

to succeed. That funding is not in this bill, nor is it in some of the other bills that will be considered. It is nice to say that we ought to get something done, but if we do not apply the resources to accomplish the objective, it is empty rhetoric and political posturing.

President Obama has requested \$1.1 billion to fight opioid addiction, but the majority has not yet committed to acting on that request, nor has it committed to funding the bipartisan legislation that we expect to pass this week. The legislation is good, but if we don't give it the resources to be implemented, it will not bring the relief that is needed.

So as we work together to take these important steps to prevent opioid abuse and promote recovery, Congress needs to work together to ensure that these efforts are not left unfunded. I am certain that there is a way we can work together to pay for them and help our communities fight this epidemic that has destroyed so many lives and devastated communities and families across this country.

Again, I want to thank the Republican leader, Mr. MCCARTHY. He and I have found opportunities to work together, and we believe those have had positive results. He has partnered with me on this OPEN Act, and I hope we can keep working together to fund these initiatives and help end the scourge, the cancer, of opioid abuse and addiction in our country. If we do so, Americans will thank us, and they will think we have done a better job, frankly, than they think we are doing.

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

I want to say to my colleagues I deeply appreciate the observations and perceptions on both sides of the aisle in dealing with this subject.

The approaches to dealing with opioid abuse should be based on evidence of their effectiveness and ability to save lives. The OPEN Act will provide the information necessary to properly make that evaluation. Accordingly, I sincerely urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5052.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this good legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time. Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5052, the "Opioid Program Evaluation Act of 2016," otherwise known as the "OPEN" Act.

This is an important bill intended to provide a mechanism to evaluate the effectiveness of the grant programs being considered by Congress to address the serious and growing problem of opioid abuse.

The current surge in the use of heroin and other opioid drugs such as hydrocodone and oxycodone requires a strong, national response.

Opioid abuse leads to physical and functional changes to parts of the brain affecting, impulse, reward, and motivation.

In recent years, it is estimated that the number of heroin users in the United States has grown to over 680,000 people.

Similarly, the use of other opioids, such as hydrocodone and oxycodone has grown by 100 percent and 500 percent respectively.

To fight this crisis involving illegal opioids and the abuse of prescription opioids, we must employ a multi-faceted approach that actually achieves results.

This bill would evaluate the effectiveness of H.R. 5046, the "Comprehensive Opioid Abuse Reduction Act," a bill reported by the Judiciary Committee.

That bill was written with the goal of assisting States in the implementation of a variety of strategies, including:

Providing treatment alternatives to incarceration; training criminal justice agency personnel on substance use and co-occurring mental illness; increasing collaboration between State criminal justice agencies and State substance abuse systems; purchasing opioid reversal drugs and devices for first responders and providing training to carry and administer opioid reversal drugs and devices; and implementing medication-assisted treatment programs used or operated by criminal justice agencies.

As opioid abuse grant programs move forward, it is important we find a way to evaluate the success of these strategies and the effectiveness of the programs in implementing them.

This is why I support the requirements of the OPEN Act.

Specifically, the OPEN Act will:

Instruct the Departments of Justice and Health and Human Services to identify outcomes to be achieved and develop metrics for evaluating success in achieving those outcomes; enlist the National Academy of Sciences to evaluate and report to Congress on the outcomes and metrics of the grant programs; require grantees to report annually on the progress made through the grants; and instruct the Departments of Justice and Health and Human Services to complete an evaluation of the effectiveness of their grant programs after five years.

I am confident that the comprehensive approach we are taking to address opioid abuse will help address the Nation's growing epidemic.

For these reasons, I support the OPEN Act and the goal of ensuring the best possible response to treat and prevent opioid abuse in America, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia). 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. 5052, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

□ 1730

BULLETPROOF VEST PARTNERSHIP GRANT PROGRAM REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2015

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 125) to amend title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to extend the authorization of the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program through fiscal year 2020, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 125

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 "Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program Reauthorization Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR BULLETPROOF VEST PARTNERSHIP GRANT PROGRAM.

Section 1001(a)(23) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3793(a)(23)) is amended to read as follows:

"(23) There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out part Y, \$25,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2020."

SEC. 3. EXPIRATION OF APPROPRIATED FUNDS.

Section 2501 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 37961l) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(h) EXPIRATION OF APPROPRIATED FUNDS.—

"(1) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term 'appropriated funds' means any amounts that are appropriated for any of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 to carry out this part.

"(2) EXPIRATION.—All appropriated funds that are not obligated on or before December 31, 2022 shall be transferred to the General Fund of the Treasury not later than January 31, 2023."

SEC. 4. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON 2-YEAR LIMITATION ON FUNDS.

It is the sense of Congress that amounts made available to carry out part Y of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 37961l et seq.) should be made available through the end of the first fiscal year following the fiscal year for which the amounts are appropriated and should not be made available until expended.

SEC. 5. MATCHING FUNDS LIMITATION.

Section 2501(f) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 37961l(f)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

"(3) LIMITATION ON MATCHING FUNDS.—A State, unit of local government, or Indian tribe may not use funding received under any other Federal grant program to pay or defer the cost, in whole or in part, of the matching requirement under paragraph (1)."

SEC. 6. APPLICATION OF BULLETPROOF VEST PARTNERSHIP GRANT PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS TO ANY ARMOR VEST OR BODY ARMOR PURCHASED WITH FEDERAL GRANT FUNDS.

Section 521 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3766a) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(c)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a grantee that uses funds made

available under this part to purchase an armor vest or body armor shall—

“(A) comply with any requirements established for the use of grants made under part Y;

“(B) have a written policy requiring uniformed patrol officers to wear an armor vest or body armor; and

“(C) use the funds to purchase armor vests or body armor that meet any performance standards established by the Director of the Bureau of Justice Assistance.

“(2) In this subsection, the terms ‘armor vest’ and ‘body armor’ have the meanings given such terms in section 2503.”

SEC. 7. UNIQUELY FITTED ARMOR VESTS.

Section 2501(c) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 379611(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking “; or” and inserting “; and”;

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

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

“(4) provides armor vests to law enforcement officers that are uniquely fitted for such officers, including vests uniquely fitted to individual female law enforcement officers; or”.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on S. 125, 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.

Since 1999, the Bulletproof Vest Program, or BVP, has awarded more than 13,000 jurisdictions a total of \$393 million in Federal funds for the purchase of over 1 million bulletproof vests. The Bulletproof Vest Grant Program is a critical resource for State and local jurisdictions that has proven to save lives.

We must be sure that our law enforcement officers are protected from the risks inherent in the job. In 2016 alone, there have been 17 police officers killed by gunfire. In March, a bulletproof vest saved the life of Officer Andy Harris, who was shot when he responded to a shots fired call. He is but one of many officers saved by a bulletproof vest.

Based on data collected and recorded by the Department of Justice, protective vests were directly attributable to saving the lives of at least 33 law enforcement and corrections officers in 20 different States in a single year. At least 14 of those lifesaving vests had been purchased, in part, with BVP funds.

This bill reauthorizes BVP grants at \$25 million per year and extends the authorization through 2020. The bill has the support of all major law enforcement organizations, and has been approved by the Senate. With this authorization, we will immediately be impacting the safety of our law enforcement officers.

Law enforcement officers across the United States put their lives on the line every day to protect their communities and fellow citizens. As they continually make sacrifices for us, we must ensure that we provide them with resources to protect their lives as they protect ours.

Today’s approval of legislation reauthorizing a critical bulletproof vest grant program for State and local law enforcement officers will save lives. I thank Representative LOBIONDO and Senate Judiciary Committee Ranking Member LEAHY for their work on this issue and dedication to our Nation’s law enforcement officers.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Members of the House, I rise in strong support of S. 125, the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program.

This bill, which would provide matching grants to State, local, and tribal law enforcement agencies so that they can purchase bullet-resistant vests for their officers, is important for several reasons.

To begin with, S. 125 will facilitate the provision of critical protection to law enforcement officers, who often risk their lives while serving our communities. While some of the approximately 800,000 law enforcement officers throughout the United States do have some form of bullet-resistant armor, far too many of these brave men and women are not afforded the same protection due to State and local budget constraints.

Since its inception, the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program has assisted State and local law enforcement agencies in obtaining the necessary protection equipment to safeguard the lives of their officers. To date, this program has provided more than 1 million officers with lifesaving vests. During the past 30 years, bullet-resistant vests have saved the lives of more than 3,000 law enforcement officers.

The timeliness of this bill provides a perfect opportunity to acknowledge National Police Week. Right now, thousands of law enforcement officers are in Washington, D.C., to honor their fellow officers who paid the ultimate sacrifice.

Each year, the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial holds a vigil to recognize the newly engraved names of officers who died while serving and protecting the people in our communities.

We must do everything in our power to protect those who protect us. The

Bulletproof Vest Program will help prevent the deaths of officers, and we hope that even fewer names will have to be added to the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial.

The bill is critical because it provides up to 50 percent of the costs for an officer’s new armor vest. The officer’s department, in turn, pays the remaining costs. Importantly, small police departments that service areas with less than 100,000 residents receive priority funding under this measure.

Finally, S. 125 responds to the critical concern that bullet-resistant vests—to achieve their intended goals of protecting an officer from life-threatening gunshots—must meet certain standards. To this end, the bill requires a law enforcement agency to purchase body armor that meets strict performance standards set by the National Institute of Justice.

Additionally, the agency must have a policy that encourages officers to wear their vests while on duty. And, the agency must ensure that these vests properly fit female officers as well.

For all of these reasons, I strongly support S. 125.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in very strong support of S. 125, the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program Reauthorization Act.

Our brave law enforcement officers put their lives in harm’s way every day to protect our communities. The least we can do is provide them with the proper safety gear.

That is why we must authorize the highly successful Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program to ensure that all of America’s law enforcement officers have access to the lifesaving protection they need. My friend, Mr. REICHERT, from the coast, and myself, pledged when we became cochairs of public safety in the Congress many, many years ago that not only do we need more police on the beat, but we need to protect them. There is no question in my mind we have allowed the bad guys to outarm the good guys, and we have to take a look at that.

Since it was established in 1999, this program has provided grantees with approximately \$247 million for more than 1 million lifesaving vests in over 13,000 State and local law enforcement agencies throughout the country. I did not hear any of those communities turn back the money. You are talking about 13,000 State and local law enforcement agencies.

There is a place for the Federal Government. There are responsibilities we cannot circumvent. While many officers are protected by bullet-resistant armor, there are an alarming number of officers in departments across our country that cannot afford this same

protection due to local budget constraints.

As long as I am in Congress, I will continue to do all that I can to work closely with law enforcement officials, not just talking with them and patting them on the back, so they have adequate resources to protect themselves while patrolling our streets.

I urge my colleagues to support swift passage of this bipartisan legislation that will help improve the protection of our law enforcement officials.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume for my closing remarks.

First, I would like to recognize the distinguished Senator from Vermont, PATRICK LEAHY, as being very, very influential in developing the measure before us under discussion now.

In closing, I note that we expect our law enforcement officers to protect those who are unable to protect themselves. But to do so, however, we must ensure that these brave men and women are themselves protected.

In 2012, for example, armor-resistant vests were credited with saving the lives of 33 law enforcement officers in 20 different States. Fourteen of those vests were purchased with the help of Bulletproof Vest Partnership Program funds.

In my home district in Michigan, the police departments for Highland Park, Melvindale, Romulus City, Wayne County, and others have received funds through this important program.

While some of the approximately 800,000 law enforcement officers throughout our country do have some form of bullet-resistant armor, far too many of these brave men and women are not afforded the same protection due to State and local budget constraints.

It is with great pleasure and privilege that I assure every Member of the House that S. 125 will ensure that this program continues to provide such vitally needed assistance.

I urge support for this measure.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE), a member of the Judiciary Committee, and he will close debate on our side.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, last month, a few weeks ago, Alden Clopton was on patrol after midnight. He is a deputy constable in Houston, Texas. He works for the constable's office at Precinct 7.

Constables are just like deputy sheriffs and police officers. They have all the power under the State of Texas laws as any other police officer.

He was on routine patrol with his rookie partner trainee, Ann Glasgow, and they made a traffic stop in a tough part of town in Houston, Texas. As the

investigation is taking place, Mr. Speaker, some outlaw snuck up behind Alden Clopton and pulled out a pistol and shot at him six times in the back.

Some of those bullets made their mark and some of those bullets missed. He owes his life, he says, to the bullet-proof vest that he was wearing. Constable May Walker, a constable at Precinct 7, said he survived because he was wearing a vest.

□ 1745

You may have never heard of Alden Clopton, but he is a peace officer who comes from a peace officer family. His wife is a deputy sheriff; his three brothers are all in law enforcement; and his son is a cop in Mississippi, I believe. He lives today because he had a bulletproof vest on. As the ranking member has said and as the chairman has said, we owe it to peace officers to protect them when they go out in society and do society's dirty work for us—to protect and serve us.

This week is National Police Week. We honor our police officers—those who protect us, those who work the thin blue line to protect us from those who would do us harm. This is an appropriate piece of legislation to show peace officers like Alden Clopton and all of those throughout the country that we have their backs—that we support them—and that Congress is going to do what is necessary to protect them while they protect us.

And that is just the way it is.

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

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Speaker, the Senate counterpart to my legislation, H.R. 228, that will reauthorize the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Act, comes during a momentous week in law enforcement—National Police Week, starting this Sunday.

Thank you, as well, to the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. VISCLOSKY, for working with me on this legislation since its original passage in 1999.

Recent tragic events highlight the threats our men and women in uniform face each day.

However, these all-important vests cannot protect the lives of those who do not have access to them.

Now more than ever, it is imperative that we give law enforcement the tools they need so they may do their jobs and carry out their duties safely and effectively.

The Bulletproof Vest Partnership program is one of those critical tools.

In fact, we know from some of the most recent statistics, that 14 of 33 officers saved by bulletproof vests, were purchased using funds from the Bulletproof Vest Partnership program.

Since 1999, over 13,000 jurisdictions across the country have participated in the BVP program.

I encourage those law enforcement officials and concerned citizens listening, especially those in South Jersey, to apply for this vital program.

The deadline to do so, May 16th, is quickly approaching.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr.

GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 125.

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.

FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT SELF-DEFENSE AND PROTECTION ACT OF 2015

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2137) to ensure Federal law enforcement officers remain able to ensure their own safety, and the safety of their families, during a covered furlough.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2137

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 Self-Defense and Protection Act of 2015”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Too often, Federal law enforcement officers encounter potentially violent criminals, placing officers in danger of grave physical harm.

(2) In 2012 alone, 1,857 Federal law enforcement officers were assaulted, with 206 sustaining serious injuries.

(3) From 2008 through 2011, an additional 8,587 Federal law enforcement officers were assaulted.

(4) Federal law enforcement officers remain a target even when they are off-duty. Over the past 3 years, 27 law enforcement officers have been killed off-duty.

(5) It is essential that law enforcement officers are able to defend themselves, so they can carry out their critical missions and ensure their own personal safety and the safety of their families whether on-duty or off-duty.

(6) These dangers to law enforcement officers continue to exist during a covered furlough.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act—

(1) the term “agency” means each authority of the executive, legislative, or judicial branch of the Government of the United States;

(2) the term “covered Federal law enforcement officer” means any individual who—

(A) is an employee of an agency;

(B) has the authority to make arrests or apprehensions for, or prosecute, violations of Federal law; and

(C) on the day before the date on which the applicable covered furlough begins, is authorized by the agency employing the individual to carry a firearm in the course of official duties;

(3) the term “covered furlough” means a planned event by an agency during which employees are involuntarily furloughed due to downsizing, reduced funding, lack of work, or any budget situation including a lapse in appropriations; and

(4) the term “firearm” has the meaning given that term in section 921 of title 18, United States Code.

SEC. 4. PROTECTING FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS WHO ARE SUBJECTED TO A COVERED FURLOUGH.

During a covered furlough, a covered Federal law enforcement officer shall have the