicalization of foreign fighters joining ISIS on the battlefield and having the ability to travel back to Europe and possibly, being undetected, travel to the United States under the Visa Waiver Program if the countries don't share the information.

In addition, in the last 30 days, we have seen numerous instances where stolen or fraudulent passports have been used by migrants and terrorists to travel throughout Europe as well as across Latin America.

Just recently, five Syrians traveled through the tri-border region, which is Argentina, Brazil, and Paraguay. It is a region in the northern area of Argentina. They traveled there from Syria on stolen Israeli passports, and then they purchased, in the tri-border region, Greek passports and were able to transit Latin America into Honduras, where they were stopped with those false passports.

These are real examples of real issues, and it is why I support what we are trying to do today.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire if the gentleman has additional speakers.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I am the only remaining speaker.

Ms. LOFGREN. Then I will close on our side.

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

A lot of things have been said today that will be very helpful, but I think clarifying some of these issues might be useful for Members.

It has been said that there is discrimination in this bill. It is important to note that the Visa Waiver Program discriminates on the basis of nationality. That is why there is only one country, Chile, in Latin America that is in the Visa Waiver Program. Everybody else has to go in for a visa interview.

There are no countries in Africa that are eligible for the Visa Waiver Program. Everybody in Africa has to go in for an interview to get a visitor's visa.

There are only four sites—Singapore, Taiwan, Japan, and South Korea—in Asia that are eligible. Everybody else has to go in for a visa interview.

So a visa interview is not a terrible thing. It helps us understand what people are about.

I include for the RECORD a letter from the U.S. Travel Association in favor of this bill. It is signed by a large number of groups, including the Asian American Hotel Owners Association and The Travel Technology Association.

U.S. TRAVEL ASSOCIATION,

Washington, DC, December 8, 2015.

DEAR MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: On behalf of the 14.6 million American workers whose livelihood depends on safe international travel to the United States, we are writing in support of H.R. 158, legislation to strengthen homeland security in the wake of the recent terrorist attacks.

The horrific attacks in Paris underscore the need for every possible measure to protect public safety. And no one advocates for security precautions more vigorously than travel professionals. Without public confidence in air security, worldwide commerce will be crippled. The Visa Waiver Program (VWP), originally created to facilitate travel, today is one of our most effective tools against global terror. Because of VWP, governments around the world now are working cooperatively at the highest levels of law enforcement to identify risky travelers—both before boarding flights and upon arrival in the United States.

For the 38 countries that are currently VWP members, the U.S. has unparalleled authority to inspect their counter-terrorism, border control, aviation and travel document security methods and facilities. VWP protocols require participating nations to issue machine-readable passports that are difficult to forge; promptly enter data on all lost and stolen passports into a central INTERPOL database; and collaborate with the United States law enforcement under essential information-sharing agreements. Since this system was established in 2008, we have denied entry to over 4,300 would-be travelers known or suspected of posing a threat. For the many nations that hope to someday become a VWP member, just that aspiration offers a strong incentive to raise security standards unilaterally, even in advance of their admission. The VWP is a rare, exemplary government program that delivers both security and economic benefits.

Even successful programs such as VWP can be improved. In our view, the battery of reforms proposed in H.R. 158 will help make us all safer. We support its provisions to add additional layers of protection, including by increasing preclearance and immigration advisory programs, working with other governments to strengthen their watch lists and vetting systems; and expanding Global Entry to enroll more rigorously screened, trusted travelers. These are thoughtful, effective reforms—and we especially commend bipartisan House leaders for working together toward enacting H.R. 158. As this bill makes its way through the legislative process, we will continue to work constructively with its sponsors.

This is a moment when the United States and our allies can send a global message about the seriousness of our air security protocols and our capacity for bipartisan con-

sensus on matters of national security. Thank you in advance and please call on us if we can serve as a resource for your deliberations.

Sincerely,

U.S. Travel Association,
Airlines for America,
American Gaming Association,
American Hotel & Lodging Association,
American Resort Development Association,
American Society of Travel Agents,
Asian American Hotel Owners Association,
Atlanta Convention & Visitors Bureau,
Dallas Convention & Visitors Bureau,
Destination DC,
Destination Marketing Association International,
Expedia, Inc.,
Hilton Worldwide,
International Association of Amusement Parks and Attractions,
Los Angeles Tourism & Convention Board,
Las Vegas Convention & Visitors Authority,
Loews Hotels and Resorts,
Marriott International, Inc.,
National Retail Federation,
National Tour Association,
PSAV®,
Sabre Corporation,
The San Diego Tourism Authority,
Starwood Hotels and Resorts Worldwide, Inc.,
The Travel Technology Association,
U.S. Tour Operators Association.

Ms. LOFGREN. Why? Because it is important for our country that this program, this Visa Waiver Program, be tightened up, that we are assured that it is being operated in a safe and secure manner.

□ 1645

I am happy that we can work together on a bipartisan basis to do this, because we are at a time in our country when reckless and racist things are being said about some of our fellow Americans—people who are saying that if you are of the Muslim faith, somehow you are a threat to the United States. That is not true. And it is important for us to stand up against that rhetoric, to stand up for all Americans and people of all faiths, but also to work together on sensible, modest reforms to the VW Program.

I am glad that we will, hopefully, stand together in the face of outrageous racist rhetoric and that we will also stand together supporting this modest reform to the program.

I would note also the suggestion that the bill does not solve all the problems. As I said in my opening statement, the most important part of this program is the database provisions. If countries do not want to share their data, they can't be in the Visa Waiver Program. I think that, as we move forward, more and more countries will understand we need to collaborate together, and I urge support for the bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill. I want to thank everybody on both sides of the aisle who have worked together to bring us to the point where we can

pass this bill through the House. I hope it is taken up and passed in the Senate. I hope it is signed into law soon.

It will do some good in stopping people who have ill intent from being able to abuse our immigration system and enter our country. But this bill is just one of many, many things with regard to our immigration system that need to be examined. Other legislation that has already passed out of the Homeland Security Committee and the Judiciary Committee needs to be brought to the floor of the House for consideration.

We also need to examine our visa programs and the interview process, which may be called into question following the tragedy in San Bernardino. We also need to make sure that our borders—particularly our southern border, but all of our borders—are secure. People are crossing into our country undetected, and they are not just from South American and Central American countries. They are from all over the world, including from the country that we have been talking about here today.

We need to make sure that our asylum program is not as rampant with fraud as it is today. We need to pass legislation introduced by Congressman CHAFFETZ of Utah that addresses that problem.

We need to make sure that when people cross into our country illegally, no matter where they are from, they are apprehended and that they are not released into the interior of the country with the hope that they will someday reappear for a hearing. Congressman JOHN CARTER has legislation that addresses that problem.

We need to make sure that when people enter the United States, for whatever purpose, they do so lawfully, and they not take jobs away from law-abiding American citizens. We need to make sure that our electronic verification of employment program is made mandatory, as legislation introduced and passed out of the committee, introduced by Congressman LAMAR SMITH, would do.

We need to make sure that we are utilizing all of our law enforcement resources across our entire Nation to keep this country safe, including better cooperation between the Federal Government and our State and local governments on law enforcement issues and on immigration enforcement issues. I hear from judges and sheriffs and other law enforcement officials in my district about the messed up way that our current program is working. We need to have a clear, statutory role for State and local governments to participate in the enforcement of these laws.

All of these things need to be brought to the floor of this House to make sure that our immigration programs are working properly, are working fairly, and are making this country safer than it is today. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, which is a very good step in the right direction.

I commend the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER), who is leaving

at the end of this Congress. This is a good note to end this debate upon. I thank her for her good work in making sure that we are keeping this country safe by improving the Visa Waiver Program. I urge my 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 Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 158, as amended.

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.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2130, RED RIVER PRIVATE PROPERTY PROTECTION ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. NEWHOUSE, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114-375) on the resolution (H. Res. 556) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2130) to provide legal certainty to property owners along the Red River in Texas, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

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. 158, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 3842 by the yeas and nays.

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

VISA WAIVER PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT AND TERRORIST TRAVEL PREVENTION ACT OF 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 158) to clarify the grounds for ineligibility for travel to the United States regarding terrorism risk, to expand the criteria by which a country may be removed from the Visa Waiver Program, to require the Secretary of

Homeland Security to submit a report on strengthening the Electronic System for Travel Authorization to better secure the international borders of the United States and prevent terrorists and instruments of terrorism from entering the United States, and for other purposes, 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 Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 407, nays 19, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 679]

YEAS—407

Abraham	Costa	Griffith
Adams	Costello (PA)	Grothman
Aderholt	Courtney	Guinta
Allen	Cramer	Guthrie
Amash	Crawford	Gutiérrez
Amodei	Crenshaw	Hahn
Ashford	Crowley	Hanna
Babin	Cuellar	Hardy
Barletta	Culberson	Harper
Barr	Cummings	Harris
Barton	Curbelo (FL)	Hartzler
Beatty	Davis (CA)	Hastings
Becerra	Davis, Danny	Heck (NV)
Benishek	Davis, Rodney	Heck (WA)
Bera	DeFazio	Hensarling
Beyer	DeGette	Herrera Beutler
Bilirakis	Delaney	Hice, Jody B.
Bishop (GA)	DeLauro	Higgins
Bishop (UT)	DelBene	Hill
Black	Denham	Himes
Blackburn	Dent	Hinojosa
Blum	DeSantis	Holding
Blumenauer	DeSaulnier	Hoyer
Bonamici	DesJarlais	Hudson
Bost	Deutch	Huelskamp
Boustany	Diaz-Balart	Huffman
Boyle, Brendan	Doggett	Huizenga (MI)
F.	Dold	Hultgren
Brady (PA)	Doyle, Michael	Hunter
Brady (TX)	F.	Hurd (TX)
Brat	Duckworth	Hurt (VA)
Bridenstine	Duffy	Israel
Brooks (AL)	Duncan (SC)	Issa
Brooks (IN)	Duncan (TN)	Jackson Lee
Brown (FL)	Edwards	Jeffries
Brownley (CA)	Ellmers (NC)	Jenkins (KS)
Buchanan	Emmer (MN)	Jenkins (WV)
Buck	Engel	Johnson (OH)
Bucshon	Eshoo	Johnson, E. B.
Burgess	Esty	Jolly
Bustos	Farenthold	Jones
Butterfield	Fattah	Jordan
Byrne	Fincher	Joyce
Calvert	Fitzpatrick	Kaptur
Capps	Fleischmann	Katko
Capuano	Fleming	Keating
Cárdenas	Flores	Kelly (IL)
Carney	Forbes	Kelly (MS)
Carson (IN)	Fortenberry	Kelly (PA)
Carter (GA)	Foster	Kennedy
Carter (TX)	Foxx	Kilmer
Cartwright	Frankel (FL)	Kind
Castor (FL)	Franks (AZ)	King (IA)
Castro (TX)	Frelinghuysen	King (NY)
Chabot	Fudge	Kinzinger (IL)
Chaffetz	Gabbard	Kirkpatrick
Chu, Judy	Galleo	Kline
Cicilline	Garamendi	Knight
Clark (MA)	Garrett	Kuster
Clawson (FL)	Gibbs	Labrador
Clay	Gibson	LaHood
Cleaver	Gohmert	LaMalfa
Clyburn	Goodlatte	Lamborn
Coffman	Gosar	Lance
Cohen	Gowdy	Langevin
Cole	Graham	Larsen (WA)
Collins (GA)	Granger	Larson (CT)
Collins (NY)	Graves (GA)	Latta
Comstock	Graves (LA)	Levin
Conaway	Graves (MO)	Lieu, Ted
Connolly	Grayson	Lipinski
Cook	Green, Al	LoBiondo
Cooper	Green, Gene	Loeback

Lofgren	Payne	Sinema
Long	Pearce	Sires
Loudermilk	Pelosi	Slaughter
Love	Perry	Smith (MO)
Lowenthal	Peters	Smith (NE)
Lowe	Peterson	Smith (NJ)
Lucas	Pingree	Smith (TX)
Luetkemeyer	Pittenger	Smith (WA)
Lujan Grisham	Pitts	Speier
(NM)	Poe (TX)	Stefanik
Lujan, Ben Ray	Poliquin	Stewart
(NM)	Polis	Stivers
Lummis	Pompeo	Stutzman
Lynch	Posey	Swalwell (CA)
MacArthur	Price (NC)	Takai
Maloney,	Price, Tom	Thompson (CA)
Carolyn	Quigley	Thompson (MS)
Maloney, Sean	Rangel	Thompson (PA)
Marchant	Ratcliffe	Thornberry
Marino	Reed	Tiberti
Massie	Reichert	Tierney
Matsui	Renacci	Tipton
McCarthy	Ribble	Titus
McCaul	Rice (NY)	Tonko
McClintock	Rice (SC)	Torres
McCollum	Richmond	Trott
McGovern	Rigell	Tsongas
McHenry	Roby	Turner
McKinley	Roe (TN)	Upton
McMorris	Rogers (AL)	Valadao
Rodgers	Rogers (KY)	Van Hollen
McNerney	Rohrabacher	Vargas
McSally	Rokita	Veasey
Meadows	Rooney (FL)	Vela
Meehan	Ros-Lehtinen	Velázquez
Meeks	Roskam	Viscosky
Meng	Ross	Wagner
Messer	Rothfus	Walberg
Mica	Rouzer	Walden
Miller (FL)	Roybal-Allard	Walker
Miller (MI)	Royce	Walorski
Moolenaar	Ruiz	Walters, Mimi
Mooney (WV)	Ruppersberger	Walz
Moore	Russell	Wasserman
Moulton	Ryan (OH)	Schultz
Mullin	Salmon	Weber (TX)
Mulvaney	Sánchez, Linda	Webster (FL)
Murphy (FL)	T.	Welch
Murphy (PA)	Sanchez, Loretta	Wenstrup
Nadler	Sanford	Westerman
Napolitano	Sarbanes	Westmoreland
Neal	Scalise	Whitfield
Neugebauer	Schiff	Williams
Newhouse	Schrader	Wilson (SC)
Noem	Schwartz	Wittman
Nolan	Scott (VA)	Womack
Norcross	Scott, Austin	Woodall
Nugent	Scott, David	Yarmuth
Nunes	Sensenbrenner	Yoder
O'Rourke	Serrano	Yoho
Olson	Sessions	Young (AK)
Palazzo	Sewell (AL)	Young (IA)
Pallone	Sherman	Young (IN)
Palmer	Shimkus	Zeldin
Pascrell	Shuster	Zinke
Paulsen	Simpson	

NAYS—19

Bass	Honda	Schakowsky
Clarke (NY)	Johnson (GA)	Takano
Conyers	Kildee	Waters, Maxine
Dingell	Lawrence	Watson Coleman
Ellison	Lee	Wilson (FL)
Farr	McDermott	
Grijalva	Pocan	

NOT VOTING—7

Aguilar	Johnson, Sam	Rush
Bishop (MI)	Lewis	
Donovan	Perlmutter	

□ 1718

Ms. LEE, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. GRIJALVA changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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 amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide enhanced security measures for the

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 1461

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

SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF ENFORCEMENT INSTRUCTION ON SUPERVISION REQUIREMENTS FOR OUTPATIENT THERAPEUTIC SERVICES IN CRITICAL ACCESS AND SMALL RURAL HOSPITALS THROUGH 2015.

Section 1 of Public Law 113-198 is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by inserting “AND 2015” after “2014”; and

(2) by striking “calendar year 2014” and inserting “calendar years 2014 and 2015”.

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.

PHYLLIS E. GALANTI ARBORETUM

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2693) to designate the arboretum at the Hunter Holmes McGuire VA Medical Center in Richmond, Virginia, as the “Phyllis E. Galanti Arboretum”, 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 Florida?

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2693

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

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Phyllis Eason Galanti, a tireless advocate for the rights of prisoners of war from the United States during the Vietnam War and a beloved member of the Richmond, Virginia, community, died on April 23, 2014.

(2) Ms. Eason graduated from the College of William and Mary in 1963 and shortly afterward was married to Paul Edward Galanti, a pilot with the United States Navy, at the Chapel of the Centurion in Fort Monroe, Virginia.

(3) In June 1966, when Mr. Galanti was shot down over North Vietnam, captured, and held prisoner, Phyllis E. Galanti became active in the National League of Families of American Prisoners and Missing in Southeast Asia, soon becoming chair of the organization.

(4) Mrs. Galanti spearheaded the Let's Bring Paul Galanti Home project as part of the national Write Hanoi campaign—

(A) to raise awareness;

(B) to secure the return of more than 600 soldiers from the United States who were missing in action or held as prisoners of war in Vietnam; and

(C) to ensure that prisoners of war were treated in accordance with the Geneva Conventions.

(5) The efforts of Mrs. Galanti under the Let's Bring Paul Galanti Home project, the most successful of many such campaigns, re-

sulted in more than 1,000,000 letters that were personally delivered to the North Vietnamese embassy in Stockholm, Sweden, in 1971.

(6) Mrs. Galanti became known as “Fearless Phyllis”, traveling to Versailles, France, seeking an audience with North Vietnamese leaders, and giving hundreds of presentations to policy leaders in the United States, including President Richard Nixon, National Security Advisor Henry Kissinger, and Virginia Governor Mills E. Godwin, Jr., who said of her in 1975, “One dedicated woman and a handful of others had more influence on the communist world than legions of armies and diplomats.”

(7) After more than seven years apart, Mrs. Galanti was reunited with her husband Paul Galanti at the Naval Air Station in Norfolk, Virginia, on February 15, 1973.

(8) Mrs. Galanti spent decades confronting the issue of prisoners and hostages from the United States, not only in Vietnam but also in the Soviet Union and Iran.

(9) Mrs. Galanti actively supported the Virginia Home, Theatre IV, and the Virginia Repertory Theatre, visited schools, and continued to meet with lawmakers until she died on April 23, 2014, at age 73, from complications with leukemia.

(10) The work of Mrs. Galanti earned her the American Legion Service Medal, and the Paul and Phyllis Galanti Education Center at the Virginia War Memorial was named in honor of her and her husband.

(11) The leadership at the Hunter Holmes McGuire VA Medical Center in Richmond, Virginia, including Director John Brandecker, seeks to recognize Mrs. Galanti by naming the arboretum at Hunter Holmes McGuire VA Medical Center in her honor.

(12) It is a fitting tribute that Congress name the arboretum after such an outstanding advocate for members of the Armed Forces of the United States and veterans.

SEC. 2. PHYLLIS E. GALANTI ARBORETUM AT HUNTER HOLMES MCGUIRE VA MEDICAL CENTER IN RICHMOND, VIRGINIA.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The arboretum at the Hunter Holmes McGuire VA Medical Center in Richmond, Virginia, shall after the date of the enactment of this Act be known and designated as the “Phyllis E. Galanti Arboretum”.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in any law, regulation, map, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the arboretum referred to in subsection (a) shall be considered to be a reference to the Phyllis E. Galanti Arboretum.

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.

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 the additional 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.

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken later.

FOREIGN AID TRANSPARENCY AND ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 2015

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the

bill (H.R. 3766) to direct the President to establish guidelines for United States foreign development and economic assistance programs, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3766

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 “Foreign Aid Transparency and Accountability Act of 2015”.

SEC. 2. GUIDELINES FOR UNITED STATES FOREIGN DEVELOPMENT AND ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to evaluate the performance of United States foreign development and economic assistance and its contribution to the policies, strategies, projects, program goals, and priorities undertaken by the Federal Government, to foster and promote innovative programs to improve effectiveness, and to coordinate the monitoring and evaluation processes of Federal departments and agencies that administer United States foreign development and economic assistance.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT OF GUIDELINES.—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall set forth guidelines for the establishment of measurable goals, performance metrics, and monitoring and evaluation plans that can be applied with reasonable consistency to United States foreign development and economic assistance. Such guidelines shall be established according to best practices of monitoring and evaluation studies and analyses.

(c) OBJECTIVES OF GUIDELINES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The guidelines established under subsection (b) shall provide direction to Federal departments and agencies that administer United States foreign development and economic assistance on monitoring the use of resources, evaluating the outcomes and impacts of United States foreign development and economic assistance projects and programs, and applying the findings and conclusions of such evaluations to proposed project and program design.

(2) OBJECTIVES.—Specifically, the guidelines established under subsection (b) shall require Federal departments and agencies that administer United States foreign development and economic assistance to take the following actions:

(A) Establish annual monitoring and evaluation agendas and objectives to plan and manage the process of monitoring, evaluating, analyzing progress, and applying learning toward achieving results.

(B) Develop specific project monitoring and evaluation plans, to include measurable goals and performance metrics, and identify the resources necessary to conduct such evaluations, which should be covered by program costs, during project design.

(C) Apply rigorous monitoring and evaluation methodologies to such programs, including through the use of impact evaluations, ex-post evaluations, or other methods as appropriate, that clearly define program logic, inputs, outputs, intermediate outcomes, and end outcomes.

(D) Disseminate guidelines for the development and implementation of monitoring and evaluation programs to all personnel, especially in the field, who are responsible for the design, implementation, and management of United States foreign development and economic assistance programs.

(E) Establish methodologies for the collection of data, including baseline data to serve

as a reference point against which progress can be measured.

(F) Evaluate at least once in their lifetime all programs whose dollar value equals or exceeds the median program size for the relevant office or bureau or an equivalent calculation to ensure the majority of program resources are evaluated.

(G) Conduct impact evaluations on all pilot programs before replicating wherever possible, or provide a written justification for not conducting an impact evaluation where such an evaluation was deemed inappropriate or impossible.

(H) Develop a clearinghouse capacity for the collection and dissemination of knowledge and lessons learned that serve as benchmarks to guide future programs for United States development professionals, implementing partners, the donor community, and aid recipient governments, and as a repository of knowledge on lessons learned.

(I) Distribute evaluation reports internally.

(J) Publicly report each evaluation, including an executive summary, a description of the evaluation methodology, key findings, appropriate context (including quantitative and qualitative data when available), and recommendations made in the evaluation within 90 days after the completion of the evaluation.

(K) Undertake collaborative partnerships and coordinate efforts with the academic community, implementing partners, and national and international institutions that have expertise in program monitoring, evaluation, and analysis when such partnerships provide needed expertise or significantly improve the evaluation and analysis.

(L) Ensure verifiable, valid, credible, precise, reliable, and timely data are available to monitoring and evaluation personnel to permit the objective evaluation of the effectiveness of United States foreign development and economic assistance programs, including an assessment of assumptions and limitations in such evaluations.

(M) Ensure that standards of professional evaluation organizations for monitoring and evaluation efforts are employed, including ensuring the integrity and independence of evaluations, permitting and encouraging the exercise of professional judgment, and providing for quality control and assurance in the monitoring and evaluation process.

(d) **PRESIDENTIAL REPORT.**—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that contains a detailed description of the guidelines established under subsection (b). The report shall be submitted in unclassified form, but it may contain a classified annex.

(e) **COMPTROLLER GENERAL REPORT.**—The Comptroller General of the United States shall, not later than 1 year after the report required by subsection (d) is submitted to Congress, submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that analyzes—

(1) the guidelines established pursuant to subsection (b); and

(2) a side-by-side comparison of the President's budget request for that fiscal year of every operational unit that carries out United States foreign development and economic assistance and the performance of such units during the prior fiscal year.

SEC. 3. INFORMATION ON UNITED STATES FOREIGN DEVELOPMENT AND ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS.

(a) **PUBLICATION OF INFORMATION.**—

(1) **UPDATE OF EXISTING WEB SITE.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall update the Department of State's Internet Web site, "ForeignAssistance.gov",

to make publicly available comprehensive, timely, and comparable information on United States foreign development and economic assistance programs, including all information required pursuant to subsection (b) of this section that is then available to the Secretary of State.

(2) **INFORMATION SHARING.**—The head of each Federal department or agency that administers United States foreign development and economic assistance shall, not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, and on a quarterly basis thereafter, provide to the Secretary of State comprehensive information about the United States foreign development and economic assistance programs carried out by such department or agency.

(3) **UPDATES TO WEB SITE.**—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall publish, through the "ForeignAssistance.gov" Web site or a successor online publication, the information provided under subsection (b) of this section and shall update such information on a quarterly basis.

(b) **MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The information described in subsection (a) shall be published on a detailed award-by-award and country-by-country basis unless assistance is provided on a regional level, in which case the information shall be published on an award-by-award and region-by-region basis.

(2) **TYPES OF INFORMATION.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—To ensure transparency, accountability, and effectiveness of United States foreign development and economic assistance programs, the information described in subsection (a) shall include—

(i) links to all regional, country, and sector assistance strategies, annual budget documents, congressional budget justifications, evaluations and summaries of evaluations as required under section 2(c)(2)(J);

(ii) basic descriptive summaries for United States foreign development and economic assistance programs and awards under such programs; and

(iii) obligations and expenditures under such programs.

Each type of information described in this paragraph shall be published or updated on the Internet Web site not later than 90 days after the date of issuance of the information.

(B) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in subparagraph (A) shall be construed to require a Federal department or agency that administers United States foreign development and economic assistance to provide any information that does not relate to or is not otherwise required by the United States foreign development and economic assistance programs carried out by such department or agency.

(3) **REPORT IN LIEU OF INCLUSION.**—

(A) **HEALTH OR SECURITY OF IMPLEMENTING PARTNERS.**—If the head of a Federal department or agency, in consultation with the Secretary of State, makes a determination that the inclusion of a required item of information online would jeopardize the health or security of an implementing partner or program beneficiary or would require the release of proprietary information of an implementing partner or program beneficiary, the head of the Federal department or agency shall provide such determination in writing to the appropriate congressional committees, including the basis for such determination and shall—

(i) provide a briefing to the appropriate congressional committees on such information; or

(ii) submit to the appropriate congressional committees such information in a written report.

(B) **NATIONAL INTERESTS OF THE UNITED STATES.**—If the Secretary of State makes a determination that the inclusion of a required item of information online would be detrimental to the national interests of the United States, the Secretary of State shall provide such determination in writing to the appropriate congressional committees, including the basis for such determination and shall—

(i) provide a briefing to the appropriate congressional committees on such information; or

(ii) submit to the appropriate congressional committees the item of information in a written report.

(C) **FORM.**—Any briefing or item of information provided under this paragraph may be provided in classified form, as appropriate.

(4) **FAILURE TO COMPLY.**—If a Federal department or agency fails to comply with the requirements of subsection (a), paragraph (1) or (2) of this subsection, or subsection (c) with respect to providing information described in subsection (a), and the information is not subject to a determination under subparagraph (A) or (B) of paragraph (3) of this subsection not to make the information publicly available, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in consultation with the head of such department or agency, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees not later than September 1, 2016, a consolidated report describing, with respect to each required item of information not made publicly available—

(A) a detailed explanation of the reason for not making such information publicly available; and

(B) the department's or agency's plan and timeline for immediately making such information publicly available, and for ensuring that information is made publicly available in following years.

(c) **SCOPE OF INFORMATION.**—The online publication required by subsection (a) shall, at a minimum, provide the information required by subsection (b)—

(1) in each fiscal year from 2016 through 2019, such information for fiscal years 2012 through the current fiscal year; and

(2) for fiscal year 2020 and each fiscal year thereafter, such information for the immediately preceding five fiscal years in a fully searchable form.

SEC. 4. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.**—The term "appropriate congressional committees" means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(2) **EVALUATION.**—The term "evaluation" means, with respect to a United States foreign development and economic assistance program, the systematic collection and analysis of information about the characteristics and outcomes of the program, including projects conducted under such program, as a basis for making judgments and evaluations regarding the program, to improve program effectiveness, and to inform decisions about current and future programming.

(3) **UNITED STATES FOREIGN DEVELOPMENT AND ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE.**—The term "United States foreign development and economic assistance" means assistance provided primarily for the purposes of foreign development and economic support, including assistance authorized under—

(A) part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151 et seq.), other than—

(i) title IV of chapter 2 of such part (relating to the Overseas Private Investment Corporation);

(ii) chapter 3 of such part (relating to International Organizations and Programs); and

(iii) chapter 8 of such part (relating to International Narcotics Control);

(B) chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2346 et seq.; relating to Economic Support Fund);

(C) the Millennium Challenge Act of 2003 (22 U.S.C. 7701 et seq.); and

(D) the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1721 et seq.).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank Chairman ROYCE and the ranking member, my cosponsor on this legislation, Mr. CONNOLLY from Virginia, for this legislation being brought to the House floor tonight.

The Foreign Aid Authorization Act first passed Congress in 1961. If you mention foreign aid to many Americans, Madam Speaker, it raises their blood pressure. Members of our communities often are concerned about foreign aid to other countries because they are just not quite sure where that aid is going and what that aid is accomplishing.

It is important that we, as Members of the House of Representatives, legislatively communicate to America how America's money is being spent in foreign countries. It is important that we are accountable and that that money, that aid, is accountable to the taxpayers.

It may shock you, Madam Speaker—maybe it won't—but Congress has never passed a law requiring transparency and accountability of foreign aid. I will use a different phrase. We have never audited our foreign aid to see if it is working and to see what it is doing so people can see whether it is successful or not.

The American public is uninformed about how much we spend and why we spend that money. A recent *Publish What You Fund* study rated half of U.S. agencies in the "poor" category when it came to transparency of aid. Transparency is important because it sheds light on where the money is spent. It is a lot harder to steal money if everybody knows where the money went and what it was for.

The American people have a right to know what we are doing with their money. There are a lot of success stories, but many Americans don't know about them. So it is important that we post that information and that the agencies that help in foreign aid assistance post that information on the Web so we know who is getting the money and what they are doing with that money.

Transparency will help foreign aid. It will make it harder for bad actors to steal that aid. It will make those who implement our programs work more vigilantly knowing the information will also be posted online. It will educate the American public about all the ways our country is helping other people around the world. As I said, Madam Speaker, there are a lot of success stories where people are better off because America is helping them.

Transparency by itself, however, won't save all of foreign aid's problems, but without transparency, those problems will not be solved. We also need to evaluate our foreign aid program so we know what works.

The key portions of this bill are transparency of the aid and evaluation of the aid: evaluate that aid to see if it is working, and if it is working may continue to do that aid; evaluate aid—if it is not working, then we cut it off and do something else.

We have all heard about the boondoggles of foreign aid. Big infrastructure projects are especially prone to waste and mismanagement. That is why it is so critically important that, as part of this bill being implemented, licensed engineers who know how to do these infrastructure projects are more involved with their expert input and operational skills.

Let me give you some examples of where foreign aid has been mismanaged. Schools are being built by Americans overseas, but some of those schools never had a student attend them. The Special Inspector for Iraq Reconstruction found out that at least \$8 billion in American taxpayer dollars was lost to fraud, waste, and abuse. \$44 million was spent on a residential camp to house international police trainers. The camp included an Olympic-sized swimming pool. The problem is, swimming pool and all, it was never used.

The \$43 million natural gas station in Afghanistan was built by the Department of Defense when it built the same kind of gas station for \$500,000 in Pakistan. Let me explain that again. American taxpayers built a \$43 million natural gas station. Besides the enormous, outrageous cost, nobody ever used the gas station in Afghanistan.

So rigorous evaluations of our foreign aid are important because they can tell us whether or not we are really making a lasting impact. We have a long way to go, and the State Department really doesn't have a system in place to keep track of the dollars spent on evaluation of those projects.

The State Department can only tell how much it plans to spend in the future, but as soon as it spends that money on evaluations, it has no way of tracking where the money went. So the State Department can't even tell how many evaluations were even done last year on the aid that we are already spending. Even in its policy, the State Department is moving in the wrong direction. Its new evaluation policy lowers the amount of evaluations that must be done.

USAID has some troubling signs as well. USAID spent less money on evaluations in 2014 than it did in 2013. To solve some of these problems with transparency and with accountability of our foreign aid, Representative CONNOLLY and myself have introduced H.R. 3766, the Foreign Aid Transparency and Accountability Act. This bill requires the President to issue guidelines requiring tough evaluations. And on transparency, it codifies what is already being done and increases the amount of information required to be posted online, including actual expenditures and evaluations so everyone knows what we are doing and whether it is working or not.

We need to be reporting on more foreign aid in a more understandable way. The American people want to know where their aid is going, what it is for, and if that aid is effective.

Transparency and accountability for our foreign aid: this is a commonsense bill, and it doesn't cost any money, Madam Speaker.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise in support of this measure.

First of all, I want to thank Congressman POE and Congressman CONNOLLY for all their hard work on this bill. Enhancing transparency and accountability in our foreign assistance spending is something with which we can all agree. And it is important that we get our foreign assistance right. Our foreign aid represents just a tiny sliver of the Federal Government's annual budget—less than 1 percent. But if it is put to the right use, it is an investment that pays huge dividends.

Why is that? Because when we support the construction of a water treatment facility in an overcrowded city or train teachers in a rural village, we are doing more than just directly helping those affected. We are helping to bring stability and prosperity to entire communities and populations. And when we have stronger partners around the world, it helps enhance our own security and advance our own interests.

So, as I like to say, foreign assistance is the right thing to do for those who are in desperate need, and it is also the smart thing to do in terms of American foreign policy and national security. But it is important that we are spending our limited foreign assistance dollars efficiently and effectively.

The Obama administration is taking important steps to enhance the monitoring and evaluation of our foreign assistance programs. When she was Secretary of State, Hillary Clinton was at the forefront of those efforts.

This legislation, the Foreign Aid Transparency and Accountability Act, would build on the great progress already made by the administration. It would write into law many of the steps they have already taken, making these efforts permanent for future administrations.

This will help ensure that our investments are as effective as possible by requiring measurable goals and plans for monitoring and evaluation.

Madam Speaker, this important legislating will help all of us to better understand how our foreign assistance programs help promote stability, prosperity, and democracy around the world, and how these investments advance our own security interests.

I am for accountability, so I strongly support this bill. I urge my colleagues to do the same.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BABIN).

Mr. BABIN. Madam Speaker, I rise today with strong concerns over President Obama attempting to unilaterally bypass Congress once again and enter the United States into the so-called "Paris Protocol" on global warming.

As the proud Representative of the 36th Congressional District in the State of Texas, I can tell you that my constituents want nothing to do with this expensive, ineffective, and unnecessary proposal.

According to the American Coalition for Clean Coal Electricity, the Paris Protocol will reduce U.S. gross domestic product by an average of 9.1 percent, or \$5 trillion per year. And consistent with this, NERA Economic Consulting states this will cost U.S. taxpayers approximately more than \$30 billion per year.

Aside from the constitutional issues of the President bypassing the Senate and not submitting this proposal as a treaty, and the outrageous costs, these negotiations will not even accomplish their end goal of substantial climate benefits.

A U.S. pledge to the U.N. is estimated to prevent only one-fiftieth of 1 degree Celsius temperature rise over the next 85 years.

□ 1745

Simply put, our planet will see no measurable benefit at all, but our economy will be wrecked by this accord.

This is just another example of the terrible leadership that we have seen from this administration and of the important role that Congress must play in standing up and fighting back on behalf of the American people.

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

I thought we were debating Mr. POE's and Mr. CONNOLLY's bill. I didn't real-

ize that climate change was on the agenda. Let me say that today, Secretary Kerry met with a bunch of businesspeople and led a meeting, and they talked about climate change because climate change is real.

Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), a valued member of the Foreign Affairs Committee and an author of this legislation.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Madam Speaker, I thank my dear friend from New York, the distinguished ranking member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, for his great leadership and for always being supportive of all of our work.

I also want to thank my dear friend from Texas, TED POE. He has been a wonderful partner and initiator of reform and of thoughtful legislation on our committee. It has been my privilege to cosponsor a lot of legislation with Mr. POE to try to make things better.

Today, I rise in support of another such example, the Foreign Aid Transparency and Accountability Act of 2015.

Madam Speaker, this bill is a project I have worked on with Judge POE for a number of years now. In the 112th Congress, a previous iteration of the bill passed this body by a unanimous vote. We hope for a similar outcome in this Congress and for quick Senate consideration and passage.

The bill directs the President to establish monitoring and evaluation guidelines for the 22 Federal agencies that are charged with implementing some piece of development and economic assistance.

The guidelines will require M&E plans as part of the project development process, and agencies will be encouraged to incorporate the findings of evaluations and impact studies into subsequent foreign assistance programs. This feedback loop will include measurable goals, performance metrics, and a clearinghouse for lessons learned on U.S.-led aid projects, something long overdue after 60-plus years of foreign aid. Additionally, the legislation requires that the documents and reports created under this M&E regime be made available to the public on foreignassistance.gov.

This administration has developed an encouraging record on foreign aid transparency. The Foreign Assistance Dashboard, which was created in 2010, is a great example of demonstrating a promising inclination toward disclosure that we hope to enshrine in this law. This measure will strengthen and codify those transparency best practices to ensure that they exist as agency policy under future administrations that might not be as accommodating of the aid community's demand for this information.

Aid programs that are held accountable for their performance and results can be made more effective, and their impact on communities and countries abroad can be more easily demonstrated. Perhaps, with more informa-

tion, we can dispel the commonly held belief that 26 percent of our budget goes to foreign aid, when, as my friend Judge POE pointed out, it is actually less than 1 percent.

The U.S. foreign assistance operation does not lack passion. The men and women who put themselves in harm's way overseas and who take their families to remote areas of the world, often dangerous, in the interest of helping vulnerable populations, are certainly not seeking fame, glory, or fortune. They do it because they can envision a path to prosperity in even the most poverty-stricken areas of the world, and they see the promise of democracy in the face of the most repressive and authoritarian regimes.

While our passion is well-defined, our mission and metrics are not.

Regarding our mission, I was a staffer on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee the last time Congress actually passed a foreign aid authorization bill in 1986. The original Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, which Judge POE cited, listed five principal goals for foreign aid. Today, we have more than 260. Some are competing and some are redundant.

What is our core mission today?

Until January 2014, USAID's mission statement read as follows: "USAID accelerates human progress in developing countries by reducing poverty, advancing democracy, building market economies, promoting security, responding to crises, and improving quality of life. Working with governments, institutions, and civil society, we assist individuals to build their own futures by mobilizing the full range of America's public and private resources through our expert presence overseas."

That is not a clear mission statement. I am hopeful this bill will help us focus on the foreign assistance operations.

While I think we have some distance to travel in streamlining the legislative construct for foreign assistance and clearly articulating our mission, we have an opportunity today to make immense progress toward establishing badly needed metrics for aid programs with the passage of this bill. It is time to apply a data-driven approach to constructing an assistance operation that has the support of both this Congress and of a well-informed public.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Again, I particularly thank my friend, Judge POE, for his leadership, for his initiative, and for his vision with respect to this subject. I know it is going to actually make U.S. foreign assistance investments in the future a lot more effective and a lot more accountable.

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the gentleman from Virginia for his comments. A couple of things that he mentioned are worth mentioning again, I believe.

This very bill that we have been working on for a long time passed unanimously in this House of Representatives 4 years ago in December. Why didn't it become law? Because, in the Senate's rules, one Senator was able to block the legislation from even being voted on in the Senate. So here we are again, 4 years later, trying to get this legislation passed.

My friend mentioned USAID and their mission statement. Nothing in the definition of "assistance" in this bill precludes USAID from reporting on data fields that it currently reports on for the Green Book and for OECD. So, if they are already making reports, this legislation, to be very clear, does not prohibit them from also making those other reports, but they will comply with the legislation in this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE), a valued member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. CICILLINE. I thank the distinguished gentleman from New York for yielding time.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3766, the Foreign Aid Transparency and Accountability Act.

I want to begin by recognizing my colleagues, the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) and the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE), for all of the work that they have done to get this important bill to the floor and to thank them for working, as they always do, in a bipartisan way on behalf of the members of our committee.

I also thank Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL for their leadership on this bill and for their creating an environment on the Foreign Affairs Committee, where we work together in a bipartisan way, and this legislation is a product of that work.

Madam Speaker, the Foreign Aid Transparency and Accountability Act will enhance the transparency and effectiveness of U.S. foreign assistance by requiring a framework for monitoring and evaluating foreign development and economic programs and for publicly disclosing the data and results.

The United States carries out a wide variety of assistance programs overseas, and it is important that there is a clearly articulated strategy and monitoring apparatus for our assistance. It is just as important that the American people have access to the information about what activities their tax dollars are funding. This is critical to sustaining public understanding and support for our diplomatic work and our foreign assistance.

I also want to take a moment to commend the Obama administration for making much of this information publicly available online on their Foreign Assistance Dashboard.

I hope that my colleagues support this legislation so that we can continue

to increase efficiency and accountability in our foreign assistance programs. The American people deserve this, and it will make our foreign assistance better understood and more impactful. I urge my colleagues to support this excellent legislation.

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, as I have no further requests for time, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

In closing, let me, again, thank Chairman ROYCE for bringing this bill forward and thank Representatives POE and CONNOLLY for their hard work.

Our foreign assistance helps improve the lives of countless people around the world, and it helps advance American interests and American values. Foreign assistance deserves the continued support of Congress. At the same time, we need to know that our foreign assistance dollars are being put to the best use possible, that we are getting the biggest bang for our buck. The American people expect no less when it comes to their tax dollars, and they are right.

So let's stand up for foreign assistance and for transparency and accountability by passing this bill. I urge a "yes" vote.

I congratulate Judge POE and Mr. CONNOLLY.

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I want to thank Chairman ROYCE, Ranking Member ENGEL, and, of course, my friend, Mr. CONNOLLY from Virginia, for their support on this bill.

Madam Speaker, the Foreign Affairs Committee is probably more bipartisan than any committee in the House of Representatives. Almost everything that we do and the legislation we bring to the floor, the vast majority of Members support. Sometimes every Member supports the legislation. This is another one of those pieces of legislation that is good for the country and is really good for the whole world.

Transparency and evaluation is what this bill is about. As I started out in my comments, many Americans don't know what we do with their money. Let me just give a few examples:

Because of American aid, there are now millions of girls in other parts of the world who are getting an education. Because of Americans and their interest, half of the AIDS epidemic in Africa has been cut. It has been cut in half, the epidemic of AIDS in Africa. The life expectancy of people in Afghanistan, because of American aid, has grown 20 years. When it comes to the youth, many children throughout the world are dying because they have dirty water. It is not clean. Because of USAID and their help, that number has been cut in half. The children are now living because they are getting clean water.

Those are just a few things that are being done. We should be proud of those accomplishments.

We also want to make sure that those accomplishments and what we are doing with American money is transparent. We want to continue to evaluate it to see if it is working. If it is working, let's continue it, and if it is not working, then let's do something else.

I do want to thank those involved for their support, especially the chairman and the ranking member.

H.R. 3766 will give us the tools to make foreign aid programs efficient and effective, two words that sometimes aren't used with "government." I strongly support this legislation.

And that is just the way it is.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3766, 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.

LASALLE LANCERS DID IT AGAIN

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

Mr. CHABOT. Madam Speaker, they did it again.

The LaSalle Lancers won the Ohio Division II State football championship for the second year in a row, and they won it convincingly, as they did last year, 42-0, this time over Massillon Perry.

One reason LaSalle was ready to compete and prevail for the State championship was they were challenged throughout the season by other great Cincinnati high school football programs. There is a saying, what doesn't kill you makes you stronger. Having to play Cincinnati powerhouse teams like Colerain, Elder, St. X, and Moeller didn't kill LaSalle, but it certainly made them stronger.

I am proud to say that LaSalle has been an important part of my life. I got my start in politics there by getting elected to the student council, and I played football, starting on the defensive line. Ten years later, my younger brother, Dave, also played defensive back for LaSalle. Of course, there is another saying, the older I get, the better I was.

So congratulations to LaSalle's players, coaches, students, teachers, parents, and supporters. Well done.

Lancers, roll deep. Congratulations.

□ 1800

IMPORTANCE OF ABUNDANT ENERGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS) is recognized for

60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROTHFUS. 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 the topic of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROTHFUS. I want to take a little time this evening to take a different look at American energy, Mr. Speaker. As many of you know, one of my core convictions is the importance of upholding the dignity of human life. Our task here in Washington should be to promote ideas and policies that allow people to live longer, healthier, and more rewarding lives.

It is in that spirit that I have joined with my fellow Pennsylvanian, Representative KELLY, and like-minded colleagues to host tonight's Special Order.

Starting last week, world elites gathered in Paris to negotiate climate change commitments and promises that, if enacted, could undo generations of human progress, progress that has provided us with the affordable and reliable energy necessary for humans to truly flourish.

I am here tonight to tell another side of the story, one that abandons the dogma of scarcity put forward by elites in Paris and climate change zealots in Washington. I want to shift this debate to focus on the remarkable story of human abundance. Affordable, reliable energy has been responsible for helping to improve and prolong the lives of billions of people around the world.

Energy powers our businesses. It keeps the lights on in our homes. It allows us to have fresh food and clean water. It powers our schools and our hospitals. Energy is in many respects a life or death matter. It is a moral issue, and it deserves more careful consideration than it has been given by the President.

I would like to highlight a little bit, just taking a look at some charts. In taking a look at what has been happening with the use of energy, a lot of the energy we get is carbon-based fossil fuel energy, whether it is coal, oil, natural gas. Yes, it has increased in recent history.

What also has happened in recent history? As CO₂ emissions have gone up, so has the wealth of this world and of this country. As the population has gone up, so has energy use. What is really striking, Mr. Speaker, is taking a look at how the increase in life expectancy has coincided with this energy revolution as well. As you can see, for much of human history, our lives were short, miserable, and lacking in fulfillment.

Consider that, until the industrial revolution, people lived 27 years, on average, earned little money, and faced

limited opportunities. Again, though CO₂ has increased, so has incredible wealth, lifting billions of people out of poverty and life expectancy.

The point now is, in the United States, the average life expectancy is near 80 years old. As people learned to access the bounty of energy available, we turned it to our advantage. As we got better at it, incomes and populations soared.

This is another interesting chart, Mr. Speaker. As we look at the use of world energy, just going back over the last 30 years, the bottom line is energy use. The top line is the world GDP, the increase in wealth that we have seen coinciding with this increase in energy. You could take a look at some specific countries and see how energy has benefited them.

In China and India, both of which have industrialized and increased energy use over the last generation, life expectancy has increased by more than a decade. Infant mortality has plummeted by 70 and 58 percent, respectively, in China and India. This is all correlated with increased energy use and the availability of affordable energy resources.

As Alex Epstein argues in "The Moral Case for Fossil Fuels," hundreds of millions of people have gotten their first light bulb, their first refrigerator, their first decent-paying job.

With all of our world problems, affordable energy has helped make this the brightest, most abundant time in human history. Some disparage the story as one of unseemly consumption and excess. I see it as a tremendous triumph of human ingenuity and a victory for those who put human well-being as our top priority.

We can tell the same story about Western Pennsylvania, where, once again, we are witnessing increasing prosperity attracted by affordable and reliable energy. This entails better opportunities for Pennsylvania's youth and a better quality of life. That is why I am so troubled by the President's actions at home and in Paris.

In negotiating a global compact, which will likely entail further restrictions on our access to energy, the President is unknowingly endangering our future well-being. By not taking his plans to Congress for approval, as should be the case with a treaty, the President is ignoring the will of the American people.

This is not a trivial point. The American people will be denied the opportunity to weigh in on something that will drastically impact their daily lives. Remember, the President said when he was a candidate in 2008 that electricity rates will necessarily skyrocket under his plan.

All of this comes in addition to heavy burdens that the American people are already grappling with. The so-called Clean Power Plan is an example. By forcing more power plant closures and placing stricter requirements on those that remain, the President's plan will

raise energy prices by \$289 billion through 2030, hurting American families and businesses large and small.

Research suggests that we will see 224,000 fewer American jobs being created each year because of this rule. We will also see reduced disposable income and weaker economic growth.

Minority communities will be especially hard-hit. A study from the National Black Chamber of Commerce found that the Clean Power Plan would increase poverty among African Americans by 23 percent and Hispanics by 26 percent. This is unacceptable, and it is immoral.

Real people will be hurt by these actions. Yet, few in Washington seem to be caring about these real human costs. That is why I have introduced a bill called the Fair Burdens Act. This bill would prevent the burden from endangering our prosperity and well-being until the EPA can verify that a sufficient number of countries have enacted similarly stringent policies.

In other words, the Fair Burdens Act would ensure that Americans aren't made to needlessly suffer and that our jobs aren't forced overseas, as the President unilaterally slows the American economy.

We can't just rely on legislation. We need to change the narrative and educate the public. Affordable, reliable energy is a vital ingredient for human prosperity and well-being. Ignoring this fact and taking ill-conceived policy actions as a result condemns millions of Americans and billions around the world to dimmer futures, higher energy costs, and less prosperity. We owe it to our constituents to defend their ability to live fulfilling, prosperous lives.

I want to thank my colleagues who have joined me here tonight to do just that. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I think tonight is a great night for us all to get together. While we are very concerned about the cost to American taxpayers and the fact that we will be going away from our fossil fuels, which are so abundant, so accessible and so affordable, there is another issue that takes place at the same time.

In the Paris protocol, we have heard the President say very clearly—and he has used this many times before—that things aren't getting done at the pace that he would like and that he has a phone and he has a pen and, if Congress can't act, he will act.

Well, I would like to suggest to the President, in fact, it is kind of shocking and stunning that a former professor of constitutional law would have a total disregard for the Constitution. I would like to tell the President that the Constitution is not a suggestion. It is who we are. It is what makes us an exceptional Nation.

Now, the United Nations' Framework Convention on Climate Change is taking place right now in Paris. It is stunning that the legacy of one man would

overshadow what is good for not only our country, but the world.

Decisions made by this President and the commitments made by this President, he looks at it as an executive decision, not as a treaty, a treaty that requires him returning to the House and to the Senate. Particularly treating this as a treaty, it would take two-thirds of the Senate to concur with whatever it is that we are proposing. Again, as I said, this is a former professor of constitutional law. Yet, he continually defies it. He makes the House irrelevant.

This is not, by the way, a Republican or Democrat issue. This is an American issue. This goes to the very framework and the very foundation of who we are as a Nation. So when you look at this, it is really hard to believe that there is such disregard.

I would just say to the President that, if you go to article II, section 2, clause 2, it is very clearly stated: "The President . . . shall have Power, by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, to make Treaties, provided two thirds of the Senators present concur . . ."

Again, this is an overreach by an executive. It doesn't matter if it is a Republican sitting in the White House or a Democrat sitting in the White House or an Independent or a Libertarian sitting in the White House. It clearly is defined in our Constitution how these powers work.

Mr. ROTHFUS. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if one were to ask a question of some high school students in a civics class—if you have an agreement, let's say, between two countries or three countries or four countries and those countries are agreeing to do things that are going to bind their respective citizens, you would ask those students, I would think, Mr. Speaker: What would you call that type of agreement?

I think every one of those students in a civics class might say a treaty. If it looks like a treaty, if it smells like a treaty and it works like a treaty, it is a treaty.

To just highlight what my colleague here has been saying, we have a process in our Constitution for when it is a treaty. It needs to get submitted to the Senate with a two-thirds vote.

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

I mean, it really does come down to, well, tonight we are talking about energy and we are talking about setting targets and timetables that will be very expensive for hardworking American taxpayers' money. I would like to remind the President that the money he is talking about committing is not his. It belongs to hardworking American taxpayers.

This insane idea that somehow there is an endless amount of money to be thrown around the world for whatever reason possible and knowing that, real-

ly, the Paris protocol is nothing more than a conversation taking place in Paris.

There is no commitment from these countries to do all these things. There is an ask for these countries to do these things. What they are asking is: If we do comply with these suggestions, these targets, these timetables, will we be subsidized by the United States of America?

The President has been unbelievable to make the commitments that he continues to make. He does not have that power. Our Constitution clearly defines the separation of powers. It is clearly structured so that no one body can run roughshod over the other body. This has been a concern forever. Yet, this President consistently time after time disregards the House and the Senate.

□ 1815

As I said earlier, this is not about Republicans or Democrats. This is about America and America's future. In this case, it is about energy. But as we go forward, what other overreaches will this Executive take? What other things will he do because it is about his legacy and not about the well-being of our country and our people. It is shocking. It is stunning that he would continue on this path.

What is even more stunning to me is that the American people sit idly by and watch this happen day after day, week after week, month after month. In 7 years of watching this, they sit back and say: I am not sure that he doesn't have the power to do this. Well, let me tell you, it is clearly defined in our Constitution that this President does not have this authority. In fact, no President, no Executive has the authority to do what this President is continuing to do.

As we meet here in America's House and we look at what can you do, because people back home tell me all the time, "Look, I agree with you, but what can you do about it?" and I know that for myself and my colleagues, we refuse to sit by idly and watch our Nation be given away and watch our Constitution be run over roughshod because of one man's legacy. This is not what is good for America. This is what is good for this administration and this President. That is not only shameful, it is unconstitutional and cannot be tolerated.

That is why, with Senator LEE in the Senate and myself, we have come up with H. Con. Res. 97 that states any commitment of funds, hardworking American taxpayer funds, has got to come before the Senate for its advice and consent.

As I said earlier, we can debate and we can talk and we can amend, but what we cannot condone is an Executive who has a total disregard for this House and for the Senate. As I said earlier, we need colleagues on both sides. This is not a Republican issue or a Democrat issue. This comes down to the very foundation of who we are as a country.

If we turn our back on this, what will be next? The continual disregard for the Constitution is not only of grave concern to me, to my colleagues, but every single American, regardless of how you vote or how you register. That is not the issue, my friends.

The issue is, when do the American people in America's House, with the Senate, stand up and say there will be no commitment of hardworking American taxpayer dollars unless it comes before the Senate as a treaty and gets the advice and consent of the Senate, two-thirds of which are required to pass this?

I know we are coming to an end in Paris, and I know there is great concern of getting to Paris to find out exactly what the Paris Protocol is structured with, but I would just say this: Before you pack your bags and leave, take a copy of your Constitution with you.

For those folks sitting back home and watching this happen, please, get out your Constitutions and look. For our schools, please start to preach and teach the Constitution, of which too many Americans are woefully uninformed.

Mr. ROTHFUS. It struck me as my colleague from Pennsylvania was talking about the Constitution. What he was getting at, Mr. Speaker, was a simple concept of authority and whether the President has authority to do what he is doing in Paris. The President is allowed to negotiate certainly. He can conduct foreign affairs. It is pretty clear in the Constitution that he has that authority to do so. But the President, on his own, does not have the authority to obligate American taxpayers to pay into any kind of fund. It is the House and the Senate that do the appropriations.

I am mindful that my colleague came out of the auto business, where he sold cars. I can imagine a situation where you might have a customer coming in, let's say a 15-year-old, who wants to go in and buy a car. Of course my colleague might welcome this individual to the showroom, and this individual, a 15-year-old kid, might make an offer, but I think he is going to be asking: Well, does this person have the authority at the age of 15 to make an offer? Maybe the kid will say: Well, I am doing it for my mom and my dad. Well, you are going to want to see what authority he has. I am mindful that our Constitution gives the authority to spend money to the Congress, which would then be signed by the President.

I yield to my colleague if he wants to close.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I would tell you this, and I think if there is anything more telling of the view that this administration has, all you have to do is go back in time to March of 2015 this year when Josh Earnest, who represents the White House in all the briefings, was asked by a reporter in regard to the Paris Protocol and in regard to the climate control conference that would be taking place.

This is so typical of this administration. The reporter looks to Mr. Earnest and says to him: Is this the kind of agreement that Congress should have the ability to sign off on?

Now, you would think that somebody who works for a former constitutional law professor would have a little bit of an idea when it comes to speaking; and even while they may feel in their heart that they have a total disregard for this body, I don't think that they would be encouraged to speak out the way Josh Earnest did that day. Let me read what Josh Earnest said when the reporter asked him: Is this the kind of agreement that Congress should have the ability to sign off on?

He looks him right in the eye and says: I think it is hard to take seriously from some Members of Congress who deny the fact that climate change exists that they should have some opportunity to render judgment about a climate change agreement.

Is that not stunning? And not only stunning, but chilling that, coming out of the White House, the spokesman for the President of the United States again consistently expresses the attitude of this President in that: Are you kidding me? We are actually going to have the people's House, the people's Representatives weigh in on a climate change initiative? They are not qualified. They only represent the people. No. We will make that decision. And he again totally trashes the House of Representatives.

By the way, for my friends who don't speak up when this happens to them, you got trashed, too, my friends. I have watched you stand and applaud a President who says consistently that: I do not need the House of Representatives to effect change. I will use my phone and I will use my pen, and I am tired of waiting for these people.

Well, Mr. President, once again I say to you that the Constitution is not a suggestion. It is who we are as a nation. It is what makes us great. It is what allows the people to decide how they will be governed, not the government to decide how the people will be governed. This is such upside-down thinking.

While I am concerned, as you are, with the abandonment of our fossil fuels and turning our economic revival upside down, I am more concerned with an administration that consistently turns upside down our Constitution, runs roughshod over the House of Representatives, disregards the Senate, and then sits back and says: This is the way it is going to be because I am the President of the United States.

I tell you, Mr. President, you are the President of the United States. You take the same oath all of us take. If for some reason you can't remember what it is, please take a look at it and remind yourself who you are, what you are, and whom you represent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded not to engage in personalities toward the President, and

Members are reminded to address the Chair and not a perceived viewing audience or other Members in the second person.

Mr. ROTHFUS. I thank my colleague from Pennsylvania for his observations about our Constitution and what it requires.

I yield the floor to my colleague from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER), who has been a very strong advocate for her constituents and for the energy policy that we need to have in this country.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to join with Representatives ROTHFUS and KELLY and all my colleagues here tonight expressing concern about the reports coming from the Conference of the Parties, or COP 21, talks in France of a planned end-around of the Senate.

It is unacceptable to me that this administration is negotiating a major international agreement, promising vast sums of taxpayer dollars, with no intention of allowing the people's representatives to weigh in on a final agreement. While the President's team is in Paris trying to finalize a deal, we have been here listening to our constituents. That should be our goal: to listen to Americans and to fight to lower their electricity costs, not obligating taxpayers to send billions of their hard-earned dollars overseas to implement climate change schemes.

Nor should we continue down this path of forcing rate increases on the hardworking families in America, yet that has been the President's plan all along, Mr. Speaker. In 2008, President Obama proudly announced his vision for energy costs in our country. He said: "Under my plan of a cap-and-trade system, electricity rates would necessarily skyrocket . . . coal . . . natural gas . . . you name it . . . whatever the plants were, whatever the industry was, they would have to retrofit their operations. That will cost money, and they will pass that money on to consumers."

His plan: make them pay more. Even though his cap-and-trade legislation failed in Congress, the administration has not given up and continues to ignore the voices of the American people by passing rules that implement them, despite the law, and by traveling to Paris to work a deal to inflict more mandates on the American people.

Even now, with little support here at home, negotiators are working every angle to make sure a deal is secured, no matter how onerous it is to senior citizens and low-income families living paycheck to paycheck and for whom a rate increase will hurt the most.

This agenda has been a hallmark of the administration when it finalized the EPA's recent Clean Power Plan rules on existing and new power plants, which amount to a disguised cap-and-trade program.

But we are listening to the American people. Upon the start of the Paris talks, both Chambers of Congress passed joint resolutions against the

EPA's Clean Power Plan rules for new and existing power plants to nullify the rules put in place which were done by ignoring the will of the people.

Twenty-seven States have also taken the EPA to court over these two rules. It is important that we do this. Missourians rely on affordable energy. Americans everywhere rely on affordable energy, and to ignore their needs and wishes is irresponsible.

We do not need extreme, arbitrary mandates that will cost hundreds of billions of dollars over the next 15 years, close power plants across the Nation, eliminate jobs, and close off access to reliable, affordable energy for the most vulnerable in our society.

We need to promote policies that increase access to affordable energy, tap into the abundant energy supply, and create a reliable infrastructure supported by American labor and ingenuity.

We need to make sure that Americans' voices are heard, which is why I proudly stand with my colleagues in support of Congressman KELLY's concurrent resolution requiring the President to send any agreement stemming from these talks in Paris to the Senate as a treaty for advice and consent from those sent here by the people to represent them.

We need American energy policy that works for the American people, not against it. They deserve a fair process that upholds the constitutional authority of checks and balances envisioned by our forefathers.

I urge my colleagues to stand up for the American people and support this resolution so the people's voices will be heard.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, those who disagree with us and our colleagues point to the wisdom of the experts on the potential impacts of climate change, but we know that many of the so-called experts have historically been wrong, often significantly wrong.

In 1986, John Holdren, a senior adviser to President Obama on science and technology issues, predicted: "carbon dioxide, climate-induced famines could kill as many as a billion people before the year 2020."

Since then, we have added almost 2½ billion people to the planet, an increase of almost 50 percent, and we aren't seeing a billion people dying from famine. We continue to make significant progress with improved technology, and we are feeding more people than ever, and people are living healthier and longer. We could not have done this without accessing abundant, affordable, and consistent energy.

Paul Ehrlich, another so-called expert on this issue, predicted in 1970, that: "By the year 2000, the United Kingdom will be simply a small group of impoverished islands, inhabited by some 70 million hungry people . . . If I were a gambler, I would take even more money that England will not exist in the year 2000." Well, England

still exists, and it is doing better than ever.

□ 1830

England's Chancellor of the Exchequer was recently published in *The Wall Street Journal* bragging about the nation's turnaround under conservative leadership: "How Britain Got Its Mojo Back."

To paraphrase Mark Twain, the report of Britain's death is greatly exaggerated, to say the least. If we had listened to the inaccurate and dire predictions of these experts and chicken littles and curtailed energy usage, our world would certainly look differently than it does. It would be poorer, less well fed, and billions of people would be generally worse off.

I yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER).

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS), and I want to commend my colleague and friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY), for his eloquent and passionate defense of constitutional government.

It is not just the administration's efforts here to ratify something and bypass Congress without any input from us, but they are also making laws through agencies, such as the EPA. We are engaged right now in a debate over the Clean Power Plan, which is a reiteration of cap-and-trade. It is all about regulating greenhouse gases. They have started this process because in 2007, the Supreme Court, in a 5-4 decision, said that the Clean Air Act gave the EPA the authority to regulate greenhouse emissions. Not everyone agrees with that.

As you see here on the easel, I have a quote from former Representative John Dingell. This is what he had to say about the Supreme Court's decision in *EPA v. Massachusetts*. He said:

"Like most members of this committee, I think the Supreme Court came up with a very much erroneous decision on whether the Clean Air Act covers greenhouse gases. Like many of the members of this committee I was present when we wrote that legislation. We thought it was clear enough that we didn't clarify it, thinking that even the Supreme Court was not stupid enough to make that finding."

I want to state for the record, Mr. Speaker, that I am in no way making personal references to the members of the Court, particularly the five who voted for that decision. That is Mr. Dingell's opinion. But I think it is clear that it was never Congress' intent to allow the EPA to do this.

The point here is that we have had a debate over regulating greenhouse gases. We did that in 2010 in the form of the cap-and-trade bill. And Congress, with Democrat majorities in both Houses, said "no." Yet the President is intent on making the United States a party to a legally-binding agreement to reduce greenhouse gas emissions that will have almost no measurable impact

on global temperatures. The EPA has admitted that in testimony before the Science Committee.

This is basically a public relations effort to encourage other nations to reduce their greenhouse gas emissions. As Mr. ROTHFUS has pointed out, the cost on the American economy, and particularly on low-income families, will be enormous. Also, on single-income households and senior citizens.

Even the former lead author of the International Panel on Climate Change, Philip Lloyd, asserted in a new paper that there is strong likelihood that the major portion of observed warming is due to natural variation. If it is due to natural variation, there is little to nothing that we can do about it.

Congress has been bypassed by the EPA and other Federal agencies for too long. Is time to stand up and reassert ourselves as the sole body empowered to make law under the Constitution.

The debate over greenhouse gases and climate change is not the central issue. This is really about the EPA and this administration usurping the authority of Congress to make a law.

As my friend from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY) explained, the issue is that the authority of Congress, and consequently the right of American citizens to representation and the making of our Nation's laws is being seriously diminished.

Under our Constitution, Congress makes the law and is held accountable by the people through elections. The effort to restrain the EPA is more than a policy position on an issue, but a matter of fidelity to the Constitution and the clear separation of powers doctrine that is essential to the successful functioning of our government.

As the people's elected Representatives, and I want to emphasize it is elected Representatives, not elected bystanders, it should be one of our top priorities to reassert Congress as the originator of law and reestablish congressional accountability for the regulations issued by Federal agencies, by requiring a vote on the regulations that have a significant impact on the economy. This would have a devastating impact on the economy. By doing so, not only will the economy benefit, but the Representative and accountable government will be restored in the process.

I urge all my colleagues to support my friend from Pennsylvania's resolution to require that the President submit any agreement reached in Paris to the Senate for their advice and consent.

Mr. ROTHFUS. I thank my colleague for his comments.

Let's take a look at where we are at in this debate over energy use and what has been going on in Paris. Again, it always seems to be a one-sided conversation about all the negatives and all the dire consequences. I highlighted a few of the examples before of what some of the advocates have been say-

ing, and how their dire predictions did not come to pass.

Too often, Mr. Speaker, we take for granted how easy it is to live with constant access to reliable sources of energy. Our health, indeed our lives, and the lives of those who we love, often depend on our access to reliable energy available to us at every hour, every day. People in the developing world cannot yet say the same.

There is a powerful story of an unborn child who suffocated in utero in Gambia comes to mind. This tiny, three-pound little girl could not be saved, because the hospital did not have access to a reliable source of energy. Her mother required an emergency C-section, but the surgery could not begin until a generator was powered on. Precious minutes were lost, so precious life was lost. Without a reliable, consistent form of energy, the hospital did not even own an incubator, which would have also been necessary to save this baby's life.

We cannot forget how important affordable, reliable energy is for every human person, and how attacks on these sources of energy are attacks on life itself.

I yield to my colleague from Texas (Mr. WEBER).

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to condemn the President's actions to regulate our power plants and his efforts to commit the United States to such onerous regulations through the United Nations. At no other time in our history has a President been more wrong more times on so many issues that this country is facing today than President Obama, Mr. Speaker.

At a time when our country is being attacked from inside our borders and radical Islamists are gaining ground all over the world, this administration is obsessed with climate change? And, he refuses to admit the radical Islam is our enemy? It makes me wonder if he thinks that Syed Farook in English means "global warming."

It is clear that he is intent on regulating our Nation's economy and hurting its citizens instead of focusing on the immediate threat. You can't make this stuff up, Mr. Speaker. I guess you could say the threat he should be focused on is global swarming. He just doesn't seem to get it, Mr. Speaker.

The sad fact, Mr. Speaker, is even if every country abided by its greenhouse gas emissions reduction commitments, temperatures would continue increasing 2.7 to 3.7 degrees Celsius. Without these reductions, temperatures would increase 3.0 to 4.0 degrees Celsius. The difference is miniscule.

Mr. Speaker, there are no positive economic or environmental benefits to the President's unlawful regulatory actions. Instead, the administration's pledge to the U.N. threatens job creation and economic growth right here in the United States of America.

According to one independent analysis, the economic cost to Americans

will be approximately \$29 to \$39 billion each year. Electricity prices for consumers in 40 States could increase by at least 10 percent, or more. He has already been quoted during his campaign saying that under his administration, electricity prices would, by necessity, skyrocket. These are his words, not mine.

This represents nothing less than a war, Mr. Speaker, on low-income families, and would further increase economic inequality.

Mr. Speaker, our country is in a crisis. Instead of its foolhardy and unconstitutional plan to regulate our climate, this administration should be focusing on the livelihood and safety of this Nation and Americans.

It is no secret that there are people around the world who hate the United States and wish to see its demise. There are attacks being planned and plotted even as we speak, Mr. Speaker. Yet this administration claims that that threat is contained and global warming is our main threat. Tell that to the 14 people who were tragically murdered while celebrating Christmas in San Bernardino.

That is how I see it here in America, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. ROTHFUS. I thank my colleague.

I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO).

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for doing this very important Special Order. I commend Mr. ROTHFUS and Mr. KELLY for doing this.

I have got several things I would like to talk about. The first thing is that 190 countries are meeting in Paris to negotiate a new international agreement on climate change at the 21st session of the Conference of Parties.

According to the U.S. Special Envoy for Climate Change, President Obama intends to commit the U.S. to giving tens of billions of dollars per year to finance green energy initiatives in developing countries to reduce emissions by 26 to 28 percent below levels by 2025.

America, wake up. These tens of billions of dollars are coming out of your money. We have seniors that can't buy health insurance or pay their rent or insurance. We have seniors and other families that are suffering here in America. But yet, the President wants to commit tens of billions of our hard-working American taxpayers' money, and mine, too, to these other countries.

The Obama administration has indicated that the President does not intend to submit the Paris agreement to the Senate for its advice and consent as an article II treaty. This is a clear violation of the constitutional laws and ideals of America, and it will not be tolerated. We will hold him accountable.

The lack of progress becomes even more apparent when you start looking at the country level. China, for its part, offered to reach peak carbon dioxide emissions around 2030, while reducing emissions per unit of Gross Domes-

tic Product by 60 to 65 percent by that time from its 2005 levels. But the U.S. Government's Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory has already predicted China's emissions would peak on their own around 2030, even without climate change initiatives. So they don't have any skin in the game.

A Bloomberg analysis found that China's 60 to 65 percent target is less ambitious than the level it would reach by continuing business as usual. All this came before the country admitted it was burning 17 percent more coal than previously estimated. That is more coal than the entire country of Germany.

So, our government, our President, and this administration want to bind America to a United Nations treaty.

And let's look at the facts. America has been blessed with an abundance of energy sources. We should utilize all those sources to the best of our ability—from coal, petroleum, natural gas, solar, wind, hydro electric, and even manmade nuclear energy. We should use those to the best of our and society's advantage.

□ 1845

We should not cripple the American power companies that supply energy to the manufacturers of America that employ the American citizens at the whim of an administration's green agenda and is paid for on the backs of hard-working American citizens in the way of lost jobs that go overseas because of higher regulations and energy costs, decreased wages because of a decrease in competition in the job market, higher energy costs felt by all of our citizens, but more on the lower end, as has been mentioned here, on the economic income scale because a higher percentage of their money goes to pay their utility bills.

Look at the facts. Geologists think the world may be frozen up again, 1895.

Disappearing glaciers—disappearing glaciers—slowly with a persistence that means there is going to be complete annihilation. That is in 1902.

Professor Schmidt warns us of an encroaching new ice age, 1912.

Scientists say Arctic ice will wipe out Canada, 1923.

The discoveries of changes in the Sun's heat and the southward advances of glaciers in recent years have given rise to the conjectures of the possible advent of a new ice age, 1923 again.

Most geologists think the world is growing warmer and that it will continue to get warmer, 1929.

The point of this is the consensus of scientists has been wrong over the course of the years. If you look at recent facts, that 2-degree Centigrade benchmark that the scientific community says we can't get warmer than 2 degrees or life on Earth is going to stop to exist as we know it, that is not a scientific number. That is an arbitrary number. I did the research on it.

That number comes from an economist in 1970 that the environmental

community has gravitated to. They have used that as a benchmark, and it is a fallacy.

The Earth's temperature has increased approximately one-half of a degree Centigrade over the past 20 to 30 years. This comes from the NASA Web site. I encourage the American people that are watching this to go to the NASA Web site. Look at the facts.

Also look at that half-a-degree Centigrade increase in our temperature in the world. It partly is attributed to the new way they are measuring things today. They are more accurate than they were 20 or 30 years ago. So that is a variation.

The other thing is they predict and they estimate that over 50 percent of that half-a-degree Centigrade increase—over 50 percent of that—comes from solar activity, not manmade or anthropogenic causes.

So what does that mean? That means do we just not really even look at the causes of these? No. Not at all.

Let's look at the facts. Even in left-leaning publications—in fact, I brought one here. I don't want to call them left-leaning, but the article in *The Economist* has a 14-page "Clear thinking needed" on climate change.

Even in this article they had some fallacies. One of them was saying the warming in the world is 100 percent by human activity. That is a fallacy. That is false reporting.

The other thing is they go in there and they say that, with all the wind power that we have put into the world, around the globe, and all the solar activity around the globe, and the massive government programs to supplement these, it has failed to make a dent in the so-called manmade CO₂ output on a global scale, and it is not reliable.

All those other forms of energy, the renewables, they are not reliable for baseline production, which is needed for national security.

As I close, I just want to say this: As I said, America has been blessed with an abundance of energy sources. So let us, as leaders of this great Nation, make energy policies that are common sense in nature and don't entangle us, as a Nation, with other nations that cripple us as a Nation not just economically, but they weaken our national security, and they are going to be paid for by all Americans and, again, felt mostly by those that can't afford it.

This treaty is a bad deal, and the President owes the respect to the American people to go through the people's House and the Senate to have any agreement binding.

I thank my colleague from Pennsylvania, and I ask him to continue the good work.

Mr. ROTHFUS. I thank the gentleman from Florida for his remarks.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I would like to just talk about this word denial that we hear thrown around a lot in this debate. There has been no denial, Mr.

Speaker, of the benefits that humanity has enjoyed because of fossil fuel use over the last decades.

Again, I am going to pull up this chart here. The benefits are clear. The lower left graph is GDP per person in the world. It has skyrocketed, coincidentally, with the increase of energy use.

But life expectancy has skyrocketed over the last 200 years, again, coincident with increased energy use, access to reliable, clean energy.

It is no wonder. You consider how energy is deployed. Take water, for example. The tremendous progress that we have made with clean water and pumping stations and ways to pull water in and to clean it, that is all done using fossil fuel-based energy, whether it is coal, gas, oil. There has been a tremendous success over the last 200 years as humanity has looked for energy and used fossil fuels-based energy products.

Mr. Speaker, if President Obama and the unelected Federal bureaucrats at EPA had installed today's regulatory regime in the 19th century, my district and this country would look vastly different.

Access to reliable, affordable energy has improved the quality of life of people wherever it is available, which is why the Clean Power Plan is so deeply misguided.

It will also raise energy prices again by \$289 billion through 2030, fulfilling a promise that the President made in 2008 when he said electricity rates would necessarily skyrocket.

But minority communities will be especially hard-hit. Again, a study from the National Black Chamber of Commerce found that the Clean Power Plan would increase poverty among African Americans by 22 percent and Hispanics by 26 percent. This is not acceptable.

In addition, the President's energy agenda constrains our energy mix and distorts the market to benefit certain politically favored technologies, regulations that reduce Americans' access to reliable, affordable energy sources, endangers our grid stability, putting millions at risk of losing power during times of peak demand.

Meanwhile, the Clean Power Plan will avert only two one-hundredths of a degree Celsius of warming over the next 85 years. That is less than 2 percent of 1 degree Celsius. It is not a fair tradeoff.

American energy policy should promote economic growth and prosperity so that we can tackle our debt. This is such an important point, Mr. Speaker.

When we have these debates and conversations about whether it is going on in Paris, whether it is going on in Congress, and we talk about American energy and coal and gas, nuclear, other forms, it is not all pain, the pain that those who are running around and saying the sky is falling, the sky is falling. Time and again, their predictions have been proved false.

It is undeniable, Mr. Speaker, that access to affordable, reliable energy

has greatly advanced humanity. And humanity can figure it out. We have made tremendous, tremendous progress with the environment over the last 50, 60 years.

Certainly we have seen that in Western Pennsylvania, and that progress is going to continue. It continues, in part, because we have access to great, reliable, abundant, cheap electricity. Fossil fuels have enabled that progress and will continue to enable that progress.

As we meet the challenges of a changing climate, Mr. Speaker, it is human ingenuity that is going to pull us through, human beings, persons, empowered to live lives freely.

Look what Holland has been able to do with the sea over the last 400 years. Before the advent of all the huge machines that can move dirt around, they have been holding back the sea and building levees and dikes. It has been remarkable what the people of Holland have been able to do, even more so now that we have access to the technologies that we have.

Mr. Speaker, we should be leading the world in heavy technology, as we address concerns with rising sea levels.

There is no reason, Mr. Speaker, to doubt the capacity of the human person and human ingenuity to overcome these challenges that may face us. But we can't be in denial about the fact that fossil fuel energy has been a tremendous boon to humanity.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, we have tremendous challenges—tremendous challenges—ahead in the coming years. We are \$18 trillion in debt as a Nation, and we have tens of trillions of dollars in unfunded liability.

We need to be growing like you have never seen before. With access to cheap, reliable energy, we will be able to pull ourselves out of debt. We will begin to have that renaissance in our economy.

We have to meet those challenges we have. But if we expect to meet those challenges, if we expect to meet the commitments we have made on Social Security for Grandpa and Medicare and meet the commitments we have made to our veterans, tens of thousands who have sustained life-changing injuries over the last 14 years, we need to be growing again.

A key access to that growth is to have access to abundant, reliable, cheap energy. We know what it has done historically: increasing incomes, lifting people out of poverty, increasing life expectancy, increasing food production, increasing water purity.

Mr. Speaker, this is a success story that needs to be told.

I yield back the balance of my time.

OUR FIRST OPPORTUNITY TO MOVE TO PROTECT AMERICANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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, I don't propose to take an hour, but I do propose to bring a very important issue before the House and before the American people. Today we had our first opportunity to really move to protect Americans.

Presently, if you are on the no-fly list, which is not easy to get on—there has to be some very specific reason why you could be a threat to American citizens, to the airplane on which you might be traveling, or you might be entering this country for some nefarious reason, like terrorism.

But if you are on the no-fly list and you do happen to be in America, you can go to a gun store or to perhaps any fairground where there is a gun show and you can buy a weapon, virtually any gun, an assault weapon, a handgun, a shotgun.

And the question arises: If you are too dangerous to fly, are you not too dangerous to buy a gun?

But, under American law today, you can, indeed, be too dangerous to fly. You could be a threat to the other passengers or to a tower, to an airplane. But, apparently, you are not a threat to buy a gun.

In fact, there are some 16,000 people, a very small portion of the American citizenry, that are on the no-fly list. Since 9/11 in 2001, more than 2,000 men, probably women, who are too dangerous to fly on the no-fly list have been able to purchase guns here in the United States.

So let's see if we get this straight. You have been designated by the Department of Homeland Security and the various Federal Government agencies—TSA, FBI, quite possibly the CIA, and others—as being a threat to the security and safety of America and Americans, and you are put on a no-fly list, meaning you can't get on an airplane.

□ 1900

You are not able to buy a ticket, you are not able to travel, and yet you find some way to go down to the local gun store in those States that do not have background checks or maybe a gun show where there are no background checks, you present yourself and say: "Oh, that is a pretty good-looking AR-14. I'd like to have it."

"Sure, you got the money?"

"I got the money."

"Here is the gun."

This makes no sense whatsoever. Somehow I think the American public gets this. If you are too dangerous to fly, then you are too dangerous to be able to buy a gun in America. It is that simple. There ought to be a law, but there is no law.

Here in the House of Representatives, many of us have been trying for, actually, several years to deal with this crazy loophole in our gun safety laws; yet we have been unable to have a bill come to the House floor where 435 of us

that represent all of the American citizens will have an opportunity to vote on whether we believe that, if you are too dangerous to fly, you are too dangerous to buy a gun.

So today my fellow Democratic representatives and I—about 135 of us thus far—have signed what is known as a discharge petition so that a bipartisan piece of legislation introduced by Representative KING of New York, who is a Republican, could be brought to the floor and all of us face the responsibility of selecting whose side do we stand on. Do we stand for the safety of Americans and prevent people that are too dangerous to fly from being able to buy a gun, or do we stand with those on the no-fly list that are presumably dangerous and say: “Oh, yeah, you ought to be able to buy a gun even though you are too dangerous to fly”?

Now, for my American friends out there, all of you, voters and nonvoters, don't you think it is time for your Representatives, 435 of us, to stand before you in this House and say: “We agree that if you are too dangerous to fly, then you are too dangerous to buy a gun, and you cannot buy a gun,” or stand here before all the American public and say: “No, no, no. If you are too dangerous to fly, go ahead and buy a gun”?

So, Mr. Speaker, that is what a discharge petition will do. It will take our Republican friend's bill, Mr. KING of New York, bring it to the floor and put the issue before your Representatives, before the representatives of the American people, and cause us to make a choice for your safety or for the presumed right of a person who is too dangerous to fly to be able to buy a gun. It is pretty simple stuff. We will see what happens.

That issue is now bubbling around here on the floor. Today there were four motions to adjourn, which is a way of disrupting the normal procedures of the House—which are terribly abnormal to begin with—and causing the attention of the membership of the House and the press from the press box, or wherever they happen to be, to focus on this one—one—issue: whether those 16,000 or so people that are on the no-fly list can also go out and buy a gun. Two thousand already have.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, we ought to quickly discuss this issue of, well, there is a constitutional issue here, an issue in which these people are on a list but they have no ability to get off—no. Not so. Not so. When the no-fly list was first put together following 9/11, the issue was raised of the constitutionality of it by the American Civil Liberties Organization. It went to a Federal court, and the Federal court said: No, we disagree with you. We believe this is a constitutionally authorized protection of the American public, and there is a procedure for an individual to petition to get off the list. So this issue of constitutionality was decided some years ago by a Federal court.

So, Mr. Speaker, the arguments that you will undoubtedly hear here about this being, oh, an infringement of the constitutional right for an individual to buy a gun, no. This issue has already been resolved. If you are on the no-fly list and you think you shouldn't be there, you have got a procedure, a program underway and available to you to remove yourself from the no-fly list, and the court said it meets constitutional muster.

So, taking it a step further, we know a lot of Americans of certain classes that cannot buy a gun: criminals, convicted felons, people that in some States have been involved in domestic violence, and people that have exhibited mental health issues. Those people are barred in many cases from not being able to buy a gun. So we would add to that category people that our law enforcement agencies have deemed to be dangerous, quite possibly terrorists, or abiding and assisting terrorist organizations. If you can't fly, we just simply say that you can't buy a gun also—pretty simple.

My Republican colleague, Mr. KING, is correct. The issue is not resolved. The issue will be back before us tomorrow, the 9th day of December, for those of us that believe that if you are too dangerous to fly, you are too dangerous to buy a gun. Those of us that believe this to be the right policy will continue to push this issue for the safety of Americans.

Mr. Speaker, 16,000 people may not be able to buy a gun if this becomes law, and that is a good thing, because we know already 2,000 people that are on that no-fly list—actually, more than 2,000—have been able to buy a gun. What did they do with it? Well, maybe they went out and shot quail, or maybe—we pray not, but we don't know, do we?

So, Mr. Speaker, the issue is before us, as are many, many important issues, but I don't think there is any issue more important than the safety of the American people. We know that if somebody is thought to be dangerous, then they ought not have a gun.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this House will see the wisdom of taking a small step and denying some 16,000 people, many of whom are probably not even American citizens, the opportunity to buy a gun.

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

TERRORISM AND OUR RIGHT TO BEAR ARMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, there has been so much in the news, and our friends here on the floor have been raising questions about responsible, reasonable gun control. We want gun

control that does not violate the Second Amendment of the Constitution, the purpose of which is to allow citizens to protect themselves. It is not just for hunting, but to allow citizens to protect themselves.

The thing that I noticed, Mr. Speaker, in my decade as a judge, the criminals that came before me for crimes involving a gun, I can't remember any of them—I think I handled around 6,000 felony cases that went through our court. I can't remember any where they went down to a gun store and bought a gun. They stole them or they bought them from other criminals. With the 100 million guns that I understand have been purchased in recent years, it doesn't look like there will be any chance to remove guns from anyone except law-abiding citizens.

Mr. Speaker, it has been interesting. We inquired, my Republican friends, my colleagues here, we inquired over and over, and still 7 years after President Obama took office, we know that shortly thereafter there was a scheme hatched within his administration to sell guns to criminals that would get to Mexico and fall into the hands of drug cartels. They didn't adequately monitor them. There was nothing put on the guns so they could be traced exactly where they were going. We know one of them was used to kill one of our own government agents. So whether it was intentional, reckless disregard for an American Government agent's life who was working for the President to have one of the President's subsidiaries or employees provide guns in such a way that they would end up killing one American agent and, apparently, hundreds of Mexicans—and we don't even know the full extent because we can't get answers from this administration.

Eric Holder intentionally withheld evidence. He refused to provide information. I felt like he should have been impeached and thrown out of office. We never got answers about Fast and Furious, but we did see emails where, within this administration, even after they got caught, that this administration had facilitated weapons being provided and sold to people who would take them to the drug cartels of Mexico. Even after they got caught, they were still wondering if it might be possible to use the fact that these guns were being used to create violence to justify attacks on the Second Amendment and taking away Americans' gun rights.

Apparently, November was a huge month for the sale of guns; and apparently, Black Friday, in the past week, has been a record for—not a record, but just a massive number of guns being sold. I believe I saw there were 185,000 requests for gun purchases on Friday after Thanksgiving. Regardless of what the number was—that is not completely accurate—it is staggering. How many people are now in fear for themselves and their families because of the policies of this administration?

Now, because of Fast and Furious and how there were people in the administration that were contemplating the

sale of guns to drug cartels that this administration facilitated as a reason to have more gun control, it does make you question the motivation of some of the administration's policies. We know that, especially in the last 5 years of George W. Bush's Presidency, his administration was vigorously prosecuting gun violations. But in 7 years, this administration has never prosecuted as vigorously as the Bush administration did in those times. Then we find out that not only were they not prosecuting as vigorously as they did in those last 5 years of the Bush administration, but in recent years, they have been cutting back on the prosecution of gun violations.

So we find out that, in 2013, gun violation prosecutions by this administration diminished. Then we find out that in 2014, they diminished even further by this administration. Then we find out that in 2015, this administration set a record for the last 7 years of prosecuting fewer gun violation crimes than any administration—well, this was the lowest year, this year, any of his last 7 years.

So, Mr. Speaker, the administration, as they have increased the demand for more gun control to take guns away from law-abiding citizens, they have been decreasing the number of gun violations they have prosecuted. In the wake of this administration's involvement in *Fast and Furious* and trying to use it to promote more gun control on law-abiding citizens, it makes you wonder what is the reason this administration continues to prosecute fewer and fewer gun crimes?

□ 1915

It is as if this administration—and I am not saying, Mr. Parliamentarian, through the Speaker, I am not saying a specific person or the President. I am not violating the House rules. But I am saying this administration in bulk, which doesn't violate the House rules, somehow has had this policy of prosecuting fewer and fewer gun crimes at the same time they are increasing rhetoric to have more gun control. It is as if—and I am not alleging; I am just saying. It is as if they wanted gun violence to increase so that they could get more gun control, as it appears their motivation was in using what happened with gun violence as a result of the 2,000 weapons they forced gun dealers to sell to people they shouldn't have.

Well, when I first heard the proposal, gee, nobody who is on the no-fly list, can't even fly on a plane, should be able to go buy a gun, seemed reasonable. I was talking to my friend, TOM PRICE from Georgia, back here earlier, Mr. Speaker, and he said the same thing, well, that seems reasonable, until you start considering how one gets on the no-fly list, who has been on the no-fly list, the massive abuses of individual constitutional rights by this administration, the abuses of the IRS of law-abiding citizens that Richard Nixon could have only dreamed of

abusing the way this administration has.

But the trouble is there is no due process for someone to be adjudicated to put on the no-fly list. There is no due process to get off the no-fly list. And, in fact, one of the men I respect as much as anybody I know—he is a constituent; he is an Army veteran; he is a retired general, lives in east Texas—we have had to help him a number of times, once again, to get off the no-fly list.

And, unfortunately, we never can find out why he is ever put on the no-fly list in the first place. The only thing I know, he is a devout Christian. He is a supporter of mine. He would never knowingly violate the law of the United States.

So, I don't know. Is it because he is a supporter of mine? I mean, a year ago, I was trying to fly back from London and an official there in London airport with their security said: Sir, I understand you are very sorry, but your homeland security says you are somebody that has to be personally, physically searched along with everything that you have.

Gee, maybe somebody didn't like the way I cross-examined them in the judiciary hearing.

But when you know that this administration has abused its power repeatedly and you find out that actually the no-fly list is so obscure, it is like something from a Kafka novel. I never really enjoyed his novels. But the trial, it makes you think of, wow, you mean this obscure government entity can charge you with something, but you can't—just like in a trial, you can't find out what you are charged with. You can't find out why you are on the no-fly list. You can't find out if it is part of an enemies list. You can't find out what is the best way to convince the government to get you off.

Are there mistakes made? Well, gee, Mr. Speaker, could it be that a mistake was made when one of my constituent families from Lufkin was going to take their dream vacation to Disney World? They felt like the kids were old enough to enjoy it now. And when they tried to check their bags, they couldn't because, of their five children, their middle child was on the no-fly list. He was a potential terrorist.

Now, I come from a family of four kids, and if I was going to pick one of my siblings, including me, to be a terrorist, I would say it is probably the young one. Well, this child was 5 years old. He was the middle child, not the youngest. They pulled him aside thinking: Well, gee, his name is on the no-fly list. He must be a terrorist.

Well, thankfully, in Houston, they had some common sense and quickly figured out this is not a terrorist; this 5-year-old kid. He is not. Not so when they tried to leave Orlando to fly back home. He was pulled aside, the 5-year-old. He was separated from his parents. His parents were fit to be tied. They were threatened. They were not allowed to be with their child.

They take him off to interrogate him, a 5-year-old child; but he is on the no-fly list, and they couldn't figure this out. They think he is a terrorist. They ask him his date of birth. He is freaking out. He is separated from his parents and his other siblings. He knows the month and day. He can't tell them the year. So now they think he is withholding information.

They endured a lot of counseling and nightmares because of the abuses of this administration's policies. And yes, mistakes are made like that; and sometimes when people's names get put on the no-fly list, you don't know what it is for.

Here is an article, and I sure don't read from these folks very often, but the Los Angeles Times says:

“It seems simple enough: If the Federal Government, based on intelligence or policing, puts a person on its watch list of suspected terrorists or decrees that he or she is too dangerous to be allowed on an airplane, then surely it would also be foolish to let that person buy a firearm in the United States. Makes sense, doesn't it?”

That was the thrust of a proposed law by Senator DIANNE FEINSTEIN.

It goes on down:

“One problem is that the people on the no-fly list, as well as the broader terror watch list from which it is drawn, have not been convicted of doing anything wrong. They are merely suspected of having terror connections.”

I thought it was outrageous that Senator Ted Kennedy was on the no-fly list. I don't know. Maybe Homeland Security knew something the rest of America didn't know, but it seemed silly to me. Senator Ted Stevens, the late Senator's wife, Catherine Stevens, her name was on the no-fly list. She had those problems.

So it could be that you are guilty of only having a name similar to somebody that was put on the list for who knows why. But that is not a good way to take people's guns away, to say: Yes, we want to pass a law so that this administration, behind closed doors, with the lowest learners of this administration, can put people's name on the list that can never buy a gun, can never fly on a plane. That is a scary proposition.

And how about the 72 Department of Homeland Security employees that are on the no-fly list? And then we find out also, thanks to Senator JEFF SESSIONS, that we have had two—two—refugees in this country who, this year, have been either charged or convicted of terrorist activities. One worked around O'Hare airport and another one worked around here, I believe, as a cab driver working around Reagan airport. How about we take care of the people that we know for sure are a threat to America?

Anyway, the article from The Washington Times says: “According to the technology website TechDirt.com, 40 percent of those on the FBI's watch

list—about 280,000 people—are considered to have no affiliation with recognized terrorist groups. All it takes is for the government to declare it has 'reasonable suspicion' that someone could be a terrorist. There is no hard evidence required, and the standard is notoriously vague and elastic."

An article from Adam Kredo, from Free Beacon, about the 72 employees. A tip of the hat to Congressman STEPHEN LYNCH for finding that information.

This article from Neil Munro, Breitbart, "California Shooting Shows Jihad Risk From Muslim Migrants' U.S.-Born Children":

"The San Bernardino shooter who killed 14 Americans is yet another name on the growing list of U.S.-born children of Muslim migrants who grew up to embrace violent jihad."

It seems like somebody has talked about that before.

"Before Syed Rizwan Farook, the most notorious example was Anwar al Awlaki, born in New Mexico in 1971 to accomplished, professional-class Yemeni parents. He subsequently embraced the violent commandments of Islam, complete with its many calls for attacks on kaffirs, or non-Muslims. His career as a jihadi adviser, recruiter cheerleader ended when he was killed by a U.S. missile strike in Yemen in September 2011.

"Another example is Nidal Malik Hasan, the Virginia-born son of Arab migrants, who murdered 13 Americans in Fort Hood, Texas, in 2009. That attack was downplayed by Federal officials as 'workplace violence,' even though Hasan had described himself as a 'Soldier of Allah' on his U.S. Army business cards . . . The problem is worse among Muslims, because Muslim culture and religion is hostile to integration, Spencer says. 'Islamic law announces itself as a superior model for society and government so you've got no community-driven reason for Muslims to integrate or adopt American values, because their way is better,' he said."

Now, that is what Spencer says.

But I do know Muslims here in the United States that don't believe that they should adopt sharia law. I have got Muslim friends in Afghanistan and all over North Africa and the Middle East. They don't want radical Islam. And, in fact, in Egypt—so proud of the people of Egypt—they rose up and said: We don't want radical Islam. Of course, this President, this administration, wants to punish them for throwing out the Muslim Brother president.

But this article—back to Neil Munro's article—he says:

"In August 2015, the FBI arrested the U.S.-born son of a supposedly moderate Imam as he began his journey to join ISIS in Syria. Mohammad Oda Dakhalla was accompanied by his young, university-educated American wife, who was a convert to Islam. "That is the quintessential example of the risks involved because the father is supposed to be a moderate and we're

supposed to think the son subscribes to a violent Islam completely different from the father . . . but there is no evidence of a rift between father and son," Spencer said.

"In October 2014, two U.S.-born teenage girls were nabbed by the FBI as they began their journey to Syria.

"The left-wing Southern Poverty Law Center lists at least five additional U.S.-born jihadis, or would-be jihadis, at its site, including James Elshafay who tried to detonate a bomb in 2004, Ehsanul Sadequee, Tarek Mehanna, Walli Mujahid—his family name comes from the Arab term for 'Holy Warrior'—and Naser Jason Abdo, who planned to attack Fort Hood in 2011."

So I also would like a tip of the hat, Mr. Speaker, to Secretary Jeh Johnson that went back out to the All Dulles Area Muslim Society, ADAMS for short. I am sure John Adams appreciates that very much. I don't know if the President's friend, Imam Magid—oh, wait. Let's see. Well, this article mentions him.

"One of the 'most meaningful discussions' on his 'tour'—talking about Jeh Johnson—"he called it, was in June with the ADAMS Center imam, which began with a Boy Scout Troop leading meeting participants in the Pledge of Allegiance. That imam, Mohamed Magid, is a past president of the Islamic Society of North America, an organization linked to the Holy Land Foundation in its terror-financing trial and to the Muslim Brotherhood."

And, by the way, it was listed as a co-conspirator in the Holy Land Foundation trial for supporting terrorism. And once they got the convictions of the five main people being prosecuted, ISNA, CAIR, and some other folks tried to get their names withdrawn from the pleadings being specifically named as co-conspirators in support of terrorism. But the Federal district judge and also the U.S. Federal Court of Appeals, Fifth Circuit, said: No, there is plenty of evidence to support that you are co-conspirators in supporting terrorism.

□ 1930

I was told by a lawyer that the plan was, once they got those first five convictions, they would go after ISNA, Imam Magid, and all of these other people. Fortunately, for Imam Magid and ISNA and CAIR and all of these groups, President Obama got elected, and Eric Holder immediately made clear that nobody was going to prosecute the rest of those named co-conspirators in supporting terrorism.

There was also a headline in the news today from The Washington Times that reads: "Huma Abedin taunts Donald Trump: 'I'm a proud Muslim.'"

"Huma Abedin, the longtime confidant to Democratic Presidential front runner Hillary Clinton, took aim at Donald Trump's proposal to ban Muslims from entering the United States in an email with the subject line: 'I'm a proud Muslim.'

"'Donald Trump is leading in every national poll to be the Republican nominee for President; and earlier today, he released his latest policy proposal: to ban all Muslims from entering our country,' wrote Ms. Abedin—"or Ms. Weiner, anyway"—in an email Monday evening to Mrs. Clinton's supporters. 'I'm a proud Muslim, but you don't have to share my faith to share my disgust. Trump wants to literally write racism into our law books. His Islamophobia doesn't reflect our Nation's values.'"

Here is an article from July 27, 2012, by Andrew McCarthy in which he talks about Senator JOHN MCCAIN's claim that concerns about Huma Abedin are smear-based on a few unspecified, unsubstantiated associations.

Actually, Michele Bachmann and I and three others signed letters in which we just said, Here are some things we know. Would you do an investigation to see the extent of the Muslim Brotherhood's influence in your department? There were five different departments that had five different specific letters, and there were not any vague allegations. We just said, We know these things are true. Would you investigate?

We come to find out a lot in this article, which reads:

"The letter averred that Abedin 'has three family members: her late father, her mother, and her brother, connected to Muslim Brotherhood operatives and/or organizations.'

"It turns out, however, that Abedin, herself, is directly connected to Abdullah Omar Naseef, a major Muslim Brotherhood figure."

By the way, Mr. Speaker, the Muslim Brotherhood has been named as a terrorist organization by both Egypt and the UAE. They have asked officials in both of those countries when I have been over there: Why do you not recognize that the Muslim Brotherhood has been at war with you since 1979? You keep helping them. You have got people advising the President. They are all Muslim Brothers. Why do you keep doing that? I don't have an answer for them.

The article goes on:

"It turns out Abedin, herself, is directly connected to Abdullah Omar Naseef, a major Muslim Brotherhood figure involved in the financing of al Qaeda. Abedin worked for a number of years at the Institute for Muslim Minority Affairs as assistant editor of its journal. The IMMA was founded by Naseef, who remained active in it for decades, overlapping for several years with Abedin. Naseef was also secretary general of the Muslim World League in Saudi Arabia, perhaps the most significant Muslim Brotherhood organization in the world. In that connection, he founded the Rabita Trust, which is formally designated as a foreign terrorist organization under American law due to its support of al Qaeda.

"You ought to be able to stop right there," but he doesn't. It goes on. Further down, it reads:

“In this instance, however, before you even start probing the extensive, disturbing Brotherhood ties of her family members, Huma Abedin should have been ineligible for any significant government position based on her own personal and longstanding connection to Naseef’s organization.

“Specifically, Ms. Abedin was affiliated with the Institute of Muslim Minority Affairs, where she was assistant editor of the Journal of Muslim Minority Affairs. The journal was the IMMA’s *raison d’être*. Abedin held the position of assistant editor from 1996 through 2008, from when she began working as an intern in the Clinton White House until shortly before she took her current position as Secretary of State Hillary Clinton’s Deputy Chief of Staff.”

Again, this article was written in 2012.

“The IMMA was founded in the late 1970s by Abdullah Omar Naseef, who was then the vice president of the prestigious King Abdulaziz University in Saudi Arabia.”

It goes on to talk about all of his ties with civilization jihad and with the Muslim World League, over which he presided and with whom Huma Abedin had this relationship in this publication for all of those years that she worked with Hillary Clinton.

“The Muslim World League manages the ‘civilization jihad’—the Brotherhood’s commitment to destroy the West from within and to ‘conquer’ it by sharia proselytism, or *dawa*, as Sheikh Yusuf Qaradawi, the Brotherhood’s top sharia jurist, puts it.

“Nevertheless, the Muslim World League has a long history of deep involvement in violent jihad as well.”

Then we have this article today: “‘Spinning up as we speak’: Email shows Pentagon was ready to roll as Benghazi attack occurred.”

We still don’t know who stopped the military. The email shows they were ready to go help our people in Benghazi. Somebody stopped them. Was that advice Huma Abedin gave to Secretary Clinton? We don’t know. Was this advice that reached the President? We don’t know. We don’t know whether he went to bed and said, “You take care of it,” or whether he went next-door, like was reported, until Osama bin Laden was taken out. He went in the next room and didn’t watch and played cards. We don’t know what they were doing.

This report from Robert Windrem: “The ISIS Trail of Death” goes on to point out all that ISIS is doing. We know there are 1,000 cases being investigated right here.

Look, I am not advocating we get rid of all Muslims in the United States, we have got Muslim friends here in the House, but we do need to take a look to see whether people want to replace our U.S. Constitution with sharia law. We need to take a harder look at who we allow to come into this country and have a child who they will take back to

Yemen, or wherever, to teach their child to hate America.

People can make fun of me still, but we know Americans have died because we have allowed this to happen. They come back as American citizens whenever they want, and it gets so bad that even President Obama has to take out an American citizen, who was born here, to parents who trained him to hate America after they went back to Yemen.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today until 4:30 p.m. on account of medical reasons.

Mr. LEWIS (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o’clock and 37 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, December 9, 2015, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker’s table and referred as follows:

3694. A letter from the General Counsel, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation’s final rule — Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Paying Benefits received December 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

3695. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department’s Major final rule — Current Good Manufacturing Practice, Hazard Analysis, and Risk-Based Preventive Controls for Human Food; Clarification of Compliance Date for Certain Food Establishments [Docket No.: FDA-2011-N-0920] (RIN: 0910-AG36) received December 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3696. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department’s Major final rule — Accreditation of Third-Party Certification Bodies To Conduct Food Safety Audits and To Issue Certifications [Docket No.: FDA-2011-N-0146] (RIN: 0910-AG66) received December 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3697. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department’s Major final rule —

Foreign Supplier Verification Programs for Importers of Food for Humans and Animals [Docket No.: FDA-2011-N-0143] (RIN: 0910-AG64) received December 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3698. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department’s Major final rule — Standards for the Growing, Harvesting, Packing, and Holding of Produce for Human Consumption [Docket No.: FDA-2011-N-0921] (RIN: 0910-AG35) received December 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3699. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Air Plan Approval and Air Quality Designation; SC; Redesignation of the Charlotte-Rock Hill, 2008 8-Hour Ozone Nonattainment Area to Attainment [EPA-R04-OAR-2015-0298; FRL-9939-66-Region 4] received December 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3700. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s direct final rule — Air Plan Approval; Minnesota; Transportation Conformity Procedures [EPA-R05-2015-0563; FRL-9939-80-Region 5] received December 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3701. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Air Plan Approval; Wisconsin; Wisconsin State Board Requirements [EPA-R05-OAR-2015-0464; FRL-9939-78-Region 5] received December 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3702. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Polyamide ester polymers; Tolerance Exemption [EPA-HQ-OPP-2015-0451; FRL-9939-28] received December 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3703. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s Major final rule — Renewable Fuel Standard Program: Standards for 2014, 2015, and 2016 and Biomass-Based Diesel Volume for 2017 [EPA-HQ-OAR-2015-0111; FRL-9939-72-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AS22) received December 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3704. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Wisconsin; Disapproval of Infrastructure SIP with respect to oxides of nitrogen as a precursor to ozone provisions for the 2006 PM2.5 NAAQS [EPA-R05-OAR-2009-0805; FRL-9939-77-Region 5] received December 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3705. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting a notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of

Turkey, Transmittal No. 14-01, pursuant to Sec. 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, and certification, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2373(d); Public Law 87-195, Sec. 620C(d); (92 Stat. 739); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3706. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, Transmittal No.: DDTC 15-092, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c)(2)(C); Public Law 90-629, Sec. 36(c) (as added by Public Law 94-329, Sec. 211(a)); (82 Stat. 1326); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3707. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, Transmittal No.: DDTC 15-106, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c)(2)(A); Public Law 90-629, Sec. 36(c) (as added by Public Law 104-164, Sec. 141(c)); (110 Stat. 1431); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3708. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, Transmittal No.: DDTC 15-060, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c)(2)(C); Public Law 90-629, Sec. 36(c) (as added by Public Law 94-329, Sec. 211(a)); (82 Stat. 1326); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3709. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, Transmittal No.: DDTC 15-049, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c)(2)(C); Public Law 90-629, Sec. 36(c) (as added by Public Law 94-329, Sec. 211(a)); (82 Stat. 1326); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3710. A letter from the Assistant Legal Advisor, Office of Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting agreements prepared by the Department of State concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States, to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(d) Public Law 92-403, Sec. 1; (86 Stat. 619); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3711. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's correcting amendments — Wassenaar Arrangement 2014 Plenary Agreements Implementation and Country Policy Amendments; Correction [Docket No.: 150304217-5727-02] (RIN: 0694-AG44) received December 3, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3712. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting a notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer and Acceptance to India, Transmittal No. 0B-16, pursuant to Sec. 36(b)(5)(C) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3713. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Agency for International Development, transmitting the Agency's Semiannual Report to the Congress for the period ending September 30, 2015, 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.

3714. A letter from the Federal Co-Chair, Appalachian Regional Commission, transmitting the Commission's semiannual report for the period April 1, 2015, through September 30, 2015, 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.

3715. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's Semiannual Report to Congress on

Audit Follow-up for the period ending September 30, 2015, 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.

3716. A letter from the Assistant Director, Senior Executive Management Office, Department of the Army, transmitting a notification of a federal vacancy, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3717. A letter from the Assistant Director, Senior Executive Management Office, Department of the Army, transmitting a notification of a federal vacancy, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3718. A letter from the Director, Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting the Agency's Semiannual Report to Congress for the period ending September 30, 2015, 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.

3719. A letter from the Chairman and General Counsel, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting the Board's Semiannual Report for the period April 1, 2015, to September 30, 2015, 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.

3720. A letter from the Labor Member and Management Member, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the Board's Performance and Accountability Report for Fiscal Year 2015, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3515(a); Public Law 101-576, Sec. 303(a); (104 Stat. 2849); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3721. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's sixth annual report regarding compliance of federal departments and agencies with providing relevant information to the National Instant Criminal Background Check System, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 922 note; Public Law 103-159, Sec. 103(e)(1)(E) (as added by Public Law 110-180, Sec. 101(a)); (121 Stat. 2561) (121 Stat. 2561); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3722. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's 2014 Annual Report of the National Institute of Justice, pursuant to Public Law 90-351 and Public Law 107-296; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3723. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's Letter Report to Congress on the 2015 Fundamental Properties of Asphalts and Modified Asphalts — III, pursuant to Public Law 102-240, Sec. 6016(e); (105 Stat. 2183); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3724. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — IFR Altitudes; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31048; Amdt. No.: 523] received November 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3725. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney Division Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0787; Directorate Identifier 2015-NE-10-AD; Amendment 39-18307; AD 2015-22-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121,

Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3726. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Procurement, Office of Procurement, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — NASA Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: NASA Capitalization Threshold (NFS Case 2015-N004) (RIN: 2700-AE23) received December 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

3727. A letter from the Chief Impact Analyst, Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the General Counsel (02REG), Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards; Updating References (RIN: 2900-AP03) received December 3, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

3728. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Applicable Federal Rates — December 2015 (Rev. Rule. 2015-25) received December 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3729. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — 2016 Section 1274A CPI Adjustments (Rev. Rul. 2015-24) received December 3, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3730. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Safe harbor method of accounting for retail establishments and restaurants (Rev. Proc. 2015-56) received December 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3731. A letter from the Deputy Director, ODRM, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Medicaid Program; Mechanized Claims Processing and Information Retrieval Systems (90/10) [CMS-2392-F] (RIN: 0938-AS53) received December 3, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MCCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 3578. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to strengthen and make improvements to the Directorate of Science and Technology of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114-372). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 974. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to promulgate regulations to allow the use of hand-propelled vessels on certain rivers and streams that flow in and through certain Federal lands in Yellowstone National Park, Grand Teton National Park, the John D. Rockefeller, Jr. Memorial Parkway, and for other purposes;

with an amendment (Rept. 114-373). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1452. A bill to authorize Escambia County, Florida, to convey certain property that was formerly part of Santa Rosa Island National Monument and that was conveyed to Escambia County subject to restrictions on use and reconveyance (Rept. 114-374). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. NEWHOUSE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 556. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2130) to provide legal certainty to property owners along the Red River in Texas, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules (Rept. 114-375). Referred to the House Calendar.

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. TOM PRICE of Georgia (for himself, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. BLUM, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. KEATING, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina, Mr. HARPER, and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia):

H.R. 4185. A bill to make adjustments, including by amending title XVIII of the Social Security Act, relating to competitive bidding program and durable medical equipment under the Medicare program, to amend such title to establish a DMEPOS market pricing program demonstration project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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. DENT (for himself and Mr. ASHFORD):

H.R. 4186. A bill to add support of a foreign terrorist organization to the list of acts for which United States nationals would lose their nationality, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. RUSH, Mr. TONKO, Mr. WELCH, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. SARBANES, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD):

H.R. 4187. A bill to require certain entities who collect and maintain personal information of individuals to secure such information and to provide notice to such individuals in the case of a breach of security involving such information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HUNTER (for himself, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mr. DEFAZIO):

H.R. 4188. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal years 2016 and 2017, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. FINCHER (for himself and Mr. LUTKEMEYER):

H.R. 4189. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to require congressional approval of rescissions of determinations of countries as state sponsors of terrorism and waivers of prohibitions on assistance to state

sponsors of terrorism under that Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MATSUI:

H.R. 4190. A bill to promote innovation, investment, and economic growth by accelerating spectrum efficiency through a challenge prize competition; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. PLASKETT:

H.R. 4191. A bill to establish a program that enables college-bound residents of the United States Virgin Islands to have greater choices among institutions of higher education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. TIBERI (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. NEAL, and Mr. PAULSEN):

H.R. 4192. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the valuation rule applicable to the early termination of certain charitable remainder unitrusts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 4193. A bill to authorize the expansion of an existing hydroelectric project; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. FOX:

H. Res. 555. A resolution electing a Member to a certain standing committee of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut (for himself and Mr. COLE):

H. Res. 557. A resolution recognizing the establishment of the Congressional Patriot Award and congratulating the first award recipients, Sam Johnson and John Lewis, for their patriotism and selfless service to the country; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. DEGETTE (for herself, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. ASHFORD, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BERA, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. ESTY, Mr. FARR, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GALLEGU, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. GRAHAM, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KEATING, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KIND, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms.

LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MENG, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEAL, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PETERS, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RANGEL, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. LORRETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. SIREN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKAI, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TONKO, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. WALZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. HOYER, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. HANNA, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. COSTA):

H. Res. 558. A resolution condemning violence that targets healthcare for women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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. TOM PRICE of Georgia:

H.R. 4185.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Consistent with the understanding and interpretation of the Commerce Clause, Congress has the authority to enact this legislation in accordance with Clause 3 of Section 8, Article 1 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 4186.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 4187.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H.R. 4188.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 3 (to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and

among the several States, and with Indian Tribes) and Clause 14 (to make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces).

By Mr. FINCHER:

H.R. 4189.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8—To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations . . .

By Ms. MATSUI:

H.R. 4190.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. PLASKETT:

H.R. 4191.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 (General Welfare Clause)

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 (Necessary and Proper Clause)

By Mr. TIBERI:

H.R. 4192.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 4193.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 and Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 27: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.

H.R. 158: Mr. ROYCE, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. WOODALL, and Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana.

H.R. 213: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 224: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 225: Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 226: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 250: Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 353: Mr. DEFazio.

H.R. 358: Mr. DEFazio.

H.R. 393: Mr. ZELDIN.

H.R. 472: Mr. COOK.

H.R. 512: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 539: Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. YARMUTH, and Ms. PLASKETT.

H.R. 546: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 565: Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 592: Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, and Mr. BARTON.

H.R. 699: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.

H.R. 731: Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 759: Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 793: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.

H.R. 879: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. CRAMER, and Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 911: Mr. RYAN of Ohio and Mrs. LUMMIS.

H.R. 920: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 921: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana and Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 973: Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 1002: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 1076: Ms. MENG, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. SINEMA, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. POLIS, Mr.

SIRES, Mr. WELCH, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. TSONGAS, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. HAHN, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. LEE, Mr. LOEBACK, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. ASHFORD.

H.R. 1116: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. YODER, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.

H.R. 1197: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.

H.R. 1283: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.

H.R. 1453: Mr. WALDEN.

H.R. 1457: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.

H.R. 1475: Mr. MICA.

H.R. 1505: Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 1559: Mr. ASHFORD.

H.R. 1571: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 1586: Ms. ESTY.

H.R. 1608: Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. TONKO, Mr. WALDEN, and Mr. TAKAI.

H.R. 1655: Mr. CUELLAR and Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 1713: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 1733: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.

H.R. 1769: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 1786: Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. LUCAS.

H.R. 1814: Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 1818: Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 1854: Mr. CURBELO of Florida and Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 1893: Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 1901: Mr. SESSIONS and Mr. BABIN.

H.R. 2046: Mr. GRIFFITH.

H.R. 2050: Mr. LAHOOD.

H.R. 2191: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 2241: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 2264: Mr. CARNEY and Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.

H.R. 2287: Mr. MCHENRY.

H.R. 2311: Mr. LOEBACK.

H.R. 2315: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.

H.R. 2380: Mr. CROWLEY.

H.R. 2449: Ms. ESTY, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 2513: Mr. POMPEO.

H.R. 2515: Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 2521: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 2536: Mr. MCKINLEY.

H.R. 2540: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 2566: Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 2646: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania and Mr. LAHOOD.

H.R. 2649: Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 2680: Mr. RYAN of Ohio and Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 2698: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.

H.R. 2799: Mr. RULZ and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 2818: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 2847: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 2858: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.

H.R. 2880: Mr. SMITH of Washington and Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 2894: Mr. DEFazio.

H.R. 2896: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 2903: Mr. CLAY, Mrs. DINGELL, and Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 2908: Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. KIND.

H.R. 3036: Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. HANNA, Mr. LANCE, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 3051: Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 3099: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.

H.R. 3110: Mr. BYRNE.

H.R. 3119: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 3164: Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 3193: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 3222: Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. PALAZZO, and Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.

H.R. 3229: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. BLUM, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. LANCE, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mr. KING of Iowa.

H.R. 3237: Mr. GRUJALVA.

H.R. 3326: Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 3359: Miss RICE of New York.

H.R. 3406: Mr. CURBELO of Florida.

H.R. 3441: Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 3445: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 3455: Mr. CROWLEY and Mr. DOLD.

H.R. 3463: Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 3516: Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. GRIF-FITH, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. THORNBERRY.

H.R. 3532: Mr. ROKITA and Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 3551: Mr. GRAYSON.

H.R. 3556: Mrs. CAPPS.

H.R. 3565: Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 3654: Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. KEATING, Mr. ROSS, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, and Mr. BERA.

H.R. 3683: Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 3687: Ms. DUCKWORTH.

H.R. 3706: Mr. DENT, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 3734: Mr. BOST.

H.R. 3742: Mr. RIGELL, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. FORBES, Mr. LANCE, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 3750: Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 3760: Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 3766: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, and Mr. ROYCE.

H.R. 3770: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 3785: Ms. DELAURO and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 3790: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 3795: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 3852: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 3861: Mr. CRAWFORD.

H.R. 3872: Ms. LEE, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Ms. FUDGE.

H.R. 3917: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. SIRES, Mr. ROSS, and Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 3940: Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. LATTA, and Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.

H.R. 3943: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H.R. 3944: Mr. POCAN and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H.R. 3946: Mrs. LOVE.

H.R. 3978: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 4000: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 4007: Mr. LOUDERMILK.

H.R. 4008: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 4016: Mr. MCHENRY.

H.R. 4019: Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 4029: Mr. ASHFORD and Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 4032: Mr. YODER.

H.R. 4055: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 4063: Mr. POCAN, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. ASHFORD.

H.R. 4065: Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 4073: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 4076: Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 4084: Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 4085: Mr. RENACCI.

H.R. 4087: Mrs. DINGELL and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 4100: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 4113: Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 4122: Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 4135: Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. CARNEY, and Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 4141: Mrs. NOEM.

H.R. 4144: Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 4148: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 4154: Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 4171: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Ms. MENG.

H.R. 4180: Mr. MULVANEY.

H.J. Res. 33: Mr. BYRNE.

H.J. Res. 47: Mr. LOEBACK, Mr. MOULTON, and Mr. KENNEDY.

H.J. Res. 50: Mr. BRAT.
 H. Con. Res. 97: Mr. LUCAS, Mrs. HARTZLER, and Mr. PALAZZO.
 H. Con. Res. 98: Ms. FUDGE.
 H. Con. Res. 99: Mr. ADERHOLT and Mr. BOUSTANY.
 H. Res. 54: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.
 H. Res. 265: Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. POCAN, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.
 H. Res. 289: Mr. FATTAH.
 H. Res. 346: Mr. PITTENGER and Mr. MEADOWS.
 H. Res. 383: Ms. KAPTUR.
 H. Res. 469: Mr. SENSENBRENNER and Mr. NUGENT.

H. Res. 536: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. YOHO, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, and Mr. CASTRO of Texas.

H. Res. 541: Mr. KEATING.

H. Res. 549: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. PETERS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CARNEY, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H. Res. 551: Mr. DEUTCH and Mrs. WAGNER.

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. BISHOP OF UTAH

The amendment filed to H.R. 2130 by me does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of House rule XXI.