

So, in essence, if former Presidents want to ride off into the sunset and go fishing and enjoy the Utah sunsets, they can go do that. They will be very healthily compensated to lead that kind of lifestyle.

If they choose to go out and sell books and give speeches and do all those things, more power to them. If that is what they choose to do, they can go out and make that type of money. For some, they make millions of dollars doing so. At that point, I just don't think that the taxpayers should necessarily supplement their income. They don't need it at that point.

So we worked in a very good, bipartisan way with Ranking Member ELIJAH CUMMINGS from Maryland. We worked to do this together. We introduced this in a bipartisan way. I want our Members to know that, if this bill passes, it would save nearly \$10 million in the first 5 years.

In fiscal year 2015, Congress appropriated \$3.2 million for pensions, office staff, and related expenses for former Presidents. Of that amount, the General Services Administration made \$1.1 million in rental payments for office space.

The annual allowance provision under H.R. 1777 replaces the millions of dollars currently provided for travel, staff, and office expenses of former Presidents and ends an unnecessary government handout to former Presidents that decide to make millions after leaving office.

This bill does not affect the security or protection of former Presidents or family members of a former President. But, rather, H.R. 1777 brings an end to the American taxpayer subsidizing expenditures for former Presidents.

Unfortunately, both sides of the aisle recognize that, no matter who the President is, in this modern age, they are going to have security concerns the rest of their lives.

Under this bill, all of those expenses for the Secret Service and those type of expenditures will continue to be paid for, at no expense. No matter their income, it is a duty and obligation of the Federal Government to protect these former Presidents, and they will continue to do so.

The Presidential Allowance Modernization Act modernizes the Former Presidents Act while reducing unnecessary costs to the taxpayers.

Again, I want to thank Ranking Member CUMMINGS, who was an original cosponsor of this bill. I also want to thank Representative GROTHMAN from Wisconsin, who cosponsored and worked on this piece of legislation. I urge Members to vote in favor of this.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1777, the Presidential Allowance Modernization Act. I want to thank my good friends, Chairman CHAFFETZ and Ranking Member CUM-

MINGS of the Oversight Committee, for their work on this important update of Presidential legislation.

This is what this bill would do: It would update what has become an arcane law and reduce unnecessary costs to the taxpayer. The bill would amend the Former Presidents Act of 1958 to provide a \$200,000 annual pension for each former President and a \$100,000 annual survivor benefit to each surviving spouse. The pensions are indexed to inflation and would increase with the Social Security cost-of-living adjustment.

Currently, surviving spouses receive \$20,000—an interesting disparity between the spouse and the former President—and former Presidents receive a pension equal to the pay for Cabinet Secretaries, which for 2015 is \$203,700.

The bill would also provide an annual allowance of \$200,000 for costs associated with post-Presidential life. The annual allowance would replace amounts currently provided for travel, staff, and office expenses, which totaled \$3.25 million in fiscal year 2015 for the four living former Presidents.

The allowance would be reduced dollar for dollar for every dollar a former President earns in outside income in excess of \$400,000.

□ 1645

So, you see, there might be no Presidential pension if the President does what most Presidents have done, which is to almost not be able to help earning outside income.

Updating the allowance ends an unnecessary government handout to former Presidents making millions of dollars after leaving office. There is little reason why American taxpayers should be subsidizing these former Presidents when they are making a comfortable living on their own work.

This legislation would not affect the funding for the security and protection of former Presidents and their spouses, and that is an important provision, considering the world in which we live today.

Last, Mr. Speaker, I want to particularly thank my good friend, Chairman CHAFFETZ, for the amendment, my amendment to the bill in committee to eliminate the prohibition on preventing a former President or surviving spouse from receiving a pension during the period of time he or she holds office in the District of Columbia.

Imagine that. When this bill was written, it was a double-dipping bill, and they thought that some President would leave office and want to, somehow, seek work in the District of Columbia. Hardly, but I can understand that provision, and I thank the chairman that this double-dipping provision, he and I both find, is no longer necessary.

While this language may have made sense in 1958, that was before the District even had home rule. The District had no mayor or city council. It was

under the total dominance of the Federal Government.

Since then, of course, there have been changes that I am pleased to applaud, and the government of the District of Columbia pays for the pensions of its own employees, so the Federal Government isn't in it at all.

There is no reason the concern that a former President would receive both a pension and a salary from the Federal Government should still be a part of our law.

This is a good-government bill that makes fiscal sense by reducing taxpayer-funded costs. I certainly urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support H.R. 1777.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers. I urge its passage. I really and truly enjoyed working with Members on both sides of the aisle to get this through and urge its adoption.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers.

I want to thank the chairman. We are off to a good start in this second session of this Congress.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. 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 Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1777, 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.

#### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURTS, PUBLIC DEFENDER SERVICE, AND COURT SERVICES AND OFFENDER SUPERVISION AGENCY ACT OF 2015

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1629) to revise certain authorities of the District of Columbia courts, the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency for the District of Columbia, and the Public Defender Service for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 1629

*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 "District of Columbia Courts, Public Defender Service, and Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency Act of 2015".

#### SEC. 2. AUTHORITIES OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURTS.

(a) AUTHORIZATION TO COLLECT DEBTS AND ERRONEOUS PAYMENTS FROM EMPLOYEES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter II of chapter 17 of title 11, District of Columbia Official

Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

**“§ 11-1733. Collection, compromise, and waiver of employee debts and erroneous payments**

“(a) COLLECTION OF DEBTS AND ERRONEOUS PAYMENTS MADE TO EMPLOYEES.—

“(1) AUTHORITY TO COLLECT.—If the Executive Officer determines that an employee or former employee of the District of Columbia Courts is indebted to the District of Columbia Courts because of an erroneous payment made to or on behalf of the employee or former employee, or any other debt, the Executive Officer may collect the amount of the debt in accordance with this subsection.

“(2) TIMING OF COLLECTION.—The Executive Officer may collect a debt from an employee under this subsection in monthly installments or at officially established regular pay period intervals, by deduction in reasonable amounts from the current pay of the employee.

“(3) SOURCE OF DEDUCTIONS.—The Executive Officer may make a deduction under paragraph (2) from any wages, salary, compensation, remuneration for services, or other authorized pay, including incentive pay, back pay, and lump sum leave payments, but not including retirement pay.

“(4) LIMIT ON AMOUNT.—In making deductions under paragraph (2) with respect to an employee, the Executive Officer—

“(A) except as provided in subparagraph (B), may not deduct more than 20 percent of the disposable pay of the employee for any period; and

“(B) upon consent of the employee, may deduct more than 20 percent of the disposable pay of the employee for any period.

“(5) COLLECTIONS AFTER EMPLOYMENT.—If the employment of an employee ends before the Executive Officer completes the collection of the amount of the employee's debt under this subsection, deductions may be made—

“(A) from later non-periodic government payments of any nature due the former employee, except retirement pay; and

“(B) without regard to the limit under paragraph (4)(A).

“(b) NOTICE AND HEARING REQUIRED.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (3), prior to initiating any proceeding under subsection (a) to collect any debt from an individual, the Executive Officer shall provide the individual with—

“(A) written notice, not later than 30 days before the date on which the Executive Officer initiates the proceeding, that informs the individual of—

“(i) the nature and amount of the debt determined by the District of Columbia Courts to be due;

“(ii) the intention of the Courts to initiate a proceeding to collect the debt through deductions from pay; and

“(iii) an explanation of the rights of the individual under this section;

“(B) an opportunity to inspect and copy Court records relating to the debt;

“(C) an opportunity to enter into a written agreement with the Courts, under terms agreeable to the Executive Officer, to establish a schedule for the repayment of the debt; and

“(D) an opportunity for a hearing in accordance with paragraph (2) on the determination of the Courts—

“(i) concerning the existence or amount of the debt; and

“(ii) in the case of an individual whose repayment schedule is established other than by a written agreement under subparagraph (C), concerning the terms of the repayment schedule.

“(2) PROCEDURES FOR HEARINGS.—

“(A) AVAILABILITY OF HEARING UPON REQUEST.—Except as provided in paragraph (3), the Executive Officer shall provide a hearing under this paragraph if an individual, not later than 15 days after the date on which the individual receives a notice under paragraph (1)(A), and in accordance with any procedures that the Executive Officer prescribes, files a petition requesting the hearing.

“(B) BASIS FOR HEARING.—A hearing under this paragraph shall be on the written submissions unless the hearing officer determines that the existence or amount of the debt—

“(i) turns on an issue of credibility or veracity; or

“(ii) cannot be resolved by a review of the documentary evidence.

“(C) STAY OF COLLECTION PROCEEDINGS.—The timely filing of a petition for a hearing under subparagraph (A) shall stay the commencement of collection proceedings under this section.

“(D) INDEPENDENT OFFICER.—An independent hearing officer appointed in accordance with regulations promulgated under subsection (e) shall conduct a hearing under this paragraph.

“(E) DEADLINE FOR DECISION.—The hearing officer shall issue a final decision regarding the questions covered by the hearing at the earliest practicable date, and not later than 60 days after the date of the hearing.

“(3) EXCEPTION.—Paragraphs (1) and (2) shall not apply to a routine intra-Courts adjustment of pay that is attributable to a clerical or administrative error or delay in processing pay documents that occurred within the 4 pay periods preceding the adjustment or to any adjustment that amounts to not more than \$50, if at the time of the adjustment, or as soon thereafter as practical, the Executive Officer provides the individual—

“(A) written notice of the nature and amount of the adjustment; and

“(B) a point of contact for contesting the adjustment.

“(c) COMPROMISE.—

“(1) AUTHORITY TO COMPROMISE CLAIMS.—The Executive Officer may—

“(A) compromise a claim to collect a debt under this section if the amount involved is not more than \$100,000; and

“(B) suspend or end collection action on a claim described in subparagraph (A) if the Executive Officer determines that—

“(i) no person liable on the claim has the present or prospective ability to pay a significant amount of the claim; or

“(ii) the cost of collecting the claim is likely to be more than the amount recovered.

“(2) EFFECT OF COMPROMISE.—A compromise under this subsection shall be final and conclusive unless obtained by fraud, misrepresentation, presenting a false claim, or mutual mistake of fact.

“(3) NO LIABILITY OF OFFICIAL RESPONSIBLE FOR COMPROMISE.—An accountable official shall not be liable for an amount paid or for the value of property lost or damaged if the amount or value is not recovered because of a compromise under this subsection.

“(d) WAIVER OF CLAIM.—

“(1) AUTHORITY TO WAIVE CLAIMS.—Upon application from a person liable on a claim to collect a debt under this section, the Executive Officer may, with written justification, waive the claim if collection would be—

“(A) against equity;

“(B) against good conscience; and

“(C) not in the best interests of the District of Columbia Courts.

“(2) LIMITATIONS ON AUTHORITY.—The Executive Officer may not waive a claim under this subsection if the Executive Officer—

“(A) determines that there exists, in connection with the claim, an indication of fraud, misrepresentation, fault, or lack of good faith on the part of the employee, the former employee, or any other person that has an interest in obtaining a waiver of the claim; or

“(B) receives the application for waiver later than 3 years after the later of the date on which the erroneous payment was discovered or the date of enactment of this section, unless the claim involves money owed for Federal health benefits, Federal life insurance, or Federal retirement benefits.

“(3) DENIAL OF APPLICATION FOR WAIVER.—A decision by the Executive Officer to deny an application for a waiver under this subsection shall be the final administrative decision of the District government.

“(4) REFUND OF AMOUNTS ALREADY COLLECTED AGAINST CLAIM SUBSEQUENTLY WAIVED.—If the Executive Officer waives a claim against an employee or former employee under this section after the District of Columbia Courts have been reimbursed for the claim in whole or in part, the Executive Officer shall provide the employee or former employee a refund of the amount of the reimbursement upon application for the refund, if the Executive Officer receives the application not later than 2 years after the effective date of the waiver.

“(5) EFFECT ON ACCOUNTS OF COURTS.—In the audit and settlement of accounts of any accountable official, full credit shall be given for any amounts with respect to which collection by the District of Columbia Courts is waived under this subsection.

“(6) VALIDITY OF PAYMENTS.—An erroneous payment or debt, the collection of which is waived under this subsection, shall be a valid payment for all purposes.

“(7) NO EFFECT ON OTHER AUTHORITIES.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to affect the authority of the District of Columbia under any other statute to litigate, settle, compromise, or waive any claim of the District of Columbia.

“(e) REGULATIONS.—The authority of the Executive Officer under this section shall be subject to regulations promulgated by the Joint Committee.”.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subchapter II of chapter 17 of title 11, District of Columbia Official Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“11-1733. Collection, compromise, and waiver of employee debts and erroneous payments.”.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply with respect to any erroneous payment made or debt incurred before, on, or after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) AUTHORIZATION TO PURCHASE UNIFORMS FOR PERSONNEL.—Section 11-1742(b), District of Columbia Official Code, is amended by adding at the end the following: “In carrying out the authority under the preceding sentence, the Executive Officer may purchase uniforms to be worn by nonjudicial employees of the District of Columbia Courts whose responsibilities warrant the wearing of uniforms if the cost of furnishing a uniform to an employee during a year does not exceed the amount applicable for the year under section 5901(a)(1) of title 5, United States Code (relating to the uniform allowance for employees of the Government of the United States).”.

**SEC. 3. AUTHORITIES OF COURT SERVICES AND OFFENDER SUPERVISION AGENCY.**

(a) AUTHORITY TO DEVELOP AND OPERATE PROGRAMMATIC INCENTIVES FOR SENTENCED OFFENDERS.—Section 11233(b)(2)(F) of the National Capital Revitalization and Self-Government Improvement Act of 1997 (sec. 24-

133(b)(2)(F), D.C. Official Code) is amended by striking "sanctions" and inserting "sanctions and incentives".

(b) **PERMANENT AUTHORITY TO ACCEPT GIFTS.**—Section 11233(b)(3)(A) of the National Capital Revitalization and Self-Government Improvement Act of 1997 (sec. 24-133(b)(3)(A), D.C. Official Code) is amended to read as follows:

"(A) **AUTHORITY TO ACCEPT GIFTS.**—The Director may accept, solicit, and use on behalf of the Agency any monetary or nonmonetary gift, donation, bequest, or use of facilities, property, or services for the purpose of aiding or facilitating the work of the Agency."

(c) **PERMANENT AUTHORITY TO ACCEPT AND USE REIMBURSEMENTS FROM DISTRICT GOVERNMENT.**—Section 11233(b)(4) of such Act (sec. 24-133(b)(4)) is amended by striking "During fiscal years 2006 through 2008, the Director" and inserting "The Director".

#### **SEC. 4. AUTHORITIES OF PUBLIC DEFENDER SERVICE.**

(a) **ACCEPTANCE AND USE OF SERVICES OF VOLUNTEERS.**—Section 307(b) of the District of Columbia Court Reform and Criminal Procedure Act of 1970 (sec. 2-1607(b), D.C. Official Code) is amended by striking "the Service may accept public grants and private contributions made to assist it" and inserting "the Service may accept and use public grants, private contributions, and voluntary and uncompensated (gratuitous) services to assist it".

(b) **TREATMENT OF MEMBERS OF BOARD OF TRUSTEES AS EMPLOYEES OF SERVICE FOR PURPOSES OF LIABILITY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 303(d) of the District of Columbia Court Reform and Criminal Procedure Act of 1970 (sec. 2-1603(d), D.C. Official Code) is amended by striking "employees of the District of Columbia" and inserting "employees of the Service".

(2) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the District of Columbia Courts and Justice Technical Corrections Act of 1998 (Public Law 105-274; 112 Stat. 2419).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

#### **GENERAL LEAVE**

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, this is a bipartisan bill from the Senate that we are considering. Senator JOHNSON of Wisconsin has put forward this bill. It has cleared the Senate, we are happy to bring this up, but I would urge its adoption.

It is S. 1629, with a very long title to it: The District of Columbia Courts, Public Defender Service, and Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency Act of 2015. It just rolls off the tongue.

This bipartisan bill was introduced, as I said, by Senator RON JOHNSON of

Wisconsin, and it gives judicial officials in the District of Columbia the authority they need to make personnel and managerial decisions.

In 1997, Congress reorganized the District of Columbia judicial agencies, making them Federal agencies with Federal employees. This bill improves the efficiency and functions of the D.C. judicial branch by extending them authorities that are available to other Federal agencies.

S. 1629 allows the D.C. courts system to collect debts and erroneous payments made to employees through installment plans of reasonable amounts. Additionally, the courts will be able to provide uniforms to nonjudicial employees. This helps address safety concerns by giving these employees greater visibility in the courthouse and in the community.

Further, these reforms will allow the D.C. judicial offices to operate certain incentive programs, make use of the donations and contributions, and utilize unpaid volunteers. It brings sensible authorities to the District's judicial agencies that will allow these officers to increase efficiencies and conduct their work more effectively.

We had an opportunity to mark up this bill, and I appreciate the input of Ms. NORTON certainly, being from the District of Columbia. And we would urge its final passage here on the floor now.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

First, I need to thank Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee Chairman RON JOHNSON and Ranking Member TOM CARPER for sponsoring the District of Columbia Courts, Public Defender Service, and Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency Act, and for all their hard work in getting it passed in the Senate.

Thanks also are due to my good friend, the chairman of the Oversight Committee, JASON CHAFFETZ, and its Ranking Member, ELIJAH CUMMINGS, for bringing this bill to the floor and working so closely with us in the District of Columbia.

This bill may seem small, but its technical changes will improve the operations and effectiveness of three District of Columbia criminal justice agencies that are under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government, and they are under that jurisdiction because of the Revitalization Act, which took over the funding of certain District of Columbia agencies because they are State agencies, to improve the financial condition of the District of Columbia, which was the only city that carried State functions.

This bill gives these agencies some modest new authorities that are already available to comparable Federal agencies. The bill would authorize CSOSA to use incentives-based programs for offenders, instead of only sanctions to get compliance.

This is in keeping with modern penology. It would allow the Public Defender Service to accept and use public grants, voluntary and uncompensated services, such as unpaid law clerks and interns of the kind, for example, that we use here every day, and private contributions made to advance the Public Defender Service's work. It would allow the courts to collect debts owed to it by its employees.

These changes are small and they are noncontroversial, but they mean a great deal to the District of Columbia because they will modernize and improve the daily operations of the District's criminal justice system.

If I may say so while the chairman is on the floor, these small changes, somehow I hope our committee will find a way to allow the courts, themselves, to do so that we do not have to bring such small changes before this body, which has such important work.

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

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, this is a good bipartisan piece of legislation. It is common sense. We should pass it.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 1629.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### **GRANTS OVERSIGHT AND NEW EFFICIENCY ACT**

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1115) to close out expired grants.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 1115

*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 "Grants Oversight and New Efficiency Act" or the "GONE Act".

#### **SEC. 2. IDENTIFYING AND CLOSING OUT EXPIRED FEDERAL GRANT AWARDS.**

(a) **EXPIRED FEDERAL GRANT AWARD REPORT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall instruct the head of each agency, in coordination with the Secretary, to submit to Congress and the Secretary a report, not later than December 31 of the first calendar year beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act, that—

(A) lists each Federal grant award held by such agency;

(B) provides the total number of Federal grant awards, including the number of grants—

(i) by time period of expiration;

(ii) with zero dollar balances; and

(iii) with undisbursed balances;