

and local taxing authority, this bill reduces the ability of state and local governments to raise funds to invest in needed infrastructure, education, health care, job training, and other vital public services.

While a short-term ban is less troubling than a permanent ban, any ban remains problematic and harmful to state and local government finances. Ideally, the existing temporary ban should be allowed to expire as scheduled on September 30, 2015. As new internet-based technology and related applications increasingly affect our daily lives and rapidly transform our economy, we are extremely wary of a ban that is permanent. Congress should be extremely cautious before supporting a permanent tax exemption for internet access. Moreover, it would set harmful, inappropriate, and costly precedents that could spillover into other sectors of our economy.

Years ago, some opined the internet needed time to grow because it was weak, tiny, or immature. In contrast, today's internet is an enormously powerful driver of our economy, a central part of our daily lives, and an enormously valuable well developed industry. As the internet continues providing new transformative services to businesses and consumers, its importance to America's economy grows. Prohibiting these taxes would unfairly exempt this economic sector from contributing to our common well being and communities. In addition, this unneeded and undeserved carve out would unfairly shift its share of taxes to other services, sectors, and stakeholders. There is no reason to exempt internet providers and users from state and local government taxes.

Our labor unions urge you to oppose the "Permanent Internet Tax Freedom Act" (H.R. 235) and any similar ban on state and local government taxes on internet access.

American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL-CIO); American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME); American Federation of Teachers (AFT); Amalgamated Transit Union (ATU); Communications Workers of America (CWA); Department for Professional Employees, AFL-CIO (DPE); International Association of Fire Fighters (IAFF); International Federation of Professional and Technical Engineers (IFPTE); International Union of Police Associations (IUPA); National Education Association (NEA); Service Employees International Union (SEIU); International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace & Agricultural Implement Workers of America (UAW).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The last thing the American people need is another tax bill at their door come October. If the ban lapses, State telecommunications taxes could take effect, and those rates are already too high. Basic economics teaches that, as price rises, demand falls.

Former White House Chief Economist Austan Goolsbee estimated that a tax that increased the price of Internet access by 1 percent would reduce demand for Internet access by 2.75 percent. This bill ensures that access to the Internet—this unparalleled engine of social mobility—remains tax-free. That is why this bill is so overwhelmingly popular. Nevertheless, I believe it is proper to counter the criticisms of the small pockets of resistance that remain.

The opponents' chief argument is that the bill would cost the States \$6.5 billion annually. This argument confuses an out-of-pocket loss with prevention of a gain. States cannot currently tax Internet access, so they will suffer no actual revenue loss. The only out-of-pocket loss would be to taxpayers in 44 States who will owe an additional \$6.5 billion annually should it expire. They will have to pay taxes that they don't have to pay now.

Nevertheless, some of our colleagues would prefer to extend the moratorium temporarily rather than permanently. That is simply inefficient. The moratorium has been periodically renewed by enormous bipartisan margins in both Houses for 16 years. No serious expectations are being upset by codifying what everyone knows is the case: the moratorium is not going away.

The grandfathers will be eliminated, but that only affects six States that have had more than enough time to transition to other sources of revenue, which was the original intent of the grandfather clauses. If those States still need more time, I am open to working with the Senate on a final phaseout.

Opponents also argue that PITFA creates unequal treatment of similar services. The example given is landline phone service, which is taxable, versus Skype which, under PITFA, is accessible tax-free. But this happens because Skype's basic service is free; Skype's paid service is taxable. Indeed, PITFA specifically provides that Internet phone service is taxable.

More importantly, this neutrality argument conflates a service with the access to it.

The toll road on the way to the shopping mall is not the same as the sales tax paid at the mall. PITFA is neutral because Skype's paid service remains taxable, just like landline service.

True, there is no tax on Skype's basic service because it is free, but that is the function of Skype's revenue model, not a different tax treatment of the same service.

This legislation has enormous bipartisan support precisely because Members on both sides of the aisle already understand the flaws in these objections. I catalog them here merely to complete the record.

This is a great issue for the Congress to move forward on in a bipartisan fashion that will help to create jobs and economic growth and foster continued greater access to the unparalleled opportunities that Internet access provides. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

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. 235.

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.

FOREIGN CULTURAL EXCHANGE JURISDICTIONAL IMMUNITY CLARIFICATION ACT

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 889) to amend chapter 97 of title 28, United States Code, to clarify the exception to foreign sovereign immunity set forth in section 1605(a)(3) of such title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 889

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 Cultural Exchange Jurisdictional Immunity Clarification Act".

SEC. 2. CLARIFICATION OF JURISDICTIONAL IMMUNITY OF FOREIGN STATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1605 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(h) JURISDICTIONAL IMMUNITY FOR CERTAIN ART EXHIBITION ACTIVITIES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—If—

“(A) a work is imported into the United States from any foreign country pursuant to an agreement that provides for the temporary exhibition or display of such work entered into between a foreign state that is the owner or custodian of such work and the United States or one or more cultural or educational institutions within the United States,

“(B) the President, or the President's designee, has determined, in accordance with subsection (a) of Public Law 89-259 (22 U.S.C. 2459(a)), that such work is of cultural significance and the temporary exhibition or display of such work is in the national interest, and

“(C) the notice thereof has been published in accordance with subsection (a) of Public Law 89-259 (22 U.S.C. 2459(a)), any activity in the United States of such foreign state, or of any carrier, that is associated with the temporary exhibition or display of such work shall not be considered to be commercial activity by such foreign state for purposes of subsection (a)(3).

“(2) NAZI-ERA CLAIMS.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply in any case asserting jurisdiction under subsection (a)(3) in which rights in property taken in violation of international law are in issue within the meaning of that subsection and—

“(A) the property at issue is the work described in paragraph (1);

“(B) the action is based upon a claim that such work was taken in connection with the acts of a covered government during the covered period;

“(C) the court determines that the activity associated with the exhibition or display is commercial activity, as that term is defined in section 1603(d); and

“(D) a determination under subparagraph (C) is necessary for the court to exercise jurisdiction over the foreign state under subsection (a)(3).

“(3) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection—

“(A) the term ‘work’ means a work of art or other object of cultural significance;

“(B) the term ‘covered government’ means—

“(i) the Government of Germany during the covered period;

“(ii) any government in any area in Europe that was occupied by the military forces of the Government of Germany during the covered period;

“(iii) any government in Europe that was established with the assistance or cooperation of the Government of Germany during the covered period; and

“(iv) any government in Europe that was an ally of the Government of Germany during the covered period; and

“(C) the term ‘covered period’ means the period beginning on January 30, 1933, and ending on May 8, 1945.”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to any civil action commenced on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 889, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by thanking the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) for introducing this legislation and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) for their support as well.

The Foreign Cultural Exchange Jurisdictional Immunity Clarification Act strengthens the ability of U.S. museums and educational institutions to borrow foreign-government-owned artwork and cultural artifacts for temporary exhibition or display in the United States.

The United States has long recognized the importance of encouraging the cultural exchange of ideas through exhibitions of artworks and other artifacts loaned from other countries. These exchanges expose Americans to other cultures and foster understanding between people of different nationalities, languages, religions, and races.

Unfortunately, the future success of cultural exchanges is severely threatened by a disconnect between the Immunity from Seizure Act and the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act.

Loans of artwork and cultural objects depend on foreign lenders having confidence that the items they loan will be returned and that the loan will not open them up to lawsuits in U.S. courts.

For 40 years, the Immunity from Seizure Act provided foreign government lenders with this confidence. However, rulings in several recent Federal cases have undermined the protection provided by this law. In these decisions,

the Federal courts have held that the Immunity from Seizure Act does not preempt the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act. The effect has been to open foreign governments up to the jurisdiction of U.S. courts simply because they loaned artwork or cultural objects to an American museum or educational institution.

This has significantly impeded the ability of U.S. institutions to borrow foreign-government-owned items. It has also resulted in cultural exchanges being curtailed as foreign governments have become hesitant to permit their cultural property to travel to the United States.

This bill addresses this situation. It provides that if the State Department grants immunity to a loan of artwork or cultural objects from the Immunity from Seizure Act, then the loan cannot subject a foreign government to the jurisdiction of U.S. courts under the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act.

This is very narrow legislation. It only applies to one of many grounds for jurisdiction under the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act, and it requires the State Department to grant the artwork immunity before its provisions apply. Moreover, in order to preserve the claims of the victims of the Nazi government and its allies during World War II, the bill has an exception for claims brought by these victims.

If we want to encourage foreign governments to continue to lend artwork and other artifacts, we must enact this legislation. Without the protections this bill provides, foreign governments will avoid the risk of lending their cultural items to American museums and educational institutions, and the American public will lose the opportunity to view and appreciate these cultural objects from abroad.

Last Congress, this legislation passed the House with broad bipartisan support by a vote of 388-4. I, once again, urge my colleagues to support this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise in support of H.R. 889, the Foreign Cultural Exchange Jurisdictional Immunity Clarification Act.

This bill makes a modest but important amendment to the “expropriation exception” of the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act of 1976. Specifically, it ensures that foreign states are immune from suits for damages concerning the ownership of cultural property when three particularly important ingredients are present: one, that the property is in the United States pursuant to an agreement between the foreign state and the U.S. or a U.S.-based cultural or educational institution; two, the President has granted the work at issue immunity from seizure pursuant to the Immunity from Seizure Act; and three, that the President’s grant of immunity from seizure is published in the Federal Register. All three of those conditions must be met.

The expropriation exception remains available to all claims concerning misappropriated cultural property to

which these factual circumstances do not apply.

I would not support this bill if it did not contain a sufficient exception for claims arising from artwork stolen by the Nazis, their allies, and their affiliates.

H.R. 889 has such an exception, ensuring that victims of Nazi art theft continue to have the opportunity to pursue justice in court. This exception is appropriate and important in light of the sheer scale and the particularly concerted efforts of the Nazis to seize artwork and other cultural property from their victims.

A movie that was directed and starred in by George Clooney called “The Monuments Men” brought to America’s attention, really, the extreme depth to which the Nazis went to confiscate art, steal art, and try to keep it for their own uses and for the future of what they saw as a Nazi world.

□ 1715

In that film, American soldiers were shown in extreme danger to themselves in great heroic acts to locate and save that artwork for generations to come. In fact, those particular survivors will be given a Congressional Gold Medal for their work.

Another recent film, “Woman in Gold,” tells the story of Maria Altmann. It surrounds compensation for artwork stolen by the Nazis and has been highlighted recently in the theatres.

Mrs. Altmann’s effort to retrieve works by Gustav Klimt that the Nazis had taken from her uncle in Austria in the thirties led to an important Supreme Court decision that held that the expropriation exception applied to claims arising prior to the FSIA’s enactment in 1976, which allowed Nazi-era victims to file suit for damages in Federal court.

It is critical to note that the bill sponsors worked with the Conference on Jewish Material Claims Against Germany to revise the Nazi-era exception to ensure that it was broad enough to be a meaningful exception. As a result, the conference has stated, for itself and for the American Jewish community, that it will not oppose the bill.

I also note that all of the FSIA’s other exceptions to sovereign immunity remain available to potential plaintiffs with claims concerning the ownership of cultural property.

In particular, I note this bill does nothing to affect the attempts of Chabad to seek enforcement of its 2011 judgment against Russia, both because such judgment would predate the effective date of this bill and because it was not predicated on the loan of any artwork to the U.S., meaning this bill would not have any effect in that case even if it had been in effect in 2011.

To the extent it may be necessary, I would encourage consideration of adding clarifying language that this bill

does nothing to affect enforcement of an already entered judgment.

H.R. 89 is narrowly tailored to ensure that it provides for just enough immunity to encourage foreign states to lend their cultural property to American museums and universities, accordingly, then, to the American people, young people and older, for temporary exhibits and displays without protecting more than we intend to protect.

The bill ensures that works that have already been granted immunity from seizure by the President, pursuant to the Immunity from Seizure Act, are also immune from suits for damages, which is in keeping with the act's purpose in encouraging foreign countries to lend their works to American institutions without fear of litigation based on the act of lending these works.

In essence, if you believe in art, you like art, you think people should see art, and you like your museums, you ought to be for this bill. That is why I thank Representative STEVE CHABOT, Judiciary Committee Chairman BOB GOODLATTE, and Ranking Member JOHN CONYERS for their leadership on this issue and for allowing me to manage this time and be part of this initiative.

I would urge my colleagues to support the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), who is the chief sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by thanking Chairman GOODLATTE, Ranking Member CONYERS, and also Mr. COHEN of Tennessee for their leadership in cosponsoring this legislation.

As Mr. COHEN had mentioned earlier, he and I have found a number of pieces of legislation which we have been able to support together in a bipartisan manner, such as the Delta Queen, which we are still working on. I would like to think that we can look forward to other pieces of legislation down the road to work together on, again in a bipartisan manner. There is a lot better chance you can get things accomplished in this House if you do that. He has reached out, and I certainly appreciate that.

H.R. 889, which I authored, is simple, straightforward legislation that restores American museums the protections of the Immunities from Seizures Act and clarifies the relationship that that act and the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act share. This bill would revise existing law to clarify that the temporary importation of artwork is not legally considered commercial activity and assure foreign government lenders that if they are granted immunity from seizures, their loan of artwork and artifacts will not subject them to the jurisdiction of U.S. courts and lawsuits and disputes about that property, so that it is much more likely that they will allow their artifacts and artworks to come here and then be enjoyed by the American public.

Furthermore, it is important to note that the immunity provided under this bill does not apply to artwork taken in violation of international law, as was already mentioned by both Mr. GOODLATTE and Mr. COHEN, in particular, to those pieces of art seized during World War II by the Nazi government or by the Nazi government's allies or impact ongoing cases to get the Russians to return a collection of sacred Jewish books and manuscripts claimed by the Chabad movement.

By enacting the Immunity from Seizure Act, Congress recognized that cultural exchanges produce substantial benefits for the United States, both artistically and diplomatically. Foreign lending has and should continue to aid cultural understanding and increase public exposure to archeological artifacts.

However, for artwork and cultural objects owned by foreign governments, the intent of the Immunity from Seizure Act is being frustrated by the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act. Some interpretations of the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act have exposed foreign governments to the jurisdiction of U.S. courts based solely upon the temporary importation into the U.S. of foreign-government-owned artwork. According to the American Association of Museum Directors, this has led, on several occasions, to foreign governments declining to exchange artwork and cultural objects with the United States for temporary exhibits.

In a recent survey of 38 museums across the U.S., it was found that, over the past 5 years, these museums had 1,000 pieces denied to showcase here in the United States for very questionable reasons. These were works that museum curators reasonably believed would be loaned to their museum for special exhibits. Therefore, in order to continue the exchange of foreign-government-owned art and reaffirm our country's commitment to the promotion of foreign lending to American museums, Congress needs to clarify the relationship between the two acts I already referred to: the Immunity from Seizure Act and the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act. That is what this legislation does.

This is a relatively minor change to the law, but it will provide enormous cultural benefits by ensuring that museums, like the Cincinnati Museum Center and the Cincinnati Art Museum and other similar museums throughout the State of Ohio and across the country, may continue to present first-class exhibits that educate the public on cultural heritage and artwork from all over the globe. Through enactment of this legislation, we can secure foreign lending to American museums and ensure that foreign art lenders are not entangled in unnecessary litigation.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is supported by the Association of Art Museum Directors, which represents 240 museums, including the Smithsonian and several within my district and all across the country.

Last Congress, this body showed overwhelming support for this bill, and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation once again. I also urge our colleagues in the other body to swiftly move similar legislation through their Chamber. Again I thank Chairman GOODLATTE and Ranking Member CONYERS and Mr. COHEN for their support.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), the ranking member of the Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me thank Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. COHEN for their great work on this instructive legislation. My appreciation for the Judiciary Committee is how we clarify the law, and in this instance the subcommittee has brought two conflicting legal tenets as relate to statutes and clarified them. So I want to celebrate it because it is directly impacting on the Nation's museums and educational institutions. Let me cite some in my congressional district.

Texas Southern University has an African American history museum. It is a beautiful display. This legislation will allow a small entity that could not stand under a lawsuit to be able to secure international gifts which they have received without the burden of litigation.

In the early stages of my career in Congress, I represented, extensively, Houston's museum district: the Museum of Foreign Arts, with an outstanding curator, museum director; the Children's Museum; the Health Museum; and the Museum of Natural Science. All of those have the tendency to receive these international gifts and also be subjected, potentially, because of the conflict to seizure.

In particular, I remember working with the Museum of Fine Arts, maybe one of my greatest early opportunities of service, and to help them bring the Russian jewels to Houston, Texas. It was a long, long journey, not because of the distance but because of the conflicting laws and the entanglement of imports and protection of the jewels. I remember being at the dock receiving those jewels after a long wait. Just imagine if there had been this potential of seizure, which there was, but that there was the glaring opportunity there for seizure and it had occurred. What would have happened to this great art exchange and, as well, to what we were doing in Houston?

Let me close by saying, Mr. Speaker, I want to support this bill extensively, and it will help all of these institutions across America.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 889, the "Foreign Cultural Exchange Jurisdictional Immunity Clarification Act."

H.R. 889 makes a modest but important amendment to the "expropriation exception" of the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act of 1976. Specifically, it ensures that foreign states are immune from suits for damages concerning

the ownership of cultural property when: that property is in the United States pursuant to an agreement between the foreign state and the U.S. or a U.S.-based cultural or educational institution; the President has granted the work at issue immunity from seizure pursuant to the Immunity from Seizure Act; and the President's grant of immunity from seizure is published in the Federal Register.

The expropriation exception remains available to all claims concerning misappropriated cultural property to which these factual circumstances do not apply.

I would not support this bill if it did not contain a sufficient exception for claims arising from artwork stolen by the Nazis, their allies, and their affiliates.

H.R. 889 has just such an exception, ensuring that victims of Nazi art theft continue to have the opportunity to pursue justice in court.

This exception is appropriate in light of the sheer scale and the particularly concerted efforts of the Nazis to seize artwork and other cultural property from their victims.

The particular sensitivity surrounding compensation for artwork stolen by the Nazis has been highlighted in recent months by the motion picture *Woman in Gold*, which tells the story of Maria Altmann.

Mrs. Altmann's efforts to retrieve works by Gustav Klimt that the Nazis had taken from uncle in Austria in the 1930's led to an important Supreme Court decision that held that the expropriation exception applied to claims arising prior to the FSIA's enactment in 1976, which allowed Nazi-era victims to file suit for damages in federal court.

It is also critical to note that the bill's sponsors worked with the Conference on Jewish Material Claims Against Germany to revise the Nazi-era exception to ensure that it was broad enough to be a meaningful exception.

As a result, the Conference has stated, for itself and for the American Jewish Committee, that it will not oppose this bill.

I also note that all of the FSIA's other exceptions to sovereign immunity remain available to potential plaintiffs with claims concerning the ownership of cultural property.

In particular, I note that this bill does nothing to affect the attempts by Chabad to seek enforcement of its 2011 judgment against Russia, both because such judgment would predate the effective date of this bill and because it was not predicated on the loan of any artwork to the U.S., meaning that this bill would not effect that case even if it had been in effect in 2011.

To the extent it may be necessary, I would encourage consideration of adding clarifying language that this bill does nothing to affect enforcement of an already-entered judgment.

H.R. 889 is narrowly tailored to ensure that it provides for just enough immunity to encourage foreign states to lend their cultural property to American museums and universities for temporary exhibits and displays without protecting more than we intend to protect.

I recognize that some people may instinctively recoil at the idea of any bill that grants any level of immunity to a foreign state when ownership of a work of art or other cultural object is at issue.

But I would not support a bill that foreclosed all possibility of redress for such people.

And, H.R. 889 does not do that.

It simply ensures that works that have already been granted immunity from seizure by

the President pursuant to the Immunity from Seizure Act are also immune from suits for damages, which is in keeping with the Act's purpose of encouraging foreign countries to lend their works to American institutions without fear of litigation based on the act of lending those works.

I thank Representative STEVE CHABOT, Judiciary Committee Chairman BOB GOODLATTE, and Committee Ranking Member JOHN CONYERS, Jr. for their leadership on this issue and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, but I would like to recognize Lafayette and Washington. The Hermione, the boat that brought Lafayette to Washington, a replica thereof, has just come to Virginia, and there is a recognition of that at Mount Vernon tonight. I think we should recognize their portraits here. They helped this country become free from the shackles of Great Britain and become the great country we are.

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. 889.

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.

SUPPORTING LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 295) supporting local law enforcement agencies in their continued work to serve our communities, and supporting their use of body worn cameras to promote transparency to protect both citizens and officers alike.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 295

Whereas the United States Department of Justice issued a report titled, "Police Officer Body-Worn Cameras", which details a number of benefits of body-worn cameras, including—

- (1) increased transparency and citizen views of police legitimacy;
- (2) improved behavior and civility among both police officers and citizens; and
- (3) increased evidentiary benefits that expedite resolution of citizen complaints or lawsuits and improving evidence for arrest and prosecution; and

Whereas the University of Cambridge's Institute of Criminology conducted a 12-month study on the use of body-worn cameras used by law enforcement in the United Kingdom and estimated that the cameras led to a 50 percent reduction in use of force, and in addition, complaints against police fell approximately by 90 percent: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes all law enforcement agencies and officers for their tireless work to protect us and make our communities safer;

(2) recognizes the potential for the use of body-worn cameras by on-duty law enforcement officers to improve community relations, increase transparency, and protect both citizens and police; and

(3) encourages State and local law enforcement agencies to consider the use of body-worn cameras, including policies and protocols to handle privacy, storage, and other relevant concerns.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H. Res. 295, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

I would like to begin by thanking the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLEAVER) for introducing this resolution and commend them for their work on this important issue.

Policing is an inherently dangerous job. Our law enforcement officers deserve our gratitude for the work they do on a daily basis to make sure that our streets are safe, the most helpless in our communities are protected, and those who commit crimes are brought to justice.

I am very concerned that force is used appropriately and that police officers are taking appropriate steps to protect innocent civilians when they make encounters. There is increasing unrest in our urban communities about policing.

I am also concerned with the repeated targeting of our police and law enforcement personnel. Last week, a terror suspect believed to be plotting to behead a Boston officer was killed in a confrontation with Boston police. Last month, two police officers were killed by criminals hoping to become cop killers. Officers Dean and Tate, responding to a routine traffic stop in Hattiesburg, Mississippi, were gunned down by a group of five men.

□ 1730

This comes on the heels of more widely known murders last year of Officers Ramos and Liu in New York, who were reportedly targeted by a man looking to kill a police officer.

It is clear that we must find a better way for our police and citizens to interact both in everyday situations and when more difficult circumstances