United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 162 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, MAY 16, 2016 No. 77

House of Representatives

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 16, 2016.

I hereby appoint the Honorable STEVE WOMACK 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 5, 2016, 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 1:50 p.m.

END HUNGER NOW

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, thousands of people will gather in Washington, D.C., this weekend for Feeding the 5000, an event designed to bring awareness to the issue of food waste. Participants will be served a communal meal made entirely out of food that would otherwise have been discarded—in other words, wasted. Since 2009, Feedback, a global environmental organization working to end food waste, has hosted dozens of Feeding the 5000 events in cities across the globe.

I am pleased to see so many local partners—including government agencies, charitable organizations, NGOs, industry, and chefs—joining together to call attention to food waste, because the truth of the matter is we will need all of these partners working together to solve the issue of food waste.

Last year, the USDA announced their first ever food waste reduction goal, calling for a 50 percent reduction in food waste by 2030. USDA is working with charitable organizations, faith-based groups, and the private sector, and I believe this goal is 100 percent achievable.

American consumers, businesses, and farms spend an estimated $218 billion per year growing, processing, transporting, and disposing of food that is never eaten. Up to 40 percent of all food grown is never eaten; 40 to 50 million tons of food is sent to landfills each year, plus another 10 million tons is left unharvested on farms. This food waste translates into approximately 387 billion calories of food that went unconsumed. With 50 million Americans—including 16 million children—struggling with hunger every year, these are startling figures.

We know food waste occurs throughout the supply chain, from harvesting to manufacturing, to retail operations and consumer habits. But we must do more to reduce food waste at every stage, recover food that would otherwise have been wasted, and recycle unavoidable waste as animal feed, compost, or energy.

Thankfully, there is already a lot of great work being doing to raise awareness about the problem of food waste. Just last week, I attended a screening of the documentary film called ''Just Eat It'' at Amherst Cinema, organized by The Food Bank of Western Massachusetts. ''Just Eat It'' follows a couple, Jen and Grant, as they stop going to the grocery store and live solely off of foods that would have been thrown away. Jen and Grant were able to find an abundance of perfectly safe and healthy food available for consumption that would have been thrown away.

It is exciting to see new partnerships forming to study food waste and find ways to use this perfectly good food to reduce hunger in our communities. One such private-public collaboration, ReFED, has brought together over 30 business, government, and NGO leaders committed to wide-scale solutions to U.S. food waste.

In March 2016, ReFED released a Roadmap that charts the course for a 20 percent reduction of food waste within a decade. The Roadmap calls for farmers to reduce unharvested food and create secondary markets for imperfect produce. It calls on manufacturers to reduce inefficiencies, make packaging adjustments, and standardize date labeling. It calls on food service companies to further implement waste tracking and incorporate imperfect produce and smaller plates into restaurants. It urges the Federal Government to strengthen tax incentives for food donations and consider standardized date labeling legislation.

The good news is that many in the industry are already taking steps to dramatically cut down on wasted food by implementing robust donation programs. For example, Starbucks recently announced it will soon scale up its successful food donation pilot program nationwide. In partnership with the Food Donation Connection and Feeding America, Starbucks will donate unsold food from more than 7,000 company-operated stores—salads, sandwiches, and other refrigerated items—to the Feeding America food bank network. By 2021, that amounts to almost 50 million meals.

Our college campuses are also stepping up. Both the Campus Kitchens

Printed on recycled paper.

Project and the Food Recovery Network will work with college dining facilities and students to provide hunger relief in their local communities. In my congressional district, Becker College, Holy Cross College, Smith College, the University of Massachusetts Amherst, and Worcester Polytechnic Institute all have campus food recovery initiatives.

Over the past 35 years, Feeding America has demonstrated an outstanding commitment to ensuring food that would otherwise have been wasted makes its way to food banks across the country and into the homes of families in need. There are dozens of other industry leaders also taking steps to reduce food waste by implementing manufacturing upgrades, maximizing harvests, and utilizing recycling initiatives.

I appreciate the efforts of the Food Waste Reduction Alliance in bringing together industry partners to reduce food waste, shrink the environmental footprint, and alleviate hunger in our communities.

Reducing food waste is one step we can take toward our goal of ending hunger in the United States and throughout the world. I am pleased to see so many partners at every level of the food supply chain taking action to reduce food waste, but there is still more that needs to be done. Let's solve the problem of food waste, and let's end hunger now.

A FIRE CHIEF SAYS GOOD-BYE

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

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate Ramsey Fire Chief Dean Kapler, who recently announced his upcoming retirement.

Since 1993, Dean Kapler has been responsible for every aspect of the Ramsey Fire Department, a responsibility that he handles with determination and enthusiasm. Over the past 23 years, Dean has recruited and trained 55 firefighters and maintained three fire stations. Additionally, he has worked tirelessly to provide better coverage and expand fire service for the Ramsey area.

The dedication that Dean Kapler has displayed to his home city of 37 years is further proven by the retirement date he has chosen. His retirement will be determined by the completion of the new fire department, a project that he has supervised and insists on seeing through to completion.

I want to thank Dean for all the work that he has done for the city of Ramsey, and I wish him happiness in his well-earned retirement.

MONTICELLO NUCLEAR GENERATING PLANT IS ''ABOVE AND BEYOND''

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate Xcel Energy's Monticello Nuclear Generating Plant for receiving the Above and Beyond Award from the U.S. Department of Defense. This award recognizes employers who have gone above and beyond the legal requirements of supporting Guard and Reserve employees, often by giving nonrequired benefits.

The role of a Reserve member is critically important to national security, but it is a job with an uncertain future. Thankfully, the Monticello plant fully welcomes the work ethic, leadership, and applied knowledge veterans can bring to a position.

Those who serve and sacrifice to keep our Nation safe not only deserve our respect, but also our help when they come home. That is why Xcel's commitment to hire our veterans is so important.

I commend the Monticello Nuclear Generating Plant for hiring our veterans and for assisting employees who are serving in the Guard or Reserves. Congratulations and thank you to Xcel Energy for your well-deserved award.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Merciful God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

In you, Lord, is found the fullness of life and love. It is why the human heart always longs for more. We seek You, Lord, sometimes without knowing it.

People within our borders, within this Chamber, pray for our Nation. Others around the world pray for the United States of America as well. So many see our potential for good, for doing the right thing in the search for justice and peace.

Answer the longing of Your people, Lord. Draw closer to us. Help the Members of the people's House to realize the promise You have placed within them. Not by words alone, but by actions, help them as those of Your choosing to be people of promise who give You glory in their service to the Nation.

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

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. KILDEE 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.

RECOGNIZING LANCASTER GENERAL HEALTH/PENN MEDICINE

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, today I want to recognize Lancaster General Health/Penn Medicine for being a finalist in the 2015 McGaw Prize for Excellence in Community Service. Lancaster General was the only Pennsylvania health system to be recognized for this honor.

Lancaster General was singled out for its work on community programs for the chronically ill, the Amish community, and those dealing with tobacco and obesity issues.

Recently, the health system launched a community-led effort called Lighten Up Lancaster that works to increase obesity awareness and weight loss. For the Amish, Lancaster General offered a special free immunization program for children in the rural areas.

The Hospital and Healthsystem Association of Pennsylvania said Lancaster General Health/Penn Medicine has fully recognized that a relationship with the community is invaluable and key to improving health and wellness. It is well-deserving of this national recognition.

Lancaster General used the $10,000 prize money to pay for technology to track and coordinate its social services. Congratulations, Lancaster General Health/Penn Medicine.

FLINT RESIDENTS DESERVE ACTION BY THEIR GOVERNMENT

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, my hometown of Flint is still facing a crisis: 100,000 people still cannot turn on their tap and have access to safe drinking water.

This Congress faces a multitude of public health crises—Zika, the opioid epidemic—but Congress must also do its job and act on Flint to aid the people that I represent of my hometown that are still suffering and still cannot drink the water coming out of the tap—100,000 people.

This is a disaster. It is a crisis that demands Congress to act. Congress

should do its job and immediately take up the Families of Flint Act, legislation that I have introduced that has over 150 cosponsors, 150 Members of this body cosponsoring legislation that would replace those damaged lead service lines, provide public health service and wraparound services, especially for children who can overcome the impact of lead exposure, but just need help in order to do so.

Families in Flint have waited too long. Congress has to do its job and act on the Flint crisis.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 4 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1600

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of New York) at 4 p.m.

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 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.

CONVEYING FEDERAL PROPERTY TO THE MUNICIPALITY OF ANCHORAGE, ALASKA

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1492) to direct the Administrator of General Services, on behalf of the Archivist of the United States, to convey certain Federal property located in the State of Alaska to the Municipality of Anchorage, Alaska.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 1492

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. REAL PROPERTY CONVEYANCE.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ARCHIVIST.—The term ''Archivist'' means the Archivist of the United States.

(2) CITY.—The term ''City'' means the Municipality of Anchorage, Alaska.

(b) CONVEYANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act and after completion of the survey and appraisal described in this section, the Administrator of General Services, on behalf of the Archivist, shall offer to convey to the City by quitclaim deed for the consideration and under the conditions described in subsection (d), all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of real property described in subsection (c).

(2) COSTS OF CONVEYANCE.—The City shall be responsible for paying—

(A) the costs of an appraisal conducted pursuant to subsection (d)(1)(B); and

(B) any other costs relating to the conveyance of the Federal property under this Act.

(c) LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The parcel to be conveyed under subsection (b) consists of approximately 9 acres and improvements located at 400 East Fortieth Avenue in the City that is administered by the National Archives and Records Administration.

(2) SURVEY REQUIRED.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the exact acreage and legal description of the real property to be conveyed under subsection (b) shall be determined by a survey, paid for by the City, that is satisfactory to the Archivist.

(d) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—

(1) CONSIDERATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—As consideration for the conveyance of the property under subsection (b), the City shall pay to the Archivist an amount not less than the fair market value of the conveyed property, to be determined as provided in subparagraph (B).

(B) APPRAISAL.—The fair market value of the property to be conveyed under subsection (b) shall be determined based on an appraisal that—

(i) is conducted by a licensed, independent appraiser that is approved by the Archivist and the City;

(ii) is based on the highest and best use of the property;

(iii) is approved by the Archivist; and

(iv) is paid for by the City.

(2) PRECONVEYANCE ENTRY.—The Archivist, on terms and conditions the Archivist determines to be appropriate, may authorize the City to enter the property at no charge for preconstruction and construction activities.

(3) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Archivist may require additional terms and conditions in connection with the conveyance under subsection (b) as the Archivist considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(e) PROCEEDS.—Any net proceeds received by the Archivist as a result of the conveyance under this Act shall be deposited in the Treasury and used for deficit reduction, in such manner as the Secretary of the Treasury considers appropriate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. CARSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on S. 1492.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

For the record, this is the same bill that has passed this House twice unanimously. It was over in the Senate, and they sent it back to us. It is a very simple bill that would direct the General Services Administration, on behalf of the National Archives, to convey property to Alaska, to the city of Anchorage.

I am pleased that the sponsor of the House companion bill, as I mentioned before, has been passed by the House twice and has now been sent back to my senator, Senator DAN SULLIVAN.

The National Archives has determined that it no longer needs the property and wants to sell it as part of its efforts to shrink its real estate footprint and reduce the costs to the taxpayer. The bill will require fair market value for the property based on an independent appraisal. The proceeds will be deposited into the Treasury and will be used for deficit reduction.

This bill is in line with what we have been urging all Federal agencies to do—consolidate and reduce their space and sell unneeded properties.

The municipality of Anchorage requested this land be made available, and the city council passed a resolution that thanks the delegation for supporting this legislation. I am very excited to get this land into the hands of the municipality of Anchorage for development purposes.

I urge my colleagues to support the passage of this legislation.

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

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I support S. 1492, which directs the GSA, on behalf of the Archivist of the United States, to convey 9 acres of property in Anchorage, Alaska, to the local municipality in exchange for its fair market value.

The GSA and the Archivist of the United States have come to the conclusion that this property is underutilized and is no longer needed by the Federal Government. A House version of this bill was reported out of committee by a voice vote and was subsequently passed by the House. Selling this property to the city of Anchorage, Alaska, at its fair market value protects the interests of taxpayers who acquired the property. It also allows the Federal Government to shed the costs of maintaining and securing an unneeded property.

Finally, I encourage the GSA to continue using its existing authority and expertise to identify and dispose of other pieces of underutilized Federal real estate as appropriate.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I urge its passage.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 1492.

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.

STOLEN IDENTITY REFUND FRAUD PREVENTION ACT OF 2016

Mr. RENACCI. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3832) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prevent tax-related identity theft and tax fraud, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3832

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 ''Stolen Identity Refund Fraud Prevention Act of 2016''.

SEC. 2. CENTRALIZED POINT OF CONTACT FOR IDENTITY THEFT VICTIMS.

The Secretary of the Treasury, or the Secretary's delegate, shall establish and maintain an office at the Internal Revenue Service and procedures to ensure that any taxpayer whose return has been delayed or otherwise adversely affected due to the theft of the taxpayer's identity has a centralized point of contact throughout the processing of his or her case. The office shall coordinate with other offices within the Internal Revenue Service to resolve the taxpayer's case as quickly as possible.

SEC. 3. TAXPAYER NOTIFICATION OF SUSPECTED IDENTITY THEFT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 77 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 7529. NOTIFICATION OF SUSPECTED IDENTITY THEFT.

''If the Secretary determines that there was an unauthorized use of the identity of any taxpayer, the Secretary shall—

''(1) as soon as practicable and without jeopardizing an investigation relating to tax administration, notify the taxpayer and include with that notice—

''(A) instructions to the taxpayer about filing a police report, and

''(B) the forms the taxpayer must submit to allow investigating law enforcement officials to access the taxpayer's personal information, and

''(2) if any person is criminally charged by indictment or information relating to such unauthorized use, notify such taxpayer as soon as practicable of such charge.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 77 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''Sec. 7529. Notification of suspected identity theft.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to determinations made after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 4. REPORT ON ELECTRONIC FILING OPT OUT.

The Secretary of the Treasury (or the Secretary's delegate) shall submit a feasibility study to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate describing a program under which a person who has filed an identity theft affidavit with the Secretary may elect to prevent the processing of any Federal tax return submitted in an electronic format by that taxpayer or a person purporting to be that taxpayer. The study shall be submitted within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and should also include a recommendation on whether to implement such a program.

SEC. 5. USE OF INFORMATION IN DO NOT PAY INITIATIVE IN PREVENTION OF IDENTITY THEFT REFUND FRAUD.

The Secretary of the Treasury, and the Secretary's delegate, shall use the information available under the Do Not Pay Initiative established under section 5 of the Improper Payments Elimination and Recovery Improvement Act of 2012 (31 U.S.C. 3321 note) to help prevent identity theft refund fraud.

SEC. 6. REPORT ON IDENTITY THEFT REFUND FRAUD.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than September 30, 2018, and biannually thereafter through September 30, 2023, the Secretary of the Treasury (or the Secretary's delegate) shall report to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate on the extent and nature of fraud involving the use of a misappropriated taxpayer identity with respect to claims for refund under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 during the preceding completed income tax filing season, and the detection, prevention, and enforcement activities undertaken by the Internal Revenue Service with respect to such fraud, including—

(1) detailing efforts to combat identity theft fraud, including an update on the victims' assistance unit;

(2) information on both the average and maximum amounts of time that elapsed before the cases of victims of such fraud were resolved; and

(3) discussing Internal Revenue Service efforts associated with other avenues for addressing identity theft refund fraud.

(b) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.—In addition, each report shall provide an update on the implementation of this Act and identify the need for any further legislation to protect taxpayer identities.

(c) PROGRESS ON OUTREACH AND EDUCATION.—In the first biannual report on identity theft refund fraud under subsection (a), the Secretary (or the Secretary's delegate) shall include—

(1) an assessment of the agency's progress on identity theft outreach and education to the private sector, State agencies, and external organizations; and

(2) the results of a feasibility study on the costs and benefits to enhancing its taxpayer authentication approach to the electronic tax return filing process.

SEC. 7. INFORMATION SHARING AND ANALYSIS CENTER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary (or the Secretary's delegate) shall establish an information sharing and analysis center to centralize, standardize, and enhance data compilation and analysis to facilitate sharing actionable data and information with respect to identity theft.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after establishment of the information sharing and analysis center, the Secretary (or the Secretary's delegate) shall submit a report to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and Committee on Finance of the Senate on the information sharing and analysis center described in subsection (a). The report shall include the data that was shared, the use of such data, and the results of the data sharing and analysis center in combating identity theft.

SEC. 8. LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT LIAISON.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Commissioner of Internal Revenue shall establish within the Criminal Investigation Division of the Internal Revenue Service the position of Local Law Enforcement Liaison.

(b) DUTIES.—The Local Law Enforcement Liaison shall serve as the primary source of contact for State and local law enforcement authorities with respect to tax-related identity theft, having duties that shall include—

(1) receiving information from State and local law enforcement authorities;

(2) responding to inquiries from State and local law enforcement authorities;

(3) administering authorized information-sharing initiatives with State or local law enforcement authorities and reviewing the performance of such initiatives;

(4) ensuring any information provided through authorized information-sharing initiatives with State or local law enforcement authorities is used only for the prosecution of identity theft-related crimes and not re-disclosed to third parties; and

(5) such other duties relating to tax-related identity theft prevention as are delegated by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

SEC. 9. IRS PHONE SCAM REPORT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Inspector General for Tax Administration, in consultation with the Federal Communications Commission and the Federal Trade Commission, shall submit a report to Congress regarding identity theft phone scams under which individuals attempt to obtain personal information over the phone from taxpayers by falsely claiming to be calling from or on behalf the Internal Revenue Service.

(b) CONTENTS OF REPORT.—Such report shall include—

(1) a description of the nature and form of such scams;

(2) an estimate of the number of taxpayers contacted pursuant to, and the number of taxpayers who have been victims of, such scams;

(3) an estimate of the amount of wrongful payments obtained from such scams; and

(4) details of potential solutions to combat and prevent such scams, including best practices from the private sector and technological solutions.

SEC. 10. PROVIDING IDENTITY THEFT PREVENTION INFORMATION WHILE ON HOLD WITH INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE.

The Secretary of the Treasury, or the Secretary's delegate, shall ensure that if a taxpayer is on hold with the Internal Revenue Service on a taxpayer service telephone call the following information is provided:

(1) Basic information about common identity theft tax scams.

(2) Directions on where to report such activity.

(3) Tips on how to protect against identity theft tax scams.

SEC. 11. NO ADDITIONAL FUNDS AUTHORIZED.

No additional funds are authorized to carry out the requirements of this Act and the amendments made by this Act. Such requirements shall be carried out using amounts otherwise authorized.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RENACCI) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RENACCI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within

which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 3832, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise to urge approval of H.R. 3832, the Stolen Identity Refund Fraud Prevention Act of 2016.

I introduced this bipartisan legislation with my friend and colleague, Mr. LEWIS, to combat tax-related identity theft. On a personal note, it has been an honor to work with Mr. LEWIS. He paid me a great compliment when he said I ''rained passion and truth'' on the important issue of identity theft. Truthfully, since Congressman LEWIS was first elected, he has been a legislator who has brought great passion and truth to every endeavor of his storied career. I truly thank him for working with me on this legislation.

Tax-related identity theft is an evolving criminal activity that targets innocent taxpayers nationwide and robs the Treasury of billions of dollars each year. I was grateful for the opportunity last month to testify before the Committee on Ways and Means about my experience with tax-related ID theft. Last year, my personal information was stolen, and someone used that information to electronically file a fraudulent tax return for my wife and me. That return, which included a fraudulent W–2 from the House of Representatives, claimed a significant refund, with the proceeds directed to a bank account outside the U.S. So when it comes to ID theft, I truly understand the impact that it has on taxpayers in northeast Ohio and across the country.

I am committed to cracking down on the growing threat, and this bipartisan bill is an important first step forward. I was pleased that two core components from this bill were included in the PATH Act that passed last December. The remaining components of this bill will help further shield taxpayer dollars from thieves and reduce the hardships that are caused by this criminal activity. They include establishing a centralized point of contact at the IRS for ID theft victims. This will make it easier for victims to resolve their ID theft tax cases and ensure a unit at the IRS is held accountable for handling a taxpayer's case from start to finish.

Another one would improve the taxpayer notification of suspected ID theft. When the IRS determines there has been the unauthorized use of a taxpayer's identity, the IRS would be required—as soon as practicable and without jeopardizing an investigation—to notify the taxpayer and give instructions to the taxpayer about filing a police report.

The last one I will mention would require the IRS to submit a study on the feasibility of establishing a program for ID theft victims to be able to opt out of electronic filing. This provision would require the IRS to report back to Congress within 180 days on this issue.

I also thank my friend, Mr. PASCRELL, for his work on this issue and for his amendments that were incorporated into the bill during this markup last month.

Mr. Speaker, tax-related identity theft is one of the most pressing challenges that we face in the world of tax administration. This complex and evolving threat requires cooperation from Congress, the IRS, State revenue agencies, and industry stakeholders. While I am aware that not every tax-related ID theft problem is best served with a congressional solution, this legislation is an important first step in fighting ID theft and in better protecting victims.

I urge all Members to support this bipartisan legislation.

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, May 13, 2016.

Hon. KEVIN BRADY,
Chairman, Committee on Ways & Means, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BRADY: I am writing with respect to H.R. 3832, the ''Stolen Identity Refund Fraud Prevention Act,'' which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary. As a result of your having consulted with us on provisions in H.R. 3832 that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary, I agree to discharge our committee from further consideration of this bill so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration.

The Judiciary Committee takes this action with our mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 3832 at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that our committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as this bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues in our jurisdiction. Our committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation, and asks that you support any such request.

I would appreciate a response to this letter confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 3832, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during Floor consideration of H.R. 3832.

Sincerely,

BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
Washington, DC, May 16, 2016.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GOODLATTE: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 3832, the ''Stolen Identity Refund Fraud Prevention Act of 2016.'' As you noted, the Committee on the Judiciary was granted an additional referral of the bill.

I am most appreciative of your decision to waive formal consideration of H.R. 3832 so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor. I acknowledge that although you waived formal consideration of the bill, the Committee on the Judiciary is in no way waiving its jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in those provisions of the bill that fall within your Rule X jurisdiction. I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees on any House-Senate conference involving this legislation.

I will include a copy of our letters in the Congressional Record during consideration of this legislation on the House floor.

Sincerely,

KEVIN BRADY,
Chairman.

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

I commend my friend from Ohio (Mr. RENACCI) for his work on this bill. As he knows, I have been interested in this issue of tax fraud and identity theft for some time.

I am pleased that the bill we are marking up today, H.R. 3832, includes many provisions included in the bill that I put forth, H.R. 3981, the Identity Theft and Tax Fraud Prevention Act. These provisions include having a central point of contact for a victim of identity theft and taxpayer notification of suspected identity theft. In addition, two of my amendments were included in the bill.

The first would create a local law enforcement liaison within the Criminal Investigation Division of the IRS. Our police and law enforcement officers are out every day, keeping our communities safe and tracking down criminals. Too often, coordinating their efforts with the IRS when it comes to identity theft is not as easy as it should be.

My amendment helps law enforcement officers do their jobs by creating a local law enforcement liaison at the IRS. This position will be tasked with sharing information and responding to local law enforcement when they have information or inquiries about identity theft cases. It is common sense, and it will make it easier for police officers to go to a single place at the IRS when they want to work a case.

The second amendment included in this bill deals with the IRS phone scam, and this is growing by the day. Imagine sitting at home when you receive a call from a threatening voice on the other end of the line that claims to be the IRS. For too many Americans, this experience is all too familiar. These criminals may ask unsuspecting citizens for their personal information, for their Social Security numbers, or even for bank account information—that has been done; it is very common—and will threaten them with arrest or other penalties if the listeners don't comply. These phone scams have become increasingly aggressive and harmful to taxpayers.

My amendment addresses this problem in practical ways. First, it requires the Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration to issue a report that identifies potential technological solutions to the phone scam.

Second, it would have the IRS provide information to callers who may be put on hold, when calling in, regarding common identity theft tax scams and how to avoid them.

We need to do all we can to make sure taxpayers are informed and armed against these scams. Identity theft and tax fraud is a growing problem in the United States of America. As technology changes and as criminal syndicates target American citizens' tax returns, we have an obligation to address the issue.

This bill does not go quite as far as I would have liked, and I urge my colleagues to take a look at H.R. 3981. I am also proud to be a cosponsor of Congressman JOHN LEWIS' bill, the Taxpayer Protection Act of 2016, which takes additional steps to increase funding for taxpayer services and to end the use of private debt collectors.

This bill is a step in the right direction. I congratulate its sponsor as it is a good example of how we can work together across the aisle and find commonsense solutions for the American people. I hope this is a harbinger of things to come. Who knows?

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RENACCI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support H.R. 3832. Mr. RENACCI and I are very good friends, as I am with Mr. LEWIS, and it is good to see Mr. PASCRELL here today.

The gentleman is right in that it is nice to see us working together to do something about people. This is about people. This is policy that concerns people, and it works in the right direction. I don't think there is anything quite as unnerving as finding out that somebody has stolen your identity. I think Shakespeare sums it up right in Othello by putting it really succinctly when he says: ''But he that filches from me my good name, robs me of that which not enriches him, and makes me poor indeed.''

□ 1615

Now, Pennsylvania is sixth in population but second when it comes to fraud, tax fraud. This is incredible that this could happen.

As we sit here today—and as Mr. PASCRELL so clearly pointed out, and Mr. RENACCI—this is about protecting people from people who wish to do them harm. They not only wish to take their tax returns, but it robs them of their identity. There is nothing that could be more chilling than losing your identity.

As we look at how this goes forward—and I think that this phone fraud is the one that is particularly interesting. When the IRS calls on you, it is not on the phone. It is in writing. And I tell constituents all the time, I also have received those calls saying that: Hey, you know what? You need to get in touch with us right now. We can handle this over the phone with you.

I said: Fine. You know what? Leave your name and number, and I will get back to you because I am really busy right now.

That is followed by a very quick click.

There is so much going on in our world today. We are so vulnerable at every single turn. We put so much information out there on ourselves. This is a piece of legislation that protects people. It protects not only their returns, but protects their identity.

So I am glad that Mr. RENACCI has done this with Mr. LEWIS and my good friend Mr. PASCRELL. We stand here today with the same purpose, and that is to protect the people who sent us here to represent them. It is the least we can do.

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

I just want to quickly say that what is really happening out there is that many seniors are being preyed upon. When you get a threatening phone call, you don't know what to think. And when you are up there in age, as some of us are, Mr. KELLY, you don't know what to expect, and you don't know who to turn to.

So this is very important, what Mr. RENACCI is putting forth right now. I just want everyone to understand that. It has good bipartisan support, and I hope that we can move this very, very quickly.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RENACCI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED).

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding.

I rise today, Mr. Speaker, to join my colleagues on both sides of the aisle—Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. RENACCI, and Mr. KELLY—in a common refrain. What Mr. RENACCI, Mr. LEWIS, and Mr. PASCRELL have identified here is something we have been working on in the committee for quite some time, and that is to make sure that we have a tax administration and a Tax Code that respects the privacy of individuals.

When that privacy is violated—I cannot speak like my colleague from Pennsylvania and quote Shakespeare, as I am a simple country lawyer from western New York—simply, what we need to do is to stand on the side of our taxpayers. When tax fraud occurs, real people suffer as a result of it.

What Mr. RENACCI and all of us have come together here to support are simple, commonsense reforms that are going to help people out like Terry. Terry is from Hornell in my district. He reached out to us, Mr. Speaker, about 1½ years to 2 years ago. He, too, was the victim of identity fraud and identity theft.

When he went to file his return, he found out that he would not be getting that refund because someone had already stolen that money from the U.S. Government. Terry relied on that money, Mr. Speaker. He needed that money. After many phone calls, after many efforts from our office, we were able to work it out and get that taken care of for Terry.

Terry is representative of millions of Americans who have found themselves in this situation, just like Mr. RENACCI did. So I applaud Mr. RENACCI for developing these commonsense reforms that are going to give a point of contact at the IRS, that are going to make sure when people engage in identity theft in the tax arena that there are real penalties and consequences to that behavior.

I strongly support this legislation, Mr. Speaker, and I urge my colleagues, just as has been demonstrated here today, to come together as we care deeply about the American taxpayer and stand for them as the victims of this crime.

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

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

I again want to thank my colleague, Mr. LEWIS, for his work with me and this legislation. I also truly want to thank Mr. PASCRELL. As he said, I hope it is a sign of things to come, where we can work together on important issues that face the American people.

I urge all Members to support H.R. 3832, the Stolen Identity Refund Fraud Prevention Act of 2016.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 3832, the Stolen Identity Refund Fraud Prevention Act of 2016, as amended. While I support the legislation's underlying goal of deterring and preventing tax-related identity theft and tax fraud, I strongly oppose the bill's expansion of mandatory minimum sentencing.

Section 5 of the bill would expand the mandatory minimums found in Title 18 Section 1028A of the United States Code. This section of Title 18 imposes a mandatory minimum sentence of two years for ''aggravated identity theft.'' Under section 5 of this bill, a violation of section 7206(b) of the Internal Revenue Code would require a judge to impose a two year mandatory minimum regardless of the circumstances of the case. While a two year sentence may be appropriate for most individuals convicted under this bill, it should be left to the discretion of the sentencing judge to determine the exact sentence based on all the relevant facts and circumstances.

Research and evidence in the past few decades has demonstrated that mandatory minimums are ineffective deterrents, waste the taxpayers' money, force judges to impose irrational sentences, and discriminate against minorities, particularly with regards to drug offenses. Unfortunately, there are too many mandatory minimums in the federal code.

Mr. Speaker, if we expect to do anything about that problem, the first step has to be to stop passing new ones. The mandatory minimums in the code today did not get there all at once—they got there one at a time, each one part of a larger bill, which on balance might have been a good idea. Therefore, the only way to stop passing new mandatory minimums is to stop passing bills that contain mandatory minimums.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to vote No on H.R. 3832.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RENACCI) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3832, 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.

REAFFIRMATION OF THE TAIWAN RELATIONS ACT AND THE SIX ASSURANCES

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 88) reaffirming the Taiwan Relations Act and the Six Assurances as the cornerstone of United States-Taiwan relations, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 88

Whereas the Cold War years cemented the close friendship between the United States and Taiwan, with Taiwan as an anti-Communist ally in the Asia-Pacific;

Whereas United States economic aid prevented Taiwan from sliding into an economic depression in the 1950s and greatly contributed to the island's later economic takeoff;

Whereas Taiwan has flourished to become a beacon of democracy in Asia and leading trade partner for the United States, and the relationship has endured for more than 65 years through many shifts in Asia's geopolitical landscape;

Whereas the strong relationship between the United States and Taiwan is based on mutually beneficial security, commercial, and cultural ties;

Whereas Deputy Assistant Secretary of State Susan Thornton stated in her testimony before the House Foreign Affairs Committee on February 11, 2016, that ''The people on Taiwan have built a prosperous, free, and orderly society with strong institutions, worthy of emulation and envy'';

Whereas Deputy Secretary of State Antony J. Blinken stated on March 29, 2016, that with Taiwan's January 2016 elections, ''the people of Taiwan showed the world again what a mature, Chinese-speaking democracy looks like'';

Whereas on January 1, 1979, when the Carter Administration established diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of China (PRC), it ended formal diplomatic ties with the Republic of China on Taiwan;

Whereas, the United States Congress acted swiftly to reaffirm the United States-Taiwan relationship with the enactment of the Taiwan Relations Act just 100 days later, ensuring the United States maintained a robust and enduring relationship with Taiwan;

Whereas the Taiwan Relations Act (Public Law 96–8) was enacted on April 10, 1979, codifying into law the basis for continued commercial, cultural, and other relations between the United States and Taiwan;

Whereas the Taiwan Relations Act was enacted ''to help maintain peace, security, and stability in the Western Pacific'', which ''are in the political, security, and economic interests of the United States and are matters of international concern'';

Whereas the United States Congress significantly strengthened the draft legislation originally submitted by the Executive Branch to include provisions concerning Taiwan's security in the Taiwan Relations Act;

Whereas then-Deputy Assistant Secretary of State Kin Moy stated in his written testimony before the House Foreign Affairs Committee on March 14, 2014, that, ''Our enduring relationship under the Taiwan Relations Act represents a unique asset for the United States and is an important multiplier of our influence in the region'', and credited the Taiwan Relations Act for having ''played such a key part in protecting Taiwan's freedom of action and U.S. interests the last 35 years in the Asia-Pacific area'';

Whereas then-Special Assistant to the President and National Security Council Senior Director for Asian Affairs Evan Medeiros noted on March 28, 2014 that the Taiwan Relations Act was ''an enduring expression to the people of Taiwan about our commitment to their well-being, their security, their economic autonomy, and their international space'';

Whereas the Taiwan Relations Act states ''the United States decision to establish diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of China rests upon the expectation that the future of Taiwan will be determined by peaceful means'';

Whereas the Taiwan Relations Act states that it is the policy of the United States to ''provide Taiwan with arms of a defensive character'' and ''to maintain the capacity of the United States to resist any resort to force or other forms of coercion that would jeopardize the security, or the social or economic system, of the people on Taiwan'';

Whereas each successive United States Administration since the enactment of the Taiwan Relations Act has provided arms of a defensive character to Taiwan;

Whereas a 2015 Department of Defense report to Congress on Military and Security Developments Involving the People's Republic of China stated that, ''Preparing for potential conflict in the Taiwan Strait remains the focus and primary driver of China's military investment'';

Whereas the United States has an abiding interest in the preservation of cross-Strait peace and stability, and in peace and stability in the entire Asia-Pacific region;

Whereas on July 14, 1982, as the United States negotiated with the People's Republic of China over the wording of a joint communique' related to United States arms sales to Taiwan, President Ronald Reagan instructed his representative in Taiwan, American Institute in Taiwan (AIT) Director James R. Lilley, to relay a set of assurances to Taiwan's then-President Chiang Ching-kuo;

Whereas in House and Senate testimony immediately after the issuance of the August 17, 1982, Joint Communique' with the PRC, then-Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs John H. Holdridge stated on behalf of the Executive Branch that—

(1) ''. . .[W]e did not agree to set a date certain for ending arms sales to Taiwan'';

(2) ''. . .[W]e see no mediation role for the United States'' between Taiwan and the PRC;

(3) ''. . .[N]or will we attempt to exert pressure on Taiwan to enter into negotiations with the PRC'';

(4) ''. . .[T]here has been no change in our longstanding position on the issue of sovereignty over Taiwan'';

(5) ''We have no plans to seek'' revisions to the Taiwan Relations Act; and

(6) the August 17 Communique', ''should not be read to imply that we have agreed to engage in prior consultations with Beijing on arms sales to Taiwan'';

Whereas these assurances, first delivered to Taiwan's president by AIT Director Lilley, have come to be known as the Six Assurances;

Whereas in testimony before the House Foreign Affairs Committee on October 4, 2011, then-Assistant Secretary of State Kurt Campbell stated that, ''[The] Taiwan Relations Act, plus the so-called Six Assurances and Three Communique's, form the foundation of our overall approach'', to relations with Taiwan; and

Whereas in testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on April 3, 2014, Assistant Secretary of State Daniel R. Russel stated that the Six Assurances ''continue to play an important part as an element of our approach to Taiwan and the situation across the strait'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress—

(1) affirms that the Taiwan Relations Act and the Six Assurances are both cornerstones of United States relations with Taiwan; and

(2) urges the President and Department of State to affirm the Six Assurances publicly, proactively, and consistently as a cornerstone of United States-Taiwan relations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous material in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 88.

I would like to recognize Mr. CHABOT for his longstanding dedication and support for the people of Taiwan.

Mr. Speaker, Taiwan has always been a strong friend and critical ally to the United States. Congress has been central to this relationship, championing a strong relationship with Taiwan through landmark measures like the Taiwan Relations Act and through pressing successive administrations to fulfill their obligation to sell defensive arms to Taiwan.

Taiwan is now the United States' ninth largest trading partner, and it is in the U.S.' interest to have a stable and a prosperous Taiwan.

It is an exciting time in Taiwan. In January, a free and fair election once again demonstrated the strength and vibrancy of Taiwan's democratic system. And in 3 days, we expect the newly elected President to be inaugurated in a peaceful transfer of power from one party to another.

The people of Taiwan should be proud of their prosperous, free, and democratic society and what they have been able to accomplish, despite having to face countless challenges outside of their control.

Mr. Speaker, when the U.S. established diplomatic relations with the

People's Republic of China on January 1, 1979, the U.S. Congress acted just 100 days later to pass the Taiwan Relations Act, which would ensure that the United States maintained a robust and enduring relationship with Taiwan.

Three years later, in 1982, President Reagan deepened the U.S. commitment to Taiwan by issuing the Six Assurances to Taiwan, which included treating Taiwan as we would treat any one of our allies when making decisions on defensive arms sales, not setting a date for termination of arms sales, and not altering the Taiwan Relations Act.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is especially important when it comes to the Six Assurances. When the Reagan administration delivered the Six Assurances, it was by way of a verbal agreement and has largely remained as such since 1982.

Today, by passing this resolution, Congress is going on record that the cornerstone of U.S.-Taiwan policy is not only the Taiwan Relations Act, but also the Six Assurances. This important measure solidifies President Reagan's commitment to Taiwan and urges this administration and the ones that follow to publicly, proactively, and consistently take the Six Assurances into account when handling United States-Taiwan relations.

I am proud that in the 114th Congress we have already passed legislation which supports Taiwan's inclusion in INTERPOL and that we are now also passing a measure which will reassure our friends in Taiwan and press the administration to continue to abide by the Six Assurances. I am also proud that maintaining a strong relationship with Taiwan continues to be a bipartisan issue.

I appreciate Mr. ELIOT ENGEL's support on this initiative, the ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee. Let me say that, by passing this resolution, we, the United States Congress, are yet again taking another step toward strengthening the U.S.-Taiwan partnership.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise in support of this resolution.

Let me once again thank Chairman ED ROYCE and our colleague from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), who introduced this measure.

At the end of this week, Taiwan will swear in a new President, marking another peaceful democratic transition in that country. I have had the pleasure of meeting the President-elect, Dr. Tsai Ing-wen, several times as well as the country's outgoing leader, President Ma. And though they represent different political parties, it is clear that they are both fully committed to Taiwan's vibrant democracy and open society. Those values are also at the root of the close ties between the United States and Taiwan.

This resolution affirms our commitment to the Taiwan Relations Act and the Six Assurances. These are the measures that have underpinned our relationship with the Taiwanese people since we normalized relations with the People's Republic of China.

As Taiwan prepares for this week's political transition, it is vital that the United States send a clear signal that we continue to stand with the people of Taiwan on a range of issues, from Taiwan's defense to its growing role on the global stage, to its commitment to freedom and democracy.

So I am happy to support this measure. We should continue to stand with our partners in Taiwan, and I wish the people of Taiwan well as they swear in a new President this week. I might add, it is the first woman President of Taiwan.

I urge support for this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT). He is chairman of the Small Business Committee, a senior member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the author of this measure.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 88.

I was one of the original founders of the Congressional Taiwan Caucus. It was a bipartisan group of people who founded it. I have been the chairman of the Foreign Affairs' Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific. I have been a longtime friend of Taiwan. I have been there probably a dozen times over the years.

This important legislation reaffirms the Taiwan Relations Act and the Six Assurances as cornerstones of U.S.-Taiwan relations.

As a longtime supporter of Taiwan, as I mentioned, I believe that the U.S.-Taiwan relationship is absolutely vital to the security and sustainability not just of Taiwan, but of the whole region.

Taiwan is a close ally, one that truly believes and practices freedom and democracy. We witnessed this firsthand this past January, as some of my colleagues have mentioned, when the people of Taiwan held democratic national elections resulting in the election of Tsai Ing-wen. I want to congratulate her and wish her best wishes in her role as President of Taiwan.

Taiwan elects their people democratically, unlike the PRC right across the Taiwan Strait. As we know, China has been bullying Taiwan for many years now. It is unfortunate that the PRC, China, doesn't follow, as an example, the people of Taiwan, who democratically elect their leaders.

□ 1630

Taiwan faces an unrelenting threat from China, which has nearly 1,600 ballistic missiles aimed at this small island. I remember when I came to Congress about 20 years ago, we talked about how scary it was that there were a couple hundred, 200 or 300 missiles aimed at Taiwan at that time. That has increased over the years to 1,600 missiles aimed at Taiwan from China.

Although Taiwan enjoys de facto independence, China's ultimate goal is to take over Taiwan, to annex Taiwan, whatever the people of Taiwan believe. We absolutely cannot let that happen. China's ultimate goal, as I say, is the annexation of the island. We have all seen the growing hostilities in the East China Sea and South China Sea over the last couple years.

I believe that this legislation underscores the point that the Taiwan Strait continues to be one of the potential flash points on the globe. We have seen China literally building islands and then militarizing those islands, much to the chagrin of all their neighbors in the region, from Japan to Vietnam, to Taiwan, to the Philippines, and on and on. That is what the PRC, China, has been up to. Any sort of solution between China and Taiwan should be reached in a peaceful and fair manner and only with the agreement of the people of Taiwan.

Mr. Speaker, April 10, 2016, marked the 37th anniversary of the enactment of the Taiwan Relations Act, the TRA. This act codifies into law an institutional framework and legal basis for continued interaction between the U.S. and Taiwan, and it serves to maintain peace and stability in the western Pacific.

When President Ronald Reagan agreed to sign the U.S.-China third communique in 1982, he was aware of the communique's effect on Taiwan and fully recognized that Taiwan needed to be reassured that they would not be abandoned—and they will not be abandoned—by the United States.

In order to reinforce American support for Taiwan, the United States issued the Six Assurances. The Six Assurances provided a framework for sustaining the unique relationship between the United States and our ally, Taiwan. Mr. Speaker, they are as valid today as they were back in 1982. They rightfully function along with the TRA, as cornerstones of U.S.-Taiwan relations.

I encourage my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to close.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that the democracies of the world stand together to help strengthen freedom, justice, and opportunity. That is why the United States and Taiwan have been such natural partners over the decades. Even as we deal with the People's Republic of China, we must continue to stand with our friends in Taiwan.

Again, I am delighted that Dr. Tsai Ing-wen is the first female President of Taiwan. Perhaps we will follow suit in November with the first woman President. This resolution reaffirms just how important that relationship is; and as Taiwan moves forward with this week's political transition, that country's people should know that they have an enduring friend in the United States.

Again, I commend Mr. CHABOT for his insight in putting forward this resolution. I thank our chairman. I support this measure.

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), the chairman emeritus of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their wonderful leadership for many years on the issue of strengthening U.S.-Taiwan relations. I also want to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), my dear friend, for authoring this important resolution of which I am proud to be a cosponsor.

H. Con. Res. 88 reaffirms the Taiwan Relations Act and the Six Assurances as the cornerstones of U.S.-Taiwan relations, guidelines to which there should be no doubt about the commitment of the United States to our neighbor.

In January, Taiwan once again demonstrated that it is one of the world's strongest and most vibrant democracies, a great partner, and I congratulate President-elect Tsai on her tremendous election and all of the people of Taiwan on their continued democratic success.

Taiwan is truly a beacon of freedom in the Pacific, serving as an inspiration for those still suffering under repressive regimes, and is living proof of what can be achieved with liberty and self-government, principles that undergird both of our nations and form the foundation for our mutual stability, for our security, for our prosperity.

As Taiwan's neighbor China continues raising tensions in the region, it is crucial that the United States provide Taiwan with the capability to defend herself against Chinese aggression, whether that aggression is political in nature, economic, or military. Both China and Taiwan must know that our commitment to Taiwan has not wavered one bit.

Taiwan is an essential U.S. ally. It is our friend. It is our partner. I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), my friend, for authoring this resolution, for reaffirming our commitment to the Taiwan Relations Act, to the Six Assurances, and to the Taiwanese people here today.

The United States will continue to stand shoulder to shoulder with Taiwan. I look forward, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Chairman, and ranking member, to even greater cooperation and friendship with Taiwan in the years ahead.

I thank the gentleman for the time, and I thank the ranking member for his leadership and Mr. CHABOT for authoring this important resolution.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support H. Con. Res. 88 and its effects on U.S. foreign relations.

Since 1979, the United States has enjoyed a friendly and productive relationship that has been supported by the passage of the Taiwan Relations Act and Six Assurances. The Taiwan Relations Act was a monumental piece of legislation that is directly responsible for fostering the longstanding friendship between the United States and Taiwan. The Six Assurances also played a significant role, setting the principles by which the United States would mediate its relationship with Taiwan and China.

As security concerns have increased in the South Pacific, our allies in the region have contributed significantly to the safety and economic growth of the region. As a member of the Congressional Taiwan Caucus, I am continually supportive of efforts to strengthen the friendship between our two countries.

I would like to commend Congressman CHABOT, Chairman ROYCE, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs for their leadership on this issue and their continued efforts in championing the close ties we have with Taiwan. I encourage all of my colleagues to support this measure so we can continue to ensure a bright future for both Taiwan and for the United States.

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

As one of the coauthors of this legislation, I really want to thank Representative CHABOT for introducing this measure and for being a longtime champion on Taiwan, especially as he was chairman of the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific last Congress. I want to thank Mr. ENGEL as well for his efforts on this legislation.

We have a commitment to democracy, and we share that with Taiwan. We share this commitment to the rule of law, to human rights. Frankly, Taiwan serves as an example of what can be built based upon these shared principles, and so do we.

I think the Six Assurances are a critical element of U.S.-Taiwan policy, but obviously they are not consistently referenced or referred to as a cornerstone of U.S.-Taiwan policy alongside the Taiwan Relations Act, which is considered that cornerstone. Passage of H. Con. Res. 88 will put that longstanding verbal agreement onto paper, and, in turn, it will call on the administration and future administrations in unambiguous terms to publicly abide by the assurances offered by President Reagan.

Taiwan is one of America's closest friends, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H. Con. Res. 88.

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

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 88, reaffirming the Taiwan Relations Act and the Six Assurances as the cornerstone of U.S.-Taiwan relations.

As a co-Chair of the Congressional Taiwan Caucus, I want to thank my colleague and founding co-Chair of the Taiwan Caucus, STEVE CHABOT, for introducing this measure.

When discussing the origins, stakeholders, and impact of the Taiwan Relations Act (TRA), it is important to note the significant role Congress played in amending the draft legislation the Executive Branch proposed for the maintenance of unofficial relations with Taiwan.

I want to thank the Chairman and Ranking Member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee for working with me on an amendment to H. Con. Res. 88 that credits Congress with significantly strengthening the TRA and the codified U.S. commitment to Taiwan.

The draft legislative text proposed by the Executive Branch published in the March 1979 Department of State Bulletin included three simple titles to provide the legal authority for the maintenance of commercial, cultural, and other relations with Taiwan.

However, the Taiwan Relations Act enacted into law bears little resemblance to the text published in the March 1979 Bulletin.

Through the legislative process in both the House of Representatives and Senate, Congress left its mark on our enduring commitment to Taiwan in several ways, most notably by adding the security commitments made in Section 2(b)(5) and Section 3 of the TRA.

The U.S. and Taiwan have since developed a dynamic relationship based on our shared values, deep economic ties, security relationship, and a history of bilateral collaboration.

It is in the tradition of Congressional stewardship of the U.S.-Taiwan relationship that I urge my colleagues to support H. Con. Res. 88.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 88, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The title of the concurrent resolution was amended so as to read: ''Concurrent resolution reaffirming the Taiwan Relations Act and the Six Assurances as cornerstones of United States-Taiwan relations.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING AUTHORITY TO MAINTAIN AND OPERATE A TOLL BRIDGE ACROSS THE RIO GRANDE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2143) to provide for the authority for the successors and assigns of the Starr-Camargo Bridge Company to maintain and operate a toll bridge across the Rio Grande near Rio Grande City, Texas, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 2143

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. STARR-CAMARGO BRIDGE.

Public Law 87–532 (76 Stat. 153) is amended—

(1) in the first section, in subsection (a)(2)—

(A) by inserting '', and its successors and assigns,'' after ''State of Texas'';

(B) by inserting ''consisting of not more than 14 lanes'' after ''approaches thereto''; and

(C) by striking ''and for a period of sixty-six years from the date of completion of such bridge,'';

(2) in section 2, by inserting ''and its successors and assigns,'' after ''companies'';

(3) by redesignating sections 3, 4, and 5 as sections 4, 5, and 6, respectively;

(4) by inserting after section 2 the following:

''SEC. 3. RIGHTS OF STARR-CAMARGO BRIDGE COMPANY AND SUCCESSORS AND ASSIGNS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Starr-Camargo Bridge Company and its successors and assigns shall have the rights and privileges granted to the B and P Bridge Company and its successors and assigns under section 2 of the Act of May 1, 1928 (45 Stat. 471, chapter 466).

''(b) REQUIREMENT.—In exercising the rights and privileges granted under subsection (a), the Starr-Camargo Bridge Company and its successors and assigns shall act in accordance with—

''(1) just compensation requirements;

''(2) public proceeding requirements; and

''(3) any other requirements applicable to the exercise of the rights referred to in subsection (a) under the laws of the State of Texas.''; and

(5) in section 4 (as redesignated by paragraph (3))—

(A) by inserting ''and its successors and assigns,'' after ''such company'';

(B) by striking ''or'' after ''public agency,'';

(C) by inserting ''or to a corporation,'' after ''international bridge authority or commission,''; and

(D) by striking ''authority, or commission'' each place it appears and inserting ''authority, commission, or corporation''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and to extend their remarks and to include any extraneous material in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 2143, the Starr-Camargo Bridge act, introduced by Senator CORNYN and by Representative CUELLAR of Texas. With today's passage, this bill goes to the President's desk for signature.

The Starr-Camargo Bridge act grants permanent authority to continue operating and maintaining the international bridge that connects Rio Grande City, Texas, with Mexican cities such as Monterrey and Mexico City. This bridge is one of 28 vehicle border crossings on the Texas-Mexico border and one of two privately owned crossing facilities. The Starr-Camargo Bridge has had continued growth in commercial traffic since 2009, and it plays an important role in facilitating legitimate trade and travel in the region.

This bill, S. 2143, would permanently extend the authority for the Starr-Camargo Bridge Company to operate the bridge. It would grant the bridge company the same rights and privileges already granted to this body to the B and P Bridge Company in Progreso, Texas. By granting this authority, we would be incentivizing the Starr-Camargo Bridge Company to continue maintaining and expanding the bridge's capacity to keep up with growing trade and commerce along the Texas border with Mexico.

This legislation received the full support of the Committee on Foreign Affairs when it was marked up last month.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this measure, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me once again thank our chairman, ED ROYCE, for bringing forward this bipartisan measure and for his continued good leadership on the committee. I also want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR), my good friend, who introduced the House version of this legislation which has already passed the Senate.

When it comes to our southern neighbor, Mexico, lately we have been hearing far too much about building walls. Mexico is a critically important partner to the United States. Our people share long, close ties, so we should be talking about building bridges, Mr. Speaker, not building walls.

A few weeks ago, the Senate helped build a bridge by confirming a new Ambassador to Mexico, Roberta Jacobson. This was long overdue. She is excellent, and we are glad to have her on her way to Mexico City now.

Today, with this bill, we are talking about, quite literally, strengthening a bridge between the United States and Mexico in the years ahead. The Starr-Camargo Bridge connects Rio Grande, Texas, with Monterrey and Ciudad Camargo in Mexico. The legal authority to operate this bridge will expire in 16 years. That may seem like a long way off, but as a result of that end date, we have already started to see a constraint in long-term investments. This bill would eliminate that expiration date.

We have done the same thing before. The Weslaco-Progreso International Bridge once had a sunsetting authorization, and Congress acted to lift that deadline.

This bill doesn't cost the U.S. taxpayers a penny, but it does clear the way for this bridge to remain an important conduit between our countries for years to come. It also sends an important message from those of us actually responsible for making laws and advancing American foreign policy.

Mexico is an extremely important partner to the United States, and bridges—not barriers—will help that friendship to thrive. I support this measure.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1645

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR).

Mr. CUELLAR. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to thank Chairman ED ROYCE for his leadership and for the help of his staff on this particular bill.

Also, I thank my friend, the ranking member, Mr. ELIOT ENGEL, and his staff also for supporting and helping us on this particular bill.

As the lead sponsor of this bill, I rise in support of this legislation. Mr. Speaker, this bill will provide equity in the law and removes a level of uncertainty.

In 1962, Congress authorized the Starr-Camargo International Bridge Company to construct, operate, and maintain the private toll bridge between the United States and Mexico near Rio Grande City, which is a city in my district.

Congress, in drafting this original authorization, included a sunset clause of 66 years. In doing so, Congress left a level of uncertainty in the law, as it did not state what should happen to the bridge once the 66 years went by.

Congress has authorized private toll bridges or other bridges along the U.S.-Mexico border before, yet previously had not included this sunset on the authorization. This sunset clause, while still a number of years away, has already begun to create issues for the owner and operator of the Starr-Camargo Bridge bill.

Due to this uncertainty around what should happen to this bridge should the authorization lapse, they are unable to get much-needed long-term financing to make improvements and finance the long-term maintenance and operations of the bridge. This bill will give the Starr-Camargo Bridge permanent status.

The Starr-Camargo Bridge plays an important role in our Nation's commerce and the economy of south Texas. The bridge supports 200 to 300 commercial trucks per day, consisting of construction materials as well as fresh fruits and vegetables coming north and machinery, oil, and recyclable products going south. The bridge further supports the crossing of around 4,000 cars a day.

Today the United States trades an estimated $531 billion in goods and services with Mexico, our Nation's third largest trading partner, and this trade is only expected to grow in the future. In order for our Nation to take

full advantage of this trade, we must be clear in these sorts of uncertainties in the law.

This bill, by ending the authorization's sunset, will afford the bridge greater opportunities to pursue and finance projects that will enhance and expand the capacity of the bridge and supporting facilities and further improve trade between the United States and Mexico.

I would like to thank Senator CORNYN for working with me on this legislation and for taking that lead and, as I said a few minutes ago, Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL for their support as well as their staffs.

I also would like to thank local leaders, Starr County Judge Eloy Vera and State Representative Ryan Guillen, for their support of this legislation.

I ask my colleagues to support this important bill.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, in closing, again I want to emphasize that Mexico is a vital partner to the United States in terms of trade, security, and a wide range of regional concerns. We need to keep all the channels between our countries flowing, and that includes the physical connections between the U.S. and Mexico.

This bill would help strengthen an important bridge between our countries and, at the same time, signal just how important we consider this friendship. I support this measure. I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR).

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

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

I want to thank Representative CUELLAR for his steadfast leadership to ensure the House's consideration of this legislation and that we move forward on this.

I thought I would also point out that this bill comes at no cost to the taxpayer. What it does instead is incentivizes the private sector to invest and maintain this important commercial border crossing. That is the point here.

While the actual end date for the bridge's authority is still some years away, the lack of that permanent authority has already begun to constrain the financing of long-term improvements that will help make the crossing more efficient and secure.

So I thank Mr. CUELLAR again and, also, Mr. CASTRO and Mr. POE, both members of the committee who have also been strong supporters.

I thank Mr. ENGEL for helping to ensure that our border infrastructure is maintained and modernized to keep pace with the growing legitimate commercial activity across our southern border.

I encourage my colleagues to support this measure.

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 California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 2143.

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.

FRANK R. WOLF INTERNATIONAL RELIGIOUS FREEDOM ACT

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1150) to amend the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 to improve the ability of the United States to advance religious freedom globally through enhanced diplomacy, training, counterterrorism, and foreign assistance efforts, and through stronger and more flexible political responses to religious freedom violations and violent extremism worldwide, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1150

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE AND TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Frank R. Wolf International Religious Freedom Act''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title and table of contents.
Sec. 2. Findings; Policy.
Sec. 3. Definitions.

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF STATE ACTIVITIES

Sec. 101. Office on International Religious Freedom; Ambassador at Large for International Religious Freedom.
Sec. 102. Annual Report on International Religious Freedom.
Sec. 103. Training for Foreign Service officers; report.
Sec. 104. Prisoner lists and issue briefs on religious freedom concerns.

TITLE II—NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

Sec. 201. Special Adviser for International Religious Freedom.

TITLE III—PRESIDENTIAL ACTIONS

Sec. 301. Non-state actor designations.
Sec. 302. Presidential actions in response to particularly severe violations of religious freedom.
Sec. 303. Report to Congress.
Sec. 304. Presidential waiver.
Sec. 305. Publication in the Federal Register.

TITLE IV—PROMOTION OF RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

Sec. 401. Assistance for promoting religious freedom.

TITLE V—DESIGNATED PERSONS LIST FOR PARTICULARLY SEVERE VIOLATIONS OF RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

Sec. 501. Designated Persons List for Particularly Severe Violations of Religious Freedom.

TITLE VI—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Sec. 601. Miscellaneous provisions.
Sec. 602. Clerical amendments.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS; POLICY.

(a) FINDINGS.—Section 2(a) of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6401(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3), by inserting immediately prior to the penultimate sentence the following new sentence: ''The freedom of thought, conscience, and religion is understood to protect theistic and non-theistic beliefs as well as the right not to profess or practice any religion.''; and

(2) in paragraph (6)—

(A) by inserting ''and the specific targeting of non-theists, humanists, and atheists because of their beliefs'' after ''religious persecution''; and

(B) by inserting ''and in regions where non-state actors exercise significant political power and influence'' after ''religious majorities''.

(b) POLICY.—Section 2(b) of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6401(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(6) Because the promotion of international religious freedom protects human rights, advances democracy abroad, and advances United States interests in stability, security, and development globally, the promotion of international religious freedom requires new and evolving policies, and diplomatic responses that are drawn from the expertise of the national security agencies, the diplomatic services, and other governmental agencies and nongovernmental organizations, and are coordinated across and carried out by the entire range of Federal agencies.''.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

Section 3 of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6402) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (13)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by redesignating clauses (iv) and (v) as clauses (v) and (vi), respectively; and

(ii) by inserting after clause (iii) the following:

''(iv) not professing a particular religion, or any religion;''; and

(B) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) by inserting ''conscience, non-theistic views, or'' before ''religious belief or practice''; and

(ii) by inserting after ''forced religious conversion'' the following: '', forcibly compelling non-believers or non-theists to recant their beliefs or to convert''; and

(2) by adding at the end, the following new paragraphs:

''(14) SPECIAL WATCH LIST.—The term 'Special Watch List' means the Special Watch List as contained in the Executive Summary to the Annual Report and described in section 102(b)(1)(F)(iii).

''(15) NON-STATE ACTOR.—The term 'non-state actor' means a nonsovereign entity that exercises significant political power and is able to exert influence at a national or international level but does not belong to or ally itself to any particular country and often employs illegal violence in pursuit of its objectives.

''(16) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term 'institution of higher education' has the meaning given that term in section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001)''.

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF STATE ACTIVITIES

SEC. 101. OFFICE ON INTERNATIONAL RELIGIOUS FREEDOM; AMBASSADOR AT LARGE FOR INTERNATIONAL RELIGIOUS FREEDOM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 101 of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6411) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by adding at the end before the period the following: '', and shall report directly to the Secretary of State'';

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking ''responsibility'' and inserting ''responsibilities'';

(ii) by striking ''shall be to advance'' and inserting the following: ''shall be to—

''(A) advance'';

(iii) in subparagraph (A) (as so added), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(iv) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(B) integrate United States international religious freedom policies and strategies into the foreign policy efforts of the United States.'';

(B) in paragraph (2), by inserting ''the principal adviser to'' before ''the Secretary of State'';

(C) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(C) contacts with nongovernmental organizations that have an impact on the state of religious freedom in their respective societies or regions, or internationally.'';

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

(E) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

''(4) COORDINATION RESPONSIBILITIES.—In order to promote religious freedom as an interest of United States foreign policy, the Ambassador at Large—

''(A) shall coordinate international religious freedom policies across all programs, projects, and activities of the United States; and

''(B) should participate in any interagency processes on issues in which the promotion of international religious freedom policy can advance United States national security interests, including in democracy promotion, stability, security, and development globally.''; and

(3) in subsection (d), by striking ''staff for the Office'' and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting ''individuals to fill at least 25 full-time equivalent staff positions, and any other temporary staff positions as needed to compile, edit, and manage the Annual Report under the direct supervision of the Ambassador at Large, and for the conduct of investigations by the Office and for necessary travel to carry out the provisions of this Act. The Secretary of State should also provide to the Ambassador at Large funds that are sufficient to carry out the duties described in this section, including as necessary representation funds, in amounts comparable to those provided to other Ambassadors at Large in the Department of State.''.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—Because international religious freedom is a vital foreign policy interest and one that needs coordination across many regional bureaus and among Special Envoys and Special Representatives with overlapping mandates, the Secretary of State should consider elevating the office of International Religious Freedom and the position of the Ambassador-at-Large for International Religious Freedom to the Office of the Secretary, similar to other Ambassador-at-Large positions that now report directly to the Secretary. Providing the Office of International Religious Freedom with additional resources and status will demonstrate both the strategic importance of international religious freedom policy within the State Department bureaucracy and show persecuted religious groups globally that the U.S. gives priority to the protection and promotion of international religious freedom as mandated by the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998.

SEC. 102. ANNUAL REPORT ON INTERNATIONAL RELIGIOUS FREEDOM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 102(b)(1) of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6412(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''September 1'' and inserting ''May 1'';

(2) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) by redesignating clause (iv) as clause (vii); and

(B) by inserting after clause (iii) the following new clauses:

''(iv) particularly severe violations of religious freedom in that country in the case of a foreign country with respect to which a government does not exist or the government does not control its territory;

''(v) an identification of prisoners in that country pursuant to section 108;

''(vi) any action taken by the government of that country to censor religious content, communications, or worship activities online, including descriptions of the targeted religious group, the content, communication, or activities censored, and the means used.'';

(3) in subparagraph (B), in the matter preceding clause (i)—

(A) by inserting ''persecution of lawyers, politicians, or other human rights advocates seeking to defend the rights of members of religious groups or highlight religious freedom violations, prohibitions on ritual animal slaughter or male infant circumcision,'' after ''entire religions,''; and

(B) by inserting ''policies that ban or restrict the public manifestation of religious belief and the peaceful involvement of religious groups or their members in the political life of each such foreign country,'' after ''such groups,'';

(4) in subparagraph (C)—

(A) by striking ''A description'' and inserting ''A comprehensive description'';

(B) by striking ''policies in support'' and inserting ''diplomatic and political coordination efforts, and other policies in support'';

and

(C) by adding at the end before the period the following: '', and a comprehensive and country-specific analysis of the impact of actions by the United States on the status of religious freedom in each such country''; and

(5) in subparagraph (F)—

(A) in clause (i)—

(i) by striking ''section 402(b)(1)'' and inserting ''section 402(b)(1)(B)(i)''; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following: ''Any country in which a non-state actor designated as an entity of particular concern for religious freedom under section 301 of the Frank R. Wolf International Religious Freedom Act is located shall be included in this section of the report.''

(B) by adding at the end the following new clause:

''(iii) SPECIAL WATCH LIST.—A list, to be known as the 'Special Watch List', which shall identify each country that engages in or tolerates severe violations of religious freedom during the previous year but which the President determines does not meet, at the time of the publication of the Annual Report, all of the criteria described in section 3(11) for designation under section 402(b)(1).''.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the original intent of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6401 et seq.) was to require annual reports from both the Department of State and the Commission on International Religious Freedom to be delivered each year, during the same calendar year, and with at least 5 months separating these reports, in order to provide updated information for policy-makers, Members of Congress, and nongovernmental organizations; and

(2) given that the annual Country Reports on Human Rights Practices no longer contain updated information on religious freedom conditions globally, it is important that the Department of State and the Commission work together to fulfill the original intent of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998.

SEC. 103. TRAINING FOR FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS; REPORT.

(a) AMENDMENT TO FOREIGN SERVICE ACT OF 1980.—Section 708 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 4028) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (b) and (c) as subsections (d) and (e), respectively;

(2) in subsection (d), as redesignated, by striking ''The Secretary of State'' and inserting ''REFUGEES.—The Secretary of State'';

(3) in subsection (e), as redesignated, by striking ''The Secretary of State'' and inserting ''CHILD SOLDIERS.—The Secretary of State'';

(4) by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following:

''(a) DEVELOPMENT OF CURRICULUM.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State shall develop a curriculum for training United States Foreign Service officers in the scope and strategic value of international religious freedom, how violations of international religious freedom harm fundamental United States interests, how the advancement of international religious freedom can advance such interests, how United States international religious freedom policy should be carried out in practice by United States diplomats and other Foreign Service officers, and the relevance and relationship of international religious freedom to United States defense, diplomacy, development, and public affairs efforts. The Secretary of State shall ensure the availability of sufficient resources to develop and implement such curriculum.

''(2) ROLE OF OTHER OFFICIALS.—The Secretary of State shall carry out paragraph (1)—

''(A) with the assistance of the Ambassador at Large for International Religious Freedom appointed under section 101(b) of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998;

''(B) in coordination with the Director of the George P. Shultz National Foreign Affairs Training Center and other Federal officials as appropriate; and

''(C) in consultation with the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom established in section 201(a) of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 and other relevant stakeholders.

''(b) TRAINING PROGRAM.—Not later than the date that is one year after the date of the enactment of the Frank R. Wolf International Religious Freedom Act, the Director of the George P. Shultz National Foreign Affairs Training Center shall begin mandatory training on religious freedom for all Foreign Service officers, including all entry level officers, all officers prior to departure for posting outside the United States, and all outgoing deputy chiefs of mission and ambassadors. Such training shall, at minimum, be a separate, independent, and required segment of each of the following:

''(1) The A–100 course attended by all Foreign Service officers.

''(2) The courses required of every Foreign Service officer prior to a posting outside the United States, with segments tailored to the particular religious demography, religious freedom conditions, and United States strategies for advancing religious freedom, in each receiving country.

''(3) The courses required of all outgoing deputy chiefs of mission and ambassadors.

''(c) INFORMATION SHARING.—The curriculum and training materials developed pursuant to subsections (a) and (b) should be made available to all other Federal agencies.''.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State, with the assistance of the Ambassador at Large for International Religious Freedom, and the Director of the George P. Shultz National Foreign Affairs Training Center, shall submit to the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate a report containing a comprehensive plan for undertaking training for Foreign Service officers as required under section 708 of the Foreign Services Act of 1980, as amended by subsection (a) of this section.

SEC. 104. PRISONER LISTS AND ISSUE BRIEFS ON RELIGIOUS FREEDOM CONCERNS.

Section 108 of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6417) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by striking ''faith'' and inserting ''activities, religious freedom advocacy, or efforts to protect and advance the universally-recognized right to the freedom of religion,'';

(2) in subsection (c), by striking '', as appropriate, provide'' and insert ''make available''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(d) VICTIMS LIST MAINTAINED BY THE UNITED STATES COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL RELIGIOUS FREEDOM.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall make publicly available online and in official publications lists of persons it determines are imprisoned, detained, disappeared, placed under house arrest, tortured, or subject to forced renunciations of faith for their religious activity or religious freedom advocacy by the government of a foreign country that the Commission recommends for designation as a country of particular concern for religious freedom under section 402(b)(1) or by a non-state actor that the Commission recommends for designation as an entity of particular concern for religious freedom under section 301 of the Frank R. Wolf International Religious Freedom Act and include as much publicly-available information as possible on the conditions and circumstances of such persons.

''(2) DISCRETION.—In compiling such lists, the Commission shall exercise all appropriate discretion, including consideration of the safety and security of, and benefit to, the persons who may be included on the lists and the families of such persons.''.

TITLE II—NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

SEC. 201. SPECIAL ADVISER FOR INTERNATIONAL RELIGIOUS FREEDOM.

Section 101 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3021) is amended by striking subsection (k) and inserting the following:

''(k) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that there should be within the staff of the National Security Council a Special Adviser to the President on International Religious Freedom, whose position should be comparable to that of a director within the Executive Office of the President, with the primary responsibility to serve as a resource for executive branch officials on international religious freedom, compiling and maintaining information on the facts and circumstances of violations of religious freedom (as defined in section 3 of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998), and making relevant policy recommendations to advance United States international religious freedom policy. The Special Advisor should also assist the Ambassador-at-Large to coordinate international religious freedom policies and strategies throughout the executive branch and within any interagency policy committees where the Ambassador-at-Large participates.''.

TITLE III—PRESIDENTIAL ACTIONS

SEC. 301. NON-STATE ACTOR DESIGNATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President shall, concurrent with the annual foreign country review required by section 402(b)(1) of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6442(b)(1))—

(1) review and identify any non-state actors operating in any such reviewed country or surrounding region that have engaged in particularly severe violations of religious freedom; and

(2) designate, in a manner consistent with such Act, each such non-state actor as an entity of particular concern for religious freedom.

(b) REPORT.—Whenever the President designates a non-state actor under subsection (a) as an entity of particular concern for religious freedom, the President shall, as soon as practicable after the designation is made, submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report detailing the reasons for such designation.

(c) ACTIONS.—The President should take specific actions to address severe violations of religious freedom of non-state actors that are designated under subsection (a), including taking actions commensurate to those actions described in section 405 of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6445).

(d) DEPARTMENT OF STATE ANNUAL REPORT.—The Secretary of State should include information detailing the reasons the President designated a non-state actor as an entity of particular concern for religious freedom under subsection (a) in the Annual Report required in section 102(b)(1) of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6442(b)(1)).

(e) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of State should work with Congress to create new political, financial, and diplomatic tools to address severe violations of religious freedom by non-state actors and to update the actions the President can take in section 405 of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998.

(f) DETERMINATIONS OF RESPONSIBLE PARTIES.—In order to appropriately target Presidential actions under the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 in response, the President shall with respect to each non-state actor designated as an entity of particular concern for religious freedom under subsection (a), seek to determine the specific officials or members thereof that are responsible for the particularly severe violations of religious freedom engaged in or tolerated by that entity.

(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms ''appropriate congressional committees'', ''non-state actor'', and ''particularly severe violations of religious freedom'' have the meanings given such terms in section 3 of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6402), as amended by section 3 of this Act.

SEC. 302. PRESIDENTIAL ACTIONS IN RESPONSE TO PARTICULARLY SEVERE VIOLATIONS OF RELIGIOUS FREEDOM.

Section 402 of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6442) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by amending subparagraph (A) to read as follows:

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date on which each Annual Report is submitted under section 102(b), the President shall—

''(i) review the status of religious freedom in each foreign country to determine whether the government of that country has engaged in or tolerated particularly severe violations of religious freedom in each such country during the preceding 12 months or longer; and

''(ii) designate each country the government of which has engaged in or tolerated violations described in clause (i) as a country of particular concern for religious freedom.''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''September 1 of the respective year'' and inserting ''the date on which each Annual Report is submitted under section 102(b)'';

(B) by amending paragraph (3) to read as follows:

''(3) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Whenever the President designates a country as a country of particular concern for religious freedom under paragraph (1)(A), the President shall, not later than 90 days after the designation is made, transmit to the appropriate congressional committees—

''(i) the designation of the country, signed by the President;

''(ii) the identification, if any, of responsible parties determined under paragraph (2); and

''(iii) a description of the actions taken under subsection (c), the purposes of the actions taken, and the effectiveness of the actions taken.

''(B) REMOVAL OF DESIGNATION.—A country that is designated as a country of particular concern for religious freedom under paragraph (1)(A) shall retain such designation until the President determines and reports to the appropriate congressional committees that the country should no longer be so designated.''; and

(C) by adding at the end, the following new paragraph:

''(4) TREATMENT OF COUNTRIES ON SPECIAL WATCH LIST.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The President shall designate as a country of particular concern for religious freedom under paragraph (1)(A) any country that appears on the Special Watch List in more than 2 consecutive Annual Reports.

''(B) EXERCISE OF WAIVER AUTHORITY.—The President may waive the application of subparagraph (A) with respect to a country for up to 2 years if the President certifies to the appropriate committees of Congress that—

''(i) the country has entered into an agreement with the United States to carry out specific and credible actions to improve religious freedom conditions and end religious freedom violations;

''(ii) the country has entered into an agreement with the United Nations, the European Union, or other ally of the United States, to carry out specific and credible actions to improve religious freedom conditions and end religious freedom violations; or

''(iii) the waiver is in the national security interests of the United States.

''(C) EFFECT ON DESIGNATION AS COUNTRY OF PARTICULAR CONCERN.—The presence or absence of a country from the Special Watch List in any given year shall not preclude the designation of such country as a country of particular concern for religious freedom under paragraph (1)(A) in any such year.''; and

(2) in subsection (c)(5), in the second sentence, by inserting ''and include a description of the impact of the designation of such sanction or sanctions that exist in each country'' after ''determines satisfy the requirements of this subsection''.

SEC. 303. REPORT TO CONGRESS.

Section 404(a)(4)(A) of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6444(a)(4)(A)) is amended—

(1) in clause (iii), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new clause:

''(iv) the impact on the advancement of United States interests in democracy, human rights, and security, and a description of policy tools being applied in the country, including programs that target democratic stability, economic growth, and counter-terrorism.''.

SEC. 304. PRESIDENTIAL WAIVER.

Section 407 of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6447) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking ''subsection (b)'' and inserting ''subsection (c)''; and

(B) by inserting '', for a single 180-day period,'' after ''may waive'';

(2) by striking ''that—'' and all that follows and inserting ''that the exercise of such waiver authority would further the purposes of this Act.'';

(3) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c);

(4) by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

''(b) ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY.—Subject to subsection (c), the President may waive, for any additional period of time after the 180-day period described in subsection (a), the application of any of the actions described in paragraphs (9) through (15) of section 405(a) (or a commensurate action in substitution thereto) with respect to a country, if the President determines and so reports to the appropriate congressional committees that—

''(1) the respective foreign government has ceased the violations giving rise to the Presidential action; or

''(2) the exercise of such authority is important to the national interests of the United States.''.

(5) in subsection (c), by inserting ''or (b)'' after ''subsection (a)''; and

(6) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(d) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

''(1) ongoing and persistent waivers of the application of any of the actions described in paragraphs (9) through (15) of section 405(a) (or commensurate action in substitution thereto) with respect to a country do not fulfill the purposes of this Act; and

''(2) because the promotion of religious freedom is a compelling interest of United States foreign policy, the President, the Secretary of State, and other Executive branch officials, in consultation with Congress, should seek to find ways to address existing violations, on a case-by-case basis, through the actions specified in section 405 or other commensurate action in substitution thereto.''.

SEC. 305. PUBLICATION IN THE FEDERAL REGISTER.

Section 408(a)(1) of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6448(a)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following: ''Any designation of a non-state actor as an entity of particular concern for religious freedom under section 301 of the Frank R. Wolf International Religious Freedom Act, together with, when applicable and to the extent practicable, the identities of individuals determined to be responsible for the violations under subsection (e) of such section.''.

TITLE IV—PROMOTION OF RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

SEC. 401. ASSISTANCE FOR PROMOTING RELIGIOUS FREEDOM.

(a) AVAILABILITY OF ASSISTANCE.—It is the sense of Congress that for each fiscal year that begins on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Department of State should make available—

(1) an amount equal to not less than 10 percent of the amounts available in that fiscal year for the Human Rights and Democracy Fund for the promotion of international religious freedom and for projects to advance United States interests in the protection and advancement of international religious freedom, in particular, through grants to—

(A) groups that are able to develop legal protections or promote cultural and societal understanding of international norms of religious freedom;

(B) groups that seek to address and mitigate religiously motivated and sectarian violence and combat violent extremism; and

(C) groups that seek to strengthen investigations, reporting, and monitoring of religious freedom violations; and

(2) an amount equal to not less than 2 percent of amounts available in that fiscal year for the Human Rights and Democracy Fund to be made available for the establishment of a Religious Freedom Defense Fund, administered by the Ambassador at Large for International Religious Freedom, to provide grants for—

(A) victims of religious freedom abuses and their families to cover legal and other expenses that may arise from detention, imprisonment, torture, fines, and other restrictions; and

(B) projects to help create and support training of a new generation of defenders of religious freedom, including legal and political advocates, and civil society projects which seek to create advocacy networks, strengthen legal representation, train and educate new religious freedom defenders, and build the capacity of religious communities and rights defenders to protect against religious freedom violations, mitigate societal or sectarian violence, or minimize legal or other restrictions of the right to freedom of religion.

(b) PREFERENCE.—It is the sense of Congress that, in providing grants under subsection (a), the Ambassador at Large for International Religious Freedom should, as appropriate, give preference to projects targeting religious freedom violations in countries designated as countries of particular concern for religious freedom under section 402(b)(1) of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6442(b)(1)) and countries included on the Special Watch List described in section 102(b)(1)(F)(iii) of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6412(b)(1)(F)(iii)).

(c) ADMINISTRATION AND CONSULTATIONS.—

(1) ADMINISTRATION.—Amounts made available in accordance with subsection (a) shall be administered by the Ambassador at Large for International Religious Freedom.

(2) CONSULTATIONS.—In developing priorities and policies for providing grants in accordance with subsection (a), including priorities and policies for identification of potential grantees, the Ambassador at Large for International Religious Freedom shall consult with other Federal agencies, including the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom and, as appropriate, nongovernmental organizations.

TITLE V—DESIGNATED PERSONS LIST FOR PARTICULARLY SEVERE VIOLATIONS OF RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

SEC. 501. DESIGNATED PERSONS LIST FOR PARTICULARLY SEVERE VIOLATIONS OF RELIGIOUS FREEDOM.

Title VI of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6471 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating section 605 as section 606; and

(2) by inserting after section 604 the following new section:

''SEC. 605. DESIGNATED PERSONS LIST FOR PARTICULARLY SEVERE VIOLATIONS OF RELIGIOUS FREEDOM.

''(a) LIST.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State, in coordination with the Ambassador at Large and in consultation with relevant government and non-government experts, shall establish and maintain a list of foreign individuals who are sanctioned, through visa denials, financial sanctions, or other measures, because they are responsible for ordering, controlling, or otherwise directing particularly severe violations of freedom religion.

''(2) REFERENCE.—The list required under paragraph (1) shall be known as the 'Designated Persons List for Particularly Severe Violations of Religious Freedom'.

''(b) REPORT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that contains the list required under subsection (a), including, with respect to each foreign individual on the list—

''(A) the name of the individual and a description of the particularly severe violation of religious freedom committed by the individual;

''(B) the name of the country or other location in which such violation took place; and

''(C) a description of the actions taken pursuant to this Act or any other Act or Executive order in response to such violation; and

''(2) SUBMISSION AND UPDATES.—The Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees—

''(A) the initial report required under paragraph (1) not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this section; and

''(B) updates to the report every 180 days thereafter and as new information becomes available.

''(3) FORM.—The report required under paragraph (1) should be submitted in unclassified form but may contain a classified annex.

''(4) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term 'appropriate congressional committees' means—

''(A) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives; and

''(B) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate.''.

TITLE VI—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 601. MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS.

Title VII of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6481 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new sections:

''SEC. 702. VOLUNTARY CODES OF CONDUCT FOR UNITED STATES INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.

''(a) FINDING.—Congress recognizes the enduring importance of United States institutions of higher education worldwide both for their potential for shaping positive leadership and new educational models in host countries and for their emphasis on teaching universally recognized rights of free inquiry and academic freedom.

''(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that United States institutions of higher education operating campuses outside the United States or establishing any educational entities with foreign governments, particularly with or in countries the governments of which engage in or tolerate severe violations of religious freedom as identified in the Annual Report, should seek to adopt a voluntary code of conduct for operating in such countries that should—

''(1) uphold the right of freedom of religion of their employees and students, including the right to manifest that religion peacefully as protected in international law;

''(2) ensure that the religious views and peaceful practice of religion in no way affect, or be allowed to affect, the status of a worker's or faculty member's employment or a student's enrollment; and

''(3) make every effort in all negotiations, contracts, or memoranda of understanding engaged in or constructed with a foreign government to protect academic freedom and the rights enshrined in the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights.

''SEC. 703. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING NATIONAL SECURITY STRATEGY TO PROMOTE RELIGIOUS FREEDOM THROUGH UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY.

''It is the sense of Congress that—

''(1) the annual national security strategy report of the President required by section 108 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3043) should promote international religious freedom as a foreign policy and national security priority and should articulate that promotion of the right to freedom of religion is a strategy that protects other, related human rights, and advances democracy outside the United States, and make clear its importance to United States foreign policy goals of stability, security, development, and diplomacy; and

''(2) the national security strategy report should be a guide for the strategies and activities of relevant Federal agencies and inform the Department of Defense quadrennial defense review under section 118 of title 10, United States Code, and the Department of State Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review.''.

SEC. 602. CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.

The table of contents of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6401 note) is amended—

(1) by striking the item relating to section 605 and inserting the following:

''Sec. 606. Studies on the effect of expedited removal provisions on asylum claims.'';

(2) by inserting after the item relating to section 604 the following:

''Sec. 605. Designated Persons List for Particularly Severe Violations of Religious Freedom.''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''Sec. 702. Voluntary codes of conduct for United States institutions of higher education operating outside the United States.

''Sec. 703. Sense of Congress regarding national security strategy to promote religious freedom through United States foreign policy.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous material on this bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, today, 18 years after enactment of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998, the right to believe and practice one's faith remains under threat around the world.

The threats come not just from authoritarian regimes obsessed with control, such as North Korea, Iran, or Vietnam, which were the focus of that law, but also from lethal terrorist groups.

Two months ago this Chamber made history by declaring that the so-called Islamic State, or ISIS, is committing genocide against religious and ethnic minorities. It has committed mass murder, beheadings, rape, torture, slavery, and the kidnapping of children, among many other atrocities. ISIS dynamites churches and flattens ancient monasteries, hoping to erase the very existence of religious groups that disagree with their brutal world view.

Boko Haram in Nigeria and al Shabaab in East Africa are also responsible for their own deadly persecutions, both also linked to ISIS in their support for that terrorist movement.

These groups have turned religious intolerance into a murderous force of global instability. The right to believe and practice according to the dictates of conscience is a direct challenge to their ideologies. Thus, religious freedom is not just a human rights issue; frankly, today, it is a global security issue. However, current law related to religious freedom, which focuses solely on governments of sovereign states, does not address this reality.

Based on years of oversight and multiple hearings, H.R. 1150, the Frank R. Wolf International Religious Freedom Act, updates the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 to improve the coordination and effectiveness of U.S. efforts to promote religious liberty around the world and also expressly addresses the role of these non-state actors like ISIS.

Introduced by Subcommittee Chairman SMITH and Congresswoman ANNA ESHOO, the bill was amended and agreed to by the Foreign Affairs Committee and has more than 115 bipartisan cosponsors.

It is fitting that this bill is named in honor of our former colleague from Virginia, Frank Wolf, a tireless advocate for human rights and the author of the original International Religious Freedom Act of 1998, which we are amending.

By enhancing coordination, confronting non-state actors, and improving reporting and training, H.R. 1150 is a helpful refinement of our statutory commitment to combat religious persecution around the globe. It deserves our unanimous support.

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 13, 2016.

Hon. ED ROYCE,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ROYCE: I am writing concerning H.R. 1150, the Frank R. Wolf International Religious Freedom Act of 2016.

As a result of your having consulted with the Committee on Financial Services concerning provisions in the bill that fall within our Rule X jurisdiction, I agree to forgo action on the bill so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House Floor. The Committee on Financial Services takes this action with our mutual understanding that, by foregoing consideration of H.R. 1150 at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that our Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as this or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues that fall within our Rule X jurisdiction. Our Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation, and requests your support for any such request.

Finally, I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 1150 and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in your committee's report to accompany the legislation, as well as in the Congressional Record during floor consideration thereof.

Sincerely,

JEB HENSARLING,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, May 12, 2016.

Hon. JEB HENSARLING,
Chairman, Committee on Financial Services, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for consulting with the Committee on Foreign Affairs on H.R. 1150, the Frank R. Wolf International Religious Freedom Act, and for agreeing to be discharged from further consideration of that bill.

I agree that your forgoing further action on this measure does not in any way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee on Financial Services, or prejudice its jurisdictional prerogatives on this bill or similar legislation in the future. I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this legislation.

I will seek to place our letters on H.R. 1150 into the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work with your committee as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM,
Washington, DC, May 13, 2016.

Hon. EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I write concerning H.R. 1150, the Frank R. Wolf International Religious Freedom Act of 2015. As you know,

the Committee on Foreign Affairs received an original referral and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform a secondary referral when the bill was introduced on February 27, 2015. I recognize and appreciate your desire to bring this legislation before the House of Representatives in an expeditious manner, and accordingly, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform will forego action on the bill.

The Committee takes this action with our mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 1150 at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation. Further, I request your support for the appointment of conferees from the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform during any House-Senate conference convened on this or related legislation.

Finally, I would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the bill report filed by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, as well as in the Congressional Record during floor consideration, to memorialize our understanding

Sincerely,

JASON CHAFFETZ,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, May 12, 2016.

Hon. JASON CHAFFETZ,
Chairman, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for consulting with the Committee on Foreign Affairs on H.R. 1150, the Frank R. Wolf International Religious Freedom Act, and for agreeing to be discharged from further consideration of that bill.

I agree that your forgoing further action on this measure does not in any way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, or prejudice its jurisdictional prerogatives on this bill or similar legislation in the future. I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this legislation.

I will seek to place our letters on H.R. 1150 into the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work with your committee as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this measure. Let me again thank Chairman ED ROYCE for bringing this bill forward. I also want to thank my friend, Congressman CHRIS SMITH of New Jersey, for his leadership and for authorizing this bill.

Mr. Speaker, freedom of religion has been a bedrock principle of open and democratic societies for centuries. Some of the first immigrants to settle on American shores sailed here because they were fleeing religious persecution at home. This liberty is enshrined in our own founding documents, in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and in the charters of democracies all over the world.

The freedom to worship as a person chooses or not to worship at all should be settled business and nobody's business but the person themselves. Yet, around the world religious communities endure discrimination, persecution, and violence.

It is amazing to me that, when we look at the history of strife and war that has swirled around religious persecution, governments continue to deny this freedom to their own people. This assault on religious liberty holds societies back and undercuts progress. It obviously has no place in the 21st century.

So for the United States and other countries that cherish freedom, it is not enough just to guarantee religious liberty to our own people. We need to speak out and act when we see this right under attack around the world. For that matter, we have a responsibility to speak out when we see any liberty under attack, whether freedom of the press, the right to organize, or the equality of LGBT persons.

Mr. SMITH's legislation would help ensure that promoting and supporting religious liberty are a component of American foreign policy. It would help ensure that our diplomats around the world understand the importance of this issue and are working to advance this freedom on the front lines.

It is worth noting that we should also continue to fully fund the State Department's Human Rights and Democracy Fund, which helps address a range of human rights abuses around the world, including threats to our religious freedom. Together with this legislation, it sends a clear message to the world that protecting human rights is a priority for the United States.

So I support this measure. I urge my colleagues to do the same. I again want to congratulate my friend Mr. SMITH, who is so strong on issues like this and so forceful in pushing forward all the way until we finally got this on the floor of the House.

I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations, and the author of the bill.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my good friend, Chairman ROYCE, for his leadership on this bill, the markup, and for the very timely recommendations he and staff made to improve it.

I would like to thank ELIOT ENGEL again for working hand in glove in a good, bipartisan effort to protect international religious freedom.

As my good friend, Chairman ROYCE, noted a moment ago, 18 years ago Congress had the foresight to pass the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998. That landmark bill, authored by Congressman Frank Wolf of Virginia, made advancing the right to religious freedom a significant and profoundly serious U.S. foreign policy priority.

Passage of the International Religious Freedom Act was not easy. There were determined opponents in Congress and in the Clinton administration. I know. I chaired the congressional hearings and the subcommittee markup. It was no cakewalk.

But our opposition was overcome by the courage, tenacity, and vision of Frank Wolf, bolstered by a diverse, bipartisan, and ecumenical coalition of Members of Congress, ethnic minority and religions groups, and human rights organizations. That coalition has reassembled to support this bill today, the Frank R. Wolf International Religious Freedom Act.

I want to especially thank ANNA ESHOO, who is the principal Democratic sponsor of this legislation, for her leadership and for working particularly in the Middle East to combat the savagery that is being imposed upon people of minority faiths, including Christians.

□ 1700

I thank her for her leadership and, again, for being the principal Democrat on this bill.

Let me just note that naming this bill after Frank Wolf, who I consider to be, and many of us consider to be the William Wilberforce of modern times, is an attempt to recognize his extraordinary life's work promoting human rights, 34 years as a Member of Congress, including, and especially, religious freedom.

He now serves as the Wilson Chair at Baylor, again, continuing his lifesaving work for religious believers all over the world.

He just returned from Nigeria and testified at our hearing last week. He was in the embattled states in northern Nigeria, where Boko Haram runs free, massacring people. He was there on a fact-finding mission to promote religious freedom.

Mr. Speaker, the Frank R. Wolf International Religious Freedom Act that is before us is a series of upgrades to meet the challenges of the 21st century.

We know that the world is experiencing an unprecedented crisis of international religious freedom; a crisis that continues to create millions—no, tens of millions of victims; a crisis that undermines liberty, prosperity, and peace; a crisis that poses a direct challenge to the U.S. interests in the Middle East, Russia, China, Sub-Saharan Africa, and elsewhere in the world.

The Pew Research Center notes that over 75 percent of the world's population today lives in countries where severe religious freedom abuses occur annually. According to Pew, instances of anti-Semitism are at a 7-year high. It is getting worse everywhere, particularly in the Middle East, but also in Europe and in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, ancient Christian communities in Iraq and Syria are on the verge of extinction, and other religious minorities in the Middle East face a

constant assault from the Islamic State.

Several weeks ago, this Congress passed a resolution, sponsored by JEFF FORTENBERRY, that was followed by a declaration by Secretary of State John Kerry, that said that ISIS has committed, and continues to commit genocide, mass atrocities and war crimes against Christians, Yazidis, and other minority faiths.

We are on record. We know it is happening. We are speaking out.

In a couple of weeks, I am chairing a hearing on what is next; what should we be doing next to combat this terrible, terrible crisis.

In Nigeria, the Islamist terror group, Boko Haram, is believed to have killed over 6,600 people last year alone, mostly Christian, but there are Muslims as well who are being targeted. According to the testimony we received last week, since 2009, the number is about 15,000 year to date since 2009.

Mr. Speaker, at one of those hearings a few years ago, I had a man named Habila. Habila, I met him at an IDP camp in Jos, Nigeria, where a lot of churches have been firebombed. He told me this story. He was credible, and it checked out. And he came to Congress and testified.

Boko Haram put an AK–47—a terrorist—to his jaw and said: Renounce Christ or I will kill you. You must become a Muslim on the spot.

Habila said: I am ready to meet my Lord.

And this terrorist pulled the trigger and blew most of his face away.

What courage, what faith for a man. And when he told the story, you could have heard a pin drop.

Mr. Speaker, the bipartisan U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom just released its 2016 annual report. And let me note, parenthetically, USCIRF, or that Commission, was also created by Chairman Wolf as part of IRFA, the original bill.

They have found that the abuses committed by governments and nonstate actors has ''deteriorated.'' ''The incarceration of prisoners of conscience''—they point out—''remains astonishingly widespread . . .''

They point out that ''Over the past year, the Chinese government''—as just one of many examples—''has stepped up its persecution of religious groups''—across the board: Tibetans, Uighurs, Muslim Uighurs, Christians, and, of course, the Falun Gong.

I spoke in mid-February at NYU, I gave a keynote there in Shanghai, and talked about how Xi Jinping, the President of China, is in a race to the bottom with North Korea to make religion absolutely subservient to the Communist Party. He calls it the sinification of religion; and what was already a bad situation has now become demonstrably worse.

The Frank R. Wolf International Religious Freedom Act will upgrade the tools so that this administration, and subsequent ones, can do an even better job to try to mitigate and, hopefully, end religious persecution. It does this by, one, requiring that international religious freedom policies be integrated into national security, immigration, rule of law, and other relevant U.S. foreign policies.

It creates a Designated Persons List of individuals sanctioned for participating in or directing religious freedom abuses.

It expands diplomatic training on international religious freedoms for all State Department diplomats; creates a tier system for IRFA, for the reports, not just countries of particular concern, of which there are currently 10, but also those that are on a watch list, those that are bad and, perhaps, getting worse.

It gives the President authority to designate non-state actors in addition to countries; and it also requires the Ambassador at Large to report directly to the Secretary of State.

It also is increasingly clear that religious freedom diplomacy is really needed to advance U.S. interests around the world. This will do it.

The legislation is backed by the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops and the International Religious Freedom Roundtable, a diverse and ecumenical group of individuals from the faith community.

Finally, just let me thank Scott Flipse, who worked for Frank Wolf previously, then he worked for the International Religious Freedom Office at the State Department, and now is working at the China Commission; our General Counsel, Piero Tozzi; Janice Kaguyutan, I thank her for her work on this; and Sajit Gandhi. This is a true, bipartisan piece of legislation and, hopefully, the Senate will favorably receive it.

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

Again, Mr. Speaker, in closing, we focus on human rights as part of our foreign policy because it is the right thing to do. The United States is founded on the idea that an individual should be able to live according to his or her own beliefs. That is a value we want to see thriving around the world.

Advancing human rights is also the smart thing to do. Countries with a strong respect for human rights are countries that prosper and play a constructive role on the global stage.

I want to again say to my friend, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), when he comes for advancing human rights, he takes a second seat to nobody. He is indefatigable when it comes to these things. In all the years I have known him, he has always been fair and honest. I really sincerely commend him, and know how heartfelt it is and how much we appreciate his hard work.

When we see governments stifling religious freedom, or any freedom, we have a responsibility to speak out and make it clear that the United States remains a champion for these basic liberties. This bill helps us to live up to that responsibility, and I am proud to support it.

I thank Chairman ROYCE and Mr. SMITH.

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. COMSTOCK), our esteemed colleague, who ably represents the district formerly served by Frank Wolf, who is honored in the title of this bill. Representative BARBARA COMSTOCK is a coauthor of this bill with Mr. SMITH, and I thank them both.

Mrs. COMSTOCK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, ask human rights and religious freedom advocates to name their most steadfast friend who has served on Capitol Hill over the years, and Representative Frank Wolf, my predecessor, is always on the short list, as are my colleagues here today.

So I am honored today to stand in support of a bill I proudly cosponsored, the Frank R. Wolf International Religious Freedom Act, named after the distinguished gentleman who served in this seat for the 10th District of Virginia, and as the co-chair of the Congressional Human Rights Caucus, and a man whose deep faith and commitment to human rights and religion freedom were a large part of why he was known for years here and around the country, and even around the world, as the conscience of the Congress.

He wrote a book, a powerful book, titled a ''Prisoner of Conscience,'' about his many trips over the years and how he fought for religious freedom; and I hope he doesn't mind if I recommend that book to our listeners here.

We continue to be blessed with Congressman Wolf's passionate leadership as he leads the 21st Century Wilberforce Initiative to create a world where religious freedom is recognized by nations across the globe as a fundamental human right.

Since leaving Congress, Mr. Wolf has continued to travel to the front lines to see, firsthand, the plight of ethnic minorities in Iraq and Syria, including Christians, Yazidis, Kurds, and other minority religious groups.

As previously mentioned, he has just returned from Nigeria. He continues to shine a light every day on the dark places where men and women and children, even, of faith are victimized, tortured and, tragically, even killed for their faith. He will not let the world look away, and we thank him for his continued work and his strong and much-needed voice.

Now this legislation amends his own legislation to continue that mission that Mr. Wolf so valiantly fought for for 3 decades here in Congress. It will improve the ability of the United States to advance religious freedom globally, with stronger and more flexible political responses to a disturbing and growing denial of basic religious freedoms around the world.

As has been said by many, Frank Wolf is the William Wilberforce of our day. He is, and has always been, a voice for the voiceless. He once said: ''Most would agree that conscience rights figure prominently in the narrative of America's founding. Historically, Americans and our corresponding institutions have recognized that conscience is not ultimately allegiant to the state, but to something, and for many people, Someone, higher.''

I appreciate the opportunity today to continue that legacy with the passing of this important legislation which will continue his important and vital mission and legacy; and that is needed now, more than ever, for so many of the reasons that my colleagues here have highlighted.

I thank the gentleman so much for the privilege of addressing and cosponsoring this legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues for their contributions to this bill and to today's debate, especially Mr. SMITH, Congresswoman BARBARA COMSTOCK and Mr. ENGEL.

The right to believe and practice one's religion according to the dictates of conscience is often called the first freedom. It is one of the founding ideas of our Nation, but we do not believe that it is only an American value. Rather, this is what we believe here. We believe it flows from the inherent dignity of every human person, and it deserves protection everywhere.

In today's world, those who are most violently opposed to religious freedom also pose the biggest threat to our Nation. They also pose the biggest threat to civilization worldwide.

Thus, the promotion of religious liberty is not some isolated human rights concern. No. It is a key component of our national security. And this bill, now authored by Mr. SMITH, H.R. 1150, contains important updates to the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 that will enhance the effectiveness of the United States' efforts to promote that liberty around the world, so it deserves our unanimous support.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1150, amending the Frank Wolf International Religious Freedom Act.

I support this measure because the right to freedom of religion has been a cornerstone of the American conscience.

Many of our country's first leaders fled religious persecution abroad and went on to establish laws protecting religious freedom.

This core belief of our great nation does not stop at our national borders; we offer refuge to those suffering from religious persecution throughout the world.

A testament to this commitment was the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 which was a landmark piece of legislation seeking to make religious freedom a higher priority in U.S. Foreign policy.

The Act was approved by Congress unanimously in 1998 and signed into law by President Clinton.

The Act condemns violations of religious freedom and promotes and assists other governments in the promotion of the fundamental right to freedom of religion.

While strides have been made in establishing worldwide practice of freedom of religion, it is currently under attack.

Let me also note that people are being prosecuted under blasphemy laws for freedom of expression, which is why I introduced the bipartisan measure H. Res. 290, calling for the global repeal of blasphemy laws.

I support H.R. 1150 because we must continue to work to preserve religious freedoms as well as making sure that religion is not a pretext for prosecution or persecution in the world.

Indeed, one of the key amendments to IRFA would be to relocate the Office of International Religious Freedom within the Office of the Secretary of State.

This action would allow for greater coordination of strategic focus and the minimization of duplicated efforts, streamline mandates, and centralize efforts to engage religious communities and promote human rights more generally in regards to religious freedom.

Currently, the office is headed by the Ambassador at-Large for International Religious Freedom which monitors religious persecution and discrimination worldwide to develop policy recommendations, programs, and awareness.

Besides being placed in the Secretary of State's office, the Ambassador at large would be able to make every effort to collaborate and coordinate across all U.S. agencies and departments to formulate strategic religious freedom policies, programs, and activities.

These two changes will provide a greater ability for us to advance religious freedom throughout the world.

H.R. 1150 will also allow us to assist emerging democracies to implement freedom of religion while also helping older partners maintain their freedom of religion practices and conscience.

H.R. 1150 calls to ensure that our diplomats and foreign policy experts are well versed in the importance of religious freedom and how to address atrocities related to religion.

H.R. 1150 also addresses how to improve our ability to promote freedom of religion by enhancing the capabilities and knowledge of our diplomats.

Our Foreign Service Officers (FSO) are on the front lines everyday carrying out American foreign policy while also shaping it, which makes sure that they are adequately trained on religious freedom.

H.R. 1150 directs the Secretary to develop mandatory religious freedom training for all Foreign Service Officers.

This major change will enhance FSO capabilities to identify severe persecutors to help assemble the Ambassador's Annual Report on International Religious Freedom.

In addition to the Annual Report, H.R. 1150 calls for an updated lists of persons that are currently being persecuted and forced to renounce their faith.

This is essential in bringing awareness to countries that need to be monitored or that have non-state actors that have high levels of detainment, disappearance, torture, or murder based on someone's religion.

Another key aspect of H.R. 1150 is to enhance engagement and coordination with the executive branch on issues pertaining to international religious freedom policies and global religion engagement strategies.

This would be achieved through amendment of The National Security Act of 1947, calling for the appointment of a Special Adviser for Global Religious Engagement and establishing the Interagency Policy Committee on Religious Freedom and Engagement.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support adequate funding in order to enable rapid and decisive efforts of supporting democracy and preservation of human rights.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of Nebraska). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1150, 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.

□ 1715

REQUIRING COMPTROLLER GENERAL TO ASSESS OPTIONS FOR DISPOSITION OF PLUM ISLAND ANIMAL DISEASE CENTER IN PLUM ISLAND, NEW YORK

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1887) to amend certain appropriation Acts to repeal the requirement directing the Administrator of General Services to sell Federal property and assets that support the operations of the Plum Island Animal Disease Center in Plum Island, New York, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1887

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The Federal Government has owned Plum Island, New York, since 1899.

(2) Since 1954, the Plum Island Animal Disease Center has conducted unrivaled scientific research on a variety of infectious animal-borne diseases, including foot-and-mouth disease, resulting, most recently, in the development of a new cell line that rapidly and reliably detects this highly debilitating disease of livestock.

(3) Over 62 years, the Center has had a strong, proven record of safety.

(4) $23,200,000 in Federal dollars have been spent on upgrades to, and the maintenance of, the Center since January 2012.

(5) In addition to the Center, Plum Island contains cultural, historical, ecological, and natural resources of regional and national significance.

(6) Plum Island is situated where the Long Island Sound and Peconic Bay meet, both of which are estuaries that are part of the National Estuary Program and are environmentally and economically significant to the region.

(7) The Federal Government has invested hundreds of millions of Federal dollars over the last two decades to make long-term improvements with respect to the conservation and management needs of Long Island Sound and Peconic Bay.

(8) The Department of Homeland Security has undertaken a study to consider alternatives for the final disposition of Plum Island, including an analysis of—

(A) conservation of the island's resources;

(B) any remediation responsibilities;

(C) the need for any legislative changes;

(D) cost; and

(E) any revenues from the alternatives.

SEC. 2. REPORT REQUIRED ON STUDY BY DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY ON CLEAN UP AND ALTERNATIVE USES OF PLUM ISLAND.

(a) ASSESSMENT BY COMPTROLLER GENERAL.—

(1) ASSESSMENT REQUIRED.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct an assessment of the study by the Department of Homeland Security on the options for the disposition of Plum Island referred to in section 1(8). Such assessment shall include a determination of whether the methodologies used by the Department in conducting such study adequately support the Department's findings with respect to the following:

(A) The possible alternative uses for Plum Island, including the transfer of ownership to another Federal agency, a State or local government, a nonprofit organization, or a combination thereof for the purpose of education, research, or conservation.

(B) The possible issues and implications, if any, of pursuing such alternative uses for Plum Island.

(C) The potential cost to be incurred for expenses related to the transition, cleanup, and hazard mitigation of Plum Island by a recipient of such property.

(2) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date on which the Department of Homeland Security completes the study referred to in section 1(8), the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report containing the following:

(A) The results of the assessment described under paragraph (1).

(B) A description of the Secretary of Homeland Security's coordination with the Administrator of General Services, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency in conducting the Department of Homeland Security study referred to in section 1(8).

(b) STUDY BY COMPTROLLER GENERAL.—

(1) STUDY REQUIRED.—If the Comptroller General of the United States determines that the methodologies referred to in subsection (a)(1) do not adequately support the Department of Homeland Security's findings related to an issue described in subparagraphs (A) through (C) of such subsection, the Comptroller General shall conduct a study on any such issue.

(2) REPORT REQUIRED.—If the Comptroller General of the United States conducts a study under paragraph (1), not later than one year after the date on which the Department of Homeland Security completes the study referred to in section 1(8), the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress a report containing the results of the study conducted under paragraph (1).

SEC. 3. SUSPENSION OF ACTION.

No action may be taken to carry out section 538 of title V of division D of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2012 (Public Law 112–74; 125 Stat. 976) until at least 180 days after the reports required by subsection (a)(2) of section 2 and, if applicable, subsection (b)(2) of such section have been submitted to Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RATCLIFFE. 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, after my remarks, I will include an exchange of letters between the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Homeland Security regarding H.R. 1887.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of H.R. 1887, which suspends an appropriations provision in order to ensure that all necessary information is accessible before deciding how to move forward with Plum Island Animal Disease Center.

Since 1954, the U.S. Department of Homeland Security Science and Technology Directorate's Plum Island Animal Disease Center has served the Nation in defending against accidental or intentional introduction of foreign animal diseases. In 2005, DHS announced that Plum Island would be moved to a new Federal facility in Kansas. While DHS will eventually move the research conducted, Plum Island will continue to operate until the National Bio and Agro-Defense Facility is fully operational and a complete transition has been made in 2022 or 2023.

The gentleman from New York, Representative ZELDIN, my friend, introduced H.R. 1887 with strong bipartisan support from the entire Long Island and Connecticut delegations in both the House and the Senate to stop the sale of Plum Island.

DHS recently undertook a study on alternatives for the disposition of Plum Island. As amended, H.R. 1887 suspends the sale of Plum Island until a thorough review of the analysis of alternatives is conducted by DHS and GAO. The bill before us today requires GAO to review the DHS study and report to Congress on whether the methodologies DHS uses adequately support the Department's findings. If those methodologies are found lacking, GAO must study possible alternative uses for Plum Island and possible costs associated for the transition and cleanup of the island.

H.R. 1887 delays the sale of Plum Island until GAO reports its findings to Congress, allowing for a complete understanding of possible options for Plum Island once the Animal Disease Center functions are transitioned. This bill ensures consideration of all options for the disposition of the island.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to join me in supporting this bill.

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

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, May, 12, 2016.

Hon. MICHAEL MCCAUL,

Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCCAUL: I write concerning H.R. 1887, a bill to amend certain appropriation Acts to repeal the requirement directing the Administrator of General Services to sell federal property and assets that support the operations of the Plum Island Animal Disease Center in Plum Island, New York.'' This legislation includes matters that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

In order to expedite Floor consideration of H.R. 1887, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure will forgo action on this bill. However, this is conditional on our mutual understanding that forgoing consideration of the bill does 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 you urge the Speaker to name members of the Committee to any conference committee named to consider such provisions.

Please place a copy of this letter and your response acknowledging our jurisdictional interest in the Congressional Record during House Floor consideration of the bill. I look forward to working with the Committee on Homeland Security as the bill moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

BILL SHUSTER,

Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,

Washington, DC, May 16, 2016.

Hon. BILL SHUSTER,

Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SHUSTER: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1887. I appreciate your support in bringing this legislation before the House of Representatives, and accordingly, understand that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure will not seek a sequential referral on the bill.

The Committee on Homeland Security concurs with the mutual understanding that by foregoing a sequential referral of this bill at this time, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure does not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this bill or similar legislation in the future. In addition, should a conference on this bill be necessary, I would support your request to have the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure represented on the conference committee.

I will insert copies of this exchange in the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill on the House floor. I thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL T. MCCAUL,

Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1887 and yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, since 1954, the Plum Island Animal Disease Center in New York's Long Island Sound has served as the primary laboratory in the United States responsible for research on foreign animal diseases of livestock, such

as foot-and-mouth disease and other animal diseases that could be accidentally or deliberately introduced into the United States.

At Plum Island, the Department of Homeland Security works with the Agricultural Research Service and Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service within the U.S. Department of Agriculture to research and develop new vaccines and diagnostic tests to respond to animal disease outbreaks.

On September 11, 2005, DHS announced plans to develop the National Bio and Agro-Defense Facility, or NBAF, as a state-of-the-art biocontainment laboratory to replace the Plum Island facility, an aging facility nearing the end of its lifecycle. After undertaking a multiyear site selection process, DHS selected a site in Manhattan, Kansas, for the NBAF. It is slated to begin operations in 2022.

This brings us to H.R. 1887. The focus of this bill is to deal with the question of what to do with Plum Island once DHS no longer needs it. DHS is currently studying the range of options for disposition of the property, including transferring it to another Federal agency, a State or local government, or a nonprofit organization for the purposes of education, research, or conservation. In doing so, DHS is expected to assess the full implications of each option, including cost, cleanup, and hazard mitigation.

H.R. 1887 requires the Government Accountability Office, or GAO, to assess whether DHS' forthcoming study is adequate to support its findings. In the event that the study is lacking in a key area, GAO would be required to conduct its own study on that issue or issues. Importantly, H.R. 1887 prohibits the sale of Plum Island operations until at least 180 days after the required reports in the bill have been submitted to Congress.

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

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN), my distinguished colleague.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE) and Mr. THOMPSON as well for both speaking in favor of this legislation, H.R. 1887.

Plum Island is not for sale. The whole purpose of this legislation is to prevent the sale of Plum Island by the Federal Government to the highest bidder.

Situated at the gateway of the Long Island Sound, Plum Island is treasured by my local community. As a critical resource for research, approximately 90 percent of the land on Plum Island has been sheltered from development, offering Long Island a diverse wildlife and ecosystem and a critical habitat for migratory birds, marine mammals, and rare plants.

With recorded history dating back to the 1700s, Plum Island is also an essential cultural and historical resource as well. Since World War II, Plum Island has been utilized as a research laboratory. The facility, which has been under Federal jurisdiction since 1899, has since grown to become what is known today as the Plum Island Animal Disease Center.

In 2005, the Department of Homeland Security, which currently has jurisdiction over the island, announced that the Animal Disease Center research would be moved to a new Federal facility: the National Bio and Agro-Defense Facility in Kansas.

To offset the cost of the relocation, a law was enacted that called for the private sale of Plum Island to the highest bidder. However, due to costs associated with the cleanup and closure of Plum Island and because of local zoning restrictions, the Federal Government would receive little compensation for the sale of Plum Island. Allowing for continued research, public access, and permanent preservation of the island, H.R. 1887 will reverse a 2008 law that mandated the sale of Plum Island.

The bill, as amended, will commission the Government Accountability Office, in consultation with the Department of Homeland Security, which currently owns the island, to formulate a comprehensive plan for the future of the island. This plan will include possible alternative uses, which can include transfer of ownership to another Federal agency, the State or local government, nonprofit, or combination thereof, for the purpose of education, research, and conservation.

Just less than 3 weeks ago, on April 28, 2016, H.R. 1887 was marked up with an amendment and passed out of the House Homeland Security Committee with unanimous bipartisan support. Currently, 24 Republicans and Democrats in this Chamber have signed on as cosponsors of this bill.

I see the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY) is here. He has long been championing this issue since before I got here.

I would especially like to thank House Majority Leader KEVIN MCCARTHY and House Homeland Security Committee Chairman MICHAEL MCCAUL for both taking such a direct, personal interest in helping with this effort in the House. Their leadership is very much appreciated.

I would also like to thank all the locally elected officials, groups, and concerned residents on Long Island and elsewhere who have moved heaven and Earth to raise awareness of this cause and help recruit cosponsors.

I encourage all my colleagues to vote in support of this critical bill. Hopefully, the Senate also passes this long-awaited legislation in earnest so that the President can sign this proposal into law this year.

I have had the opportunity to visit Plum Island. It is a place where you feel as if you are thousands of miles away from Long Island. You have the history of Fort Terry, the coastline, the dunes, the waterways, the water hitting the rocks, and the seals. You literally feel as if you are nowhere near the Northeastern United States. It is a treasure, and it is one that should be protected.

Mr. Speaker, I am very grateful for this Chamber's considering this legislation and hopefully passing it unanimously.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to, first of all, thank Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi for his interest and support in this measure, even though he hails from a part of the country which is far away from the Long Island Sound. But, again, going back to his days on the Agriculture Committee, he clearly knows the forensics of this legislation, and, again, his interest and support is much appreciated.

I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE) for bringing this bill up today.

Again, Long Island Sound, maybe, is not right on your radar screen, but as Congressman ZELDIN said, it is an incredibly special place, a tidal estuary which separates Connecticut from New York, and it is within the New York territory. Frankly, it is a very small, densely populated area, and the interest level on both sides of the Long Island Sound in terms of passage of this legislation is off the charts.

I again want to thank Mr. ZELDIN for his efforts.

Again, this measure started in 2013 in response to the GAO report that basically signaled that the sale of this island was on the fast track, and it really took persistence up until today's vote on the floor to make sure that we stop that process, as Mr. ZELDIN indicated, and send the message that Plum Island is not for sale.

Again, because of its unique history, the activity that took place there with the Animal Disease Center made it unsuitable for residential development and commercial development, but sort of the outcome of that is that this incredibly rich diversity of biology has sprung up there.

Like the gentleman from Long Island, I have had the opportunity to visit there, and it is as if you were in a different world. That is something that we can never take for granted, particularly in a part of the country where, again, there are tremendous amounts of sea traffic, maritime activity, and economic activity. To try and, again, basically preserve this 840-acre parcel with its incredible richness is something that really will live on for generations and, really, I think, will make the 114th Congress memorable, certainly in terms of that region, for many years to come.

Again, like the gentleman from New York, I want to say that the external pressure which was brought to bear by municipal officials and by folks from

Save the Sound—that is an umbrella group on both sides of the Long Island Sound—and the Connecticut Fund for the Environment, again, is what really kept the interest level and the pressure on both delegations to make sure that this didn't get lost in the process and allow that mandated sale to move forward.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge passage of this bill, and, again, with the gentleman from New York, am determined to make sure that this moves as quickly as possible through the Upper Chamber and is signed into law by President Obama, sending a message to all the individuals and groups that are so interested in preserving Plum Island that, in fact, we, again, have taken it off this sort of conveyor belt and we are going to make sure that it gets the careful treatment that it deserves. At the end of the day, it is going to basically preserve this for generations to come.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1887 has broad bipartisan support. It will ensure that, before DHS disposes of Plum Island, there is a thorough vetting of all the options.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1730

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, I once again urge my colleagues to support Mr. ZELDIN's bill, H.R. 1887.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1887, repeals the requirement directing the Administrator of General Services to sell Federal property and assets that support the operations of the Plum Island Animal Disease Center in Plum Island, New York, and for other purposes.

Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Homeland Security I support this bill because the safety record of the Plum Island Animal Disease Center is unparalleled.

The Plum Island Animal Disease Center is a United States federal research facility dedicated to the study of animal diseases. It is part of the DHS Directorate for Science and Technology.

Since 1954, the center has had the goal of protecting America's livestock from animal diseases

Throughout the history of the Plum Island Animal Disease Center, there have been no accidental releases of infected animals to the mainland.

The Animal Disease Center on Plum Island has conducted first rate scientific research on a variety of infectious animal-borne diseases, including foot-and-mouth disease, resulting most recently, in the development of a new cell line that rapidly and reliably detects this highly debilitating disease of livestock

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the Animal Disease Center Plum Island contains cultural, historical, ecological, and natural resources of regional and national significance.

Importantly, the Federal Government has invested hundreds of millions of tax payer dollars over the last two decades to make long-term improvements with respect to the conservation and management needs of Long Island Sound and Peconic Bay.

Mr. Speaker, preserving historical and geographical entities play a pivotal role in maintaining homeland security and the sustainability of our ecosystem and health of our community.

I urge all members to join me in voting to pass H.R. 1887.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1887, as amended.

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

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: ''A bill to authorize the Comptroller General of the United States to assess a study on the alternatives for the disposition of Plum Island Animal Disease Center, and for other purposes.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL CYBERSECURITY PREPAREDNESS CONSORTIUM ACT OF 2016

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4743) to authorize the Secretary of Homeland Security to establish a National Cybersecurity Preparedness Consortium, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4743

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 ''National Cybersecurity Preparedness Consortium Act of 2016''.

SEC. 2. NATIONAL CYBERSECURITY PREPAREDNESS CONSORTIUM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security may work with a consortium, including the National Cybersecurity Preparedness Consortium, to support efforts to address cybersecurity risks and incidents (as such terms are defined in section 227 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 148)), including threats of terrorism and acts of terrorism.

(b) ASSISTANCE TO THE NCCIC.—The Secretary of Homeland Security may work with a consortium to assist the national cybersecurity and communications integration center of the Department of Homeland Security (established pursuant to section 227 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002) to—

(1) provide training to State and local first responders and officials specifically for preparing for and responding to cybersecurity risks and incidents, including threats of terrorism and acts of terrorism, in accordance with current law;

(2) develop and update a curriculum utilizing existing programs and models in accordance with such section 227, for State and local first responders and officials, related to cybersecurity risks and incidents, including threats of terrorism and acts of terrorism;

(3) provide technical assistance services to build and sustain capabilities in support of preparedness for and response to cybersecurity risks and incidents, including threats of terrorism and acts of terrorism, in accordance with such section 227;

(4) conduct cross-sector cybersecurity training and simulation exercises for entities, including State and local governments, critical infrastructure owners and operators, and private industry, to encourage community-wide coordination in defending against and responding to cybersecurity risks and incidents, including threats of terrorism and acts of terrorism, in accordance with subsection (c) of section 228 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 149);

(5) help States and communities develop cybersecurity information sharing programs, in accordance with section 227 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, for the dissemination of homeland security information related to cybersecurity risks and incidents, including threats of terrorism and acts of terrorism; and

(6) help incorporate cybersecurity risk and incident prevention and response (including related to threats of terrorism and acts of terrorism) into existing State and local emergency plans, including continuity of operations plans.

(c) PROHIBITION ON DUPLICATION.—In carrying out the functions under subsection (b), the Secretary of Homeland Security shall, to the greatest extent practicable, seek to prevent unnecessary duplication of existing programs or efforts of the Department of Homeland Security.

(d) CONSIDERATIONS REGARDING SELECTION OF A CONSORTIUM.—In selecting a consortium with which to work under this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall take into consideration the following:

(1) Any prior experience conducting cybersecurity training and exercises for State and local entities.

(2) Geographic diversity of the members of any such consortium so as to cover different regions across the United States.

(e) METRICS.—If the Secretary of Homeland Security works with a consortium pursuant to subsection (a), the Secretary shall measure the effectiveness of the activities undertaken by such consortium under this Act.

(f) OUTREACH.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall conduct outreach to universities and colleges, including historically Black colleges and universities, Hispanic-serving institutions, Tribal Colleges and Universities, and other minority-serving institutions, regarding opportunities to support efforts to address cybersecurity risks and incidents, including threats of terrorism and acts of terrorism, by working with the Secretary pursuant to subsection (a).

(g) TERMINATION.—The authority to carry out this Act shall terminate on the date that is five years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(h) CONSORTIUM DEFINED.—In this Act, the term ''consortium'' means a group primarily composed of non-profit entities, including academic institutions, that develop, update, and deliver cybersecurity training in support of homeland security.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4743. The National Cybersecurity Preparedness Consortium Act of 2016 allows the U.S. Department of Homeland Security to work with a consortium, including the National Cybersecurity Preparedness Consortium, to support efforts to address cybersecurity risks and incidents.

This bill allows DHS to engage with a consortium to assist the National Cybersecurity and Communications Integration Center, or NCCIC, in providing training to State and local first responders in preparing for and responding to cybersecurity risks and incidents. An example of a consortium DHS may work with under this bill is the National Cybersecurity Preparedness Consortium, or NCPC.

The NCPC provides State and local communities with the tools they need to prevent, detect, respond to, and recover from cyber attacks. The consortium also evaluates communities' cybersecurity posture and provides them with a roadmap to correct deficiencies in the security of their information systems.

Based out of the University of Texas at San Antonio's Center for Infrastructure Assurance and Security, the NCPC membership includes the University of Arkansas, the University of Memphis, Norwich University, and Texas A&M Engineering Extension Service.

DHS is responsible for carrying out significant aspects of the Federal Government's cybersecurity mission. The Cybersecurity Act, which was recently signed into law, allows DHS to actively share cyber threat indicators and defensive measures with the private sector by affording liability protections.

DHS's National Cybersecurity and Communications Integration Center is responsible for facilitating cross-sector coordination to address cybersecurity risks and incidents.

H.R. 4743 allows DHS to work with any consortium, including the NCPC, in a number of activities, including providing technical assistance, conducting cross-sector cybersecurity training and simulation exercises, and helping States and local communities to develop cybersecurity information sharing programs. Allowing DHS to work with organizations already supporting State and local cyber preparedness and response will provide additional support to State and local entities.

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

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 4743, the National Cybersecurity Preparedness Consortium Act of 2016.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4743 allows the Department of Homeland Security to utilize university-based consortia to help provide cybersecurity training and support to State, local, and tribal leaders, including first responders.

There is strong bipartisan support for this legislation, as introduced by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO).

H.R. 4743 authorizes DHS to use consortia to provide State and local governments with university-developed cyber training and technical assistance, including for the development of cyber information sharing that jurisdictions in need can use.

Recent studies reveal that organizations at the State and local level describe their cybersecurity programs as being in the early and middle stages of maturity, and 86 percent of State and local respondents identified managing cybersecurity risk as one of their most stressful jobs.

By partnering with consortia, DHS can make a meaningful impact on raising the levels of cybersecurity on the State, local, and tribal levels.

Importantly, H.R. 4743 requires DHS, when selecting a consortium for participation in its cyber efforts, to not only take into account the prior experience of the institutions that would be conducting cybersecurity training exercises, but also the geographic diversity of the institutions participating in the consortium. The inclusion of geographic diversity should help reach more States and localities.

Moreover, I am pleased that the bill requires DHS to do outreach to colleges and universities, including Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Hispanic-serving institutions, and other minority-serving institutions about opportunities to provide research-based cybersecurity-related training exercises and technical assistance.

Mr. Speaker, States and localities need the ability to prevent, detect, respond to, and recover from cyber events as they would have any other disaster or emergency situation. For this reason, I support H.R. 4743 and urge passage.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD), my distinguished friend and colleague.

Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his leadership on this issue and for yielding me some time.

I would like to also thank the ranking member and my colleague from San Antonio on this piece of legislation that is so important to our hometown.

It is no secret that cyber attacks are on the rise, and the unfortunate reality is that everyone is vulnerable. The costs of protecting your network and properly training communities on best practices in a digital world can be burdensome.

As we all know, State and local communities, in many instances, do not possess the same digital resources as the Federal Government. States and communities need the ability to detect, respond to, and recover from cyber events just as they would any other disaster or emergency situation.

That is why I am proud to be an original cosponsor of H.R. 4743, which will allow DHS to coordinate with a handful of universities that have been leading the way in cyber preparedness.

One of these universities, the University of Texas at San Antonio, is located in my hometown and serves many of my constituents. Another leader in this field is none other than my alma mater, Texas A&M University.

Building upon their great work and the breakthroughs of others across the country will be crucial to protecting our digital infrastructure at all levels. This will help us ensure that our first responders and government entities are adequately prepared for a significant cyber event.

I thank my colleague from Texas for his attention to this issue. I fully support H.R. 4743, the National Cybersecurity Preparedness Consortium Act of 2016. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO), the author of this bill.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member THOMPSON for yielding me this time and for his support of this legislation. He and his staff have been terrific partners in moving this bill forward.

I would also like to thank my fellow Texans, Chairman MCCAUL, Congressman HURD, Congressman RATCLIFFE, and also Congressman RICHMOND, who is not a Texan, but is a wonderful person here in our body, for all of their work on this issue.

Every day our Nation faces a growing number of potentially debilitating cyber threats. Our retailers, our banks, government agencies, military operations, and everyday private American citizens all face these threats. We must ensure that our defenses are as strong as possible because of that.

I represent San Antonio, a national leader in the cybersecurity field. Institutions in San Antonio do cutting-edge cyber work that keeps our Nation safe.

For example, the University of Texas at San Antonio leads the National Cybersecurity Preparedness Consortium, which helps communities across the Nation improve their cyber defenses.

It is critical that localities understand the impact cyber attacks could have on their ability to function and are prepared to prevent, detect, respond to, and recover from harmful cyber incidents.

UTSA and its cybersecurity consortium are educating communities about these cyber threats and helping them develop the defenses they need to successfully withstand a cyber emergency.

This legislation allows consortiums like UTSAs to work more closely with DHS to address cybersecurity risks and incidents at the State and local level. This collaboration will bolster our cyber preparedness and keep us one step ahead of cyber attackers.

Mr. Speaker, again I would like to thank the Homeland Security Committee's leadership for their partnership on this legislation and also all of the staff, both Republican and Democratic, who helped bring this to the floor.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the inspiration for this bill was important work being done by the National Cybersecurity Preparedness Consortium, a group of five universities led by the University of Texas at San Antonio that has helped to raise cyber preparedness at the State and local level by evaluating communities, cybersecurity postures, and providing them with a roadmap to correct deficiencies.

While this consortium is making an important contribution to cybersecurity, there is an enormous need for training and technical assistance around the Nation. With the enactment of H.R. 4743, more institutions will be able to partner with DHS to provide such critical assistance.

As such, I urge passage.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, I once again urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4743.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4743, the National Cybersecurity Preparedness Consortium Act of 2016.

This bill allows the Department of Homeland Security to work with a cybersecurity consortium to carry out training, technical assistance and simulation exercises for State and local officials, critical infrastructure owners and operators and private industry.

The National Cybersecurity Preparedness Consortium, based at the University of Texas San Antonio's Center for Infrastructure Assurance and Security, provides research-based cybersecurity-related training and exercises to increase cybersecurity preparedness across the nation.

Other members of the Consortium include the Texas Engineering Extension Service in the Texas A&M University system, the University of Memphis, the University of Arkansas System, and Norwich University.

Last December, I helped usher through the landmark Cybersecurity Act of 2015. That legislation helps protect our nation's private sector and federal networks which are under continuous threat from foreign hackers and cyber terrorists. H.R. 4743 will be a value add in better securing the Nation's overall cybersecurity preparedness.

Locally, first responders and government officials as well as critical infrastructure owners and operators and private industry are bombarded with cybersecurity threats in the same way as at the federal level.

Helping organizations working to incorporate cybersecurity risk and incident prevention and response into State and local emergency plans is just one of the elements this bill encourages.

Allowing DHS to work with organizations like the Consortium, will ensure more tools are available back at home for those working to prepare for and combat cyber attacks on a regular basis.

I support this bill and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4743, the National Cybersecurity Preparedness Consortium Act of 2016, because it will establish an important resource to ensure that private sector entities are better prepared to protect against cyber threats.

As a senior member of the House Committee on Homeland Security, I am well aware of the threats posed by cybersecurity vulnerabilities, and this bill takes an essential step to strengthen domestic cybersecurity.

H.R. 4743 establishes a National Cybersecurity Preparedness Consortium to engage academic, nonprofit, private industry, and federal, state, and local government partners to address cybersecurity risks and incidents, including threats or acts of terrorism.

The Consortium may provide training to State and local first responders and officials to equip them with the tools and skills needed to prepare for and respond to cybersecurity risks and incidents, including threats and acts of terrorism, in accordance with current law.

I thank both Chairman MCCAUL and Ranking Member THOMPSON for the bipartisan work done to bring the bill before the House for Consideration.

I am pleased that during the Committee markup of H.R. 4743, two important Jackson Lee Amendments were adopted.

The first Jackson Lee Amendment to H.R. 4743 establishes metrics as a measure of the effectiveness of the National Cybersecurity Preparedness Consortium program.

Having the information provided by my amendment to H.R. 4743, will allow the Congressional oversight committees to better plan future programs around cybersecurity collaborations that are intended to share knowledge on best practices in securing computer networks from attack.

The second Jackson Lee Amendment added an additional objective of the bill, a directive that should help participants prepare to address continuity of operations.

This amendment provides a focus for the Consortium's work on the issue of continuity of operation, which addresses whether an entity can survive a cyber-attack, continue to provide information or services during an attack; or the likelihood that the time to recovery from a successful cyberattack or threat is predictable and reasonable.

Just as the attacks on the morning of September 11, 2001 came without notice so may a major cyber-attack.

In March, of this year, U.S. Attorney General Lynch announced "wanted" notices for a group of Iranian hackers the United States believes are behind a 2013 computer intrusion of a small New York dam and a series of cyberattacks on dozens of U.S. banks.

There are many companies offering continuity of operations services to companies large and small with the intent that they will be there to support their clients in the event of a cyber incident.

The work of the Consortium should go beyond planning to the answering questions regarding the operationalization of plans in the event of an attack or cyber incident.

We know that planning is crucial, but we must encourage cybersecurity planning to go beyond the planning process to understand the capacity of an entity's continuity of operations plans by looking at continuity of operations of service providers should an incident impact an area or industry.

I support H.R. 4743, because it provides this assurance by providing critical cybersecurity collaboration among experts and industries that are essential to critical infrastructure operations or have a significant economic presence in our nation's economy that a cyber-attack would have broad repercussions.

I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 4743.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4743, 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. RATCLIFFE. 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.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY STRATEGY FOR INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS ACT

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4780) to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to develop a comprehensive strategy for Department of Homeland Security operations abroad, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4780

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 "Department of Homeland Security Strategy for International Programs Act".

SEC. 2. COMPREHENSIVE STRATEGY FOR INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS FOR VETTING AND SCREENING PERSONS SEEKING TO ENTER THE UNITED STATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a comprehensive three-year strategy for international programs of the Department of Homeland Security in which personnel and resources of the Department are deployed abroad for vetting and screening of persons seeking to enter the United States.

(b) CONTENTS.—The strategy required under subsection (a) shall include, at a minimum, the following:

(1) Specific Department of Homeland Security risk-based goals for international programs of the Department in which personnel and resources of the Department are deployed abroad for vetting and screening of persons seeking to enter the United States.

(2) A risk-based method for determining whether to establish new international programs in new locations, given resource constraints, or expand existing international programs of the Department, in which personnel and resources of the Department are deployed abroad for vetting and screening of persons seeking to enter the United States.

(3) Alignment with the highest Department-wide and Government-wide strategic priorities of resource allocations on international programs of the Department in which personnel and resources of the Department are deployed abroad for vetting and screening of persons seeking to enter the United States.

(4) A common reporting framework for the submission of reliable, comparable cost data by components of the Department on overseas expenditures attributable to international programs of the Department in which personnel and resources of the Department are deployed abroad for vetting and screening of persons seeking to enter the United States.

(c) CONSIDERATIONS.—In developing the strategy required under subsection (a), the Secretary of Homeland Security shall consider, at a minimum, the following:

(1) Information on existing operations of international programs of the Department of Homeland Security in which personnel and resources of the Department are deployed abroad for vetting and screening of persons seeking to enter the United States that includes corresponding information for each location in which each such program operates.

(2) The number of Department personnel deployed to each location at which an international program referred to in subparagraph (A) is in operation during the current and preceding fiscal year.

(3) Analysis of the impact of each international program referred to in paragraph (1) on domestic activities of components of the Department of Homeland Security.

(4) Analysis of barriers to the expansion of an international program referred to in paragraph (1).

(d) FORM.—The strategy required under subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may contain a classified annex if the Secretary of Homeland Security determines that such is appropriate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4780, the Department of Homeland Security Strategy for International Programs Act, offered by the ranking member of the committee, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON).

This bill would require the Secretary of Homeland Security to submit a report to Congress on the Department of Homeland Security's international programs, including the vetting and screening of persons seeking to enter the United States.

□ 1745

The legislation builds off of recommendations made by the Committee on Homeland Security's bipartisan Task Force on Combating Terrorist and Foreign Fighter Travel that identified security gaps which allow jihadists to get to and from Iraq and Syria undetected. Specifically, the task force recommended that U.S. authorities continue to push the border outward by deploying homeland security initiatives overseas.

The DHS has established several international programs that are designed to thoroughly vet and screen such individuals before their travel to the United States. Through its many international programs, the DHS personnel overseas effectively extends our Nation's borders to increase the security of the United States. Expanding initiatives like the U.S. Customs and Border Protection's Preclearance program or Immigration and Customs Enforcement's Visa Security Program could help detect and interdict threats before they are bound for the homeland. For example, the Preclearance program allows overseas-based CBP officers to screen all passengers and luggage before a flight takes off for the United States.

The CBP currently has 15 preclearance locations in six countries, including Ireland, Aruba, the Bahamas, Bermuda, Canada, and the United Arab Emirates. However, the foreign fighter threat and travel patterns continue to concern immigration and national security officials. As a result, DHS has announced plans to expand preclearance operations.

Other programs, like ICE's Visa Security Program deploy specially trained agents to diplomatic posts worldwide to conduct additional visa security screening and quickly identify potential terrorists or criminal threats before they reach the United States. Agents provide an additional level of review for persons of special interest or concern, review visa applications, liaise with host country immigration and border security officials, and conduct investigations with a nexus to U.S. travel and security. The program has agents posted at consulates and embassies in more than 25 countries, with additional plans to expand to additional high-risk locations.

As the Department of Homeland Security continues to build its international footprint for these and other border security programs, the DHS must ensure that the expansion of international programs is considered with risk, cost, and benefit in mind. This bill would require the DHS to report on the specific risk-based goals for these international programs to ensure that they align with Department-wide and government-wide strategic priorities.

This additional transparency, including the costs related to international programs, will improve Congress' oversight of these activities. Additionally, the Department will be required to consider how the deployment of personnel abroad may impact its domestic capabilities as well as to identify barriers for the expansion of international programs.

While international programs provide tangible national security and travel facilitation benefits, the growing DHS presence overseas should be built upon the foundation of a long-term strategy that guides the Department in the deployment of officers and agents in a risk-based manner.

I am confident that the comprehensive strategy that is required by this bill will help ensure that the Department is managing these programs effectively and that Congress has the appropriate insight that is necessary to protect the American taxpayers' investment in our security.

I, therefore, urge all Members to join me in supporting this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 4780, the Department of Homeland Security Strategy for International Programs Act.

I introduced H.R. 4780 to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to develop a comprehensive strategy for the Department's international programs where personnel and resources are deployed abroad for vetting and screening persons who are seeking to enter the U.S.

In recent years, the Department has expanded its international footprint through programs such as the Immigration Advisory Program, the Joint Security Program, and the Visa Security Program. In fact, presently, the Customs and Border Protection has, approximately, 800 employees who are posted in 43 countries, and the Immigration and Customs Enforcement has almost 400 employees in 45 countries. DHS personnel who are at overseas locations perform vital vetting and passenger prescreening activities to ensure individuals who are traveling to the U.S. do not pose a threat to our Nation's security.

Looking ahead, the DHS has announced plans to expand the Preclearance program to 10 new locations in the coming years, and ICE continues to expand its Visa Security Program to additional visa-issuing posts abroad.

I strongly support these efforts to push out our borders through the expansion of these important homeland

security programs. That said, to do it right, DHS needs a comprehensive strategy to bolster its presence and partnerships around the world. My bill requires just that. Specifically, it requires the DHS to have a 3-year strategy that includes risk-based goals, which is a process to ensure resource allocations align with overall Departmental strategic priorities, and a common reporting framework for personnel who are deployed abroad.

My bill requires the DHS to not only take into account where it currently deploys resources for these overseas screening and vetting programs and the number of DHS personnel at each location, but also any impacts of these overseas activities on domestic operations, including with respect to staffing at U.S. ports of entry.

After 9/11, the attempted Christmas Day attack in 2009, as well as other more recent cases, it is imperative for the DHS and its Federal partners to bolster the screening and vetting of travelers before they arrive at our borders. My bill will help ensure that the DHS has a sound strategy for its efforts to do so.

Mr. Speaker, we face evolving terrorist threats, which include individuals who are attempting to use legitimate forms of travel to the U.S. to inflict harm. The DHS personnel who are posted abroad perform critical preemptive operations to make sure that travelers who are coming to our country are thoroughly screened and vetted. H.R. 4780 will help ensure that these important international DHS programs are utilized in a strategic and effective manner to further enhance the security of the U.S.

Before I yield back, I would note that H.R. 4780 is a part of a larger legislative package that I am introducing today. Among other things, my package would authorize significant expansions of critical CBP and ICE overseas screening and vetting programs and significant new CBP staffing resources to support overseas program expansion and address domestic staffing shortages at U.S. international airports.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4780.

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

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, once again, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4780.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4780, the "Department of Homeland Security Strategy for International Programs Act."

This legislation directs the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) to submit a comprehensive three-year strategy for international programs in which DHS personnel and resources are deployed abroad for vetting and screening persons seeking to enter the United States.

Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Homeland Security I support this bill because the issue of proper vetting and screening processes' upon the entry into the country is paramount.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4780 directs the Security Committee of the Department of Homeland Security to use the following strategies to implement this legislation:

1. A risk-based method for determining whether to establish new international programs in new locations, given resource constraints, or expand existing international programs;

2. Alignment with the highest DHS-wide and government-wide strategic priorities of resource allocations on such programs; and

3. A common reporting framework for the submission of reliable, comparable cost data by DHS components on overseas expenditures attributable to such programs.

In developing this strategy the Department for health and human services shall secure:

1. Information on existing operations of DHS programs that includes corresponding information for each location in which each such program operates,

2. Analysis of the impact of each such international program on domestic activities of DHS components,

3. The number of DHS personnel deployed to each location at which such an international program is in operation during the current and preceding fiscal year, and

4. Analysis of barriers to the expansion of such an international program.

There should be a proper vetting and screening process for individuals entering the country from locations abroad.

Border security is an evolving process, and our legislative process must evolve with it.

Avoiding recurrences of attacks on the homeland such as the 911 attack is a major reason entry into the country should be heavily monitored.

I urge all members to join me in voting to pass H.R. 4780.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4780, 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.

COUNTERTERRORISM ADVISORY BOARD ACT OF 2016

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4407) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish in the Department of Homeland Security a board to coordinate and integrate departmental intelligence, activities, and policy related to counterterrorism, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4407

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 "Counterterrorism Advisory Board Act of 2016".

SEC. 2. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY COUNTERTERRORISM ADVISORY BOARD.

(a) IN GENERAL.—At the end of subtitle A of title II of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 121 et seq.) insert the following new section:

"SEC. 210G. DEPARTMENTAL COORDINATION ON COUNTERTERRORISM.

"(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is in the Department a board to be composed of senior representatives of departmental operational components and headquarters elements. The purpose of the board shall be to coordinate and integrate departmental intelligence, activities, and policy related to the counterterrorism mission and functions of the Department.

"(b) CHARTER.—There shall be a charter to govern the structure and mission of the board. Such charter shall direct the board to focus on the current threat environment and the importance of aligning departmental counterterrorism activities under the Secretary's guidance. The charter shall be reviewed and updated every four years, as appropriate.

"(c) MEMBERS.—

"(1) CHAIR.—The Secretary shall appoint a Coordinator for Counterterrorism within the Department who will serve as the chair of the board.

"(2) ADDITIONAL MEMBERS.—The Secretary shall appoint additional members of the board from among the following:

"(A) The Transportation Security Administration.

"(B) United States Customs and Border Protection.

"(C) United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

"(D) The Federal Emergency Management Agency.

"(E) The Coast Guard.

"(F) United States Citizenship and Immigration Services.

"(G) The United States Secret Service.

"(H) The National Protection and Programs Directorate.

"(I) The Office of Operations Coordination.

"(J) The Office of the General Counsel.

"(K) The Office of Intelligence and Analysis.

"(L) The Office of Policy.

"(M) The Science and Technology Directorate.

"(N) Other Departmental offices and programs as determined appropriate by the Secretary.

"(d) MEETINGS.—The board shall meet on a regular basis to discuss intelligence and coordinate ongoing threat mitigation efforts and departmental activities, including coordination with other Federal, State, local, tribal, territorial, and private sector partners, and shall make recommendations to the Secretary.

"(e) TERRORISM ALERTS.—The board shall advise the Secretary on the issuance of terrorism alerts pursuant to section 203 of this Act.

"(f) PROHIBITION ON ADDITIONAL FUNDS.—No additional funds are authorized to carry out this section.".

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of such Act is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 210F the following new item:

"Sec. 210G. Departmental coordination on counterterrorism.".

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary, acting through the Coordinator for Counterterrorism, shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a report on the status and activities of the board established under section 210G of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by subsection (a).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from

New York (Mr. KATKO) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KATKO. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

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

Since the tragic events of 9/11, this body has endeavored to better integrate intelligence and law enforcement agencies to react to new and evolving threats and to reduce duplicative efforts and waste. To a large extent, we have succeeded in producing a more integrated security apparatus that properly reflects the terrorist threats of the 21st century. However, we must continue to make improvements to counter fast-changing threats like those posed by ISIS.

Mr. Speaker, we are seeing the greatest convergence of radical Islamic threats in history, with more than 40,000 jihadist fighters traveling to the battlefield in Syria and Iraq.

Furthermore, the United States faces the highest threat level since 9/11—with open counterterrorism investigations in all 50 States in this great country of ours and with more than 80 ISIS-related arrests in the past 2 years, including one just up the road from my district on New Year's Eve.

With the current threat environment in mind, I offer H.R. 4407, the Counterterrorism Advisory Board Act of 2016.

Initially established at the end of 2010, this panel brings together the Department of Homeland Security's top counterterrorism decisionmakers to respond to threats. However, I led a bipartisan task force, which found that the Counterterrorism Advisory Board, or CTAB, had neither been codified nor had its charter kept pace with today's evolving terrorist threats. That is why we need to pass this bill—to ensure that the DHS is effectively integrating intelligence, operations, and policy to fight terrorism and that it is quickly exchanging threat information.

This legislation formally establishes the CTAB in law, and it makes it the Department's central coordination body for counterterrorism activities. The bill also updates the Board's charter to better enable it to confront tomorrow's challenges today, and it requires the Secretary to appoint a Coordinator for Counterterrorism to oversee the Board's activities. It is an important change to the current structure.

Additionally, the legislation requires the CTAB to advise the Secretary on the issuance of terrorism alerts, ensuring that top counterterrorism and intelligence officials play a key role in developing these critical notices to the public.

Finally, H.R. 4407 ensures continued congressional oversight by requiring the DHS to report on the status and activities of the CTAB so that we can be certain it is meeting its mandate.

I thank Chairman MCCAUL for appointing me to lead the bipartisan Task Force on Combating Terrorist and Foreign Fighter Travel, which formulated, roughly, 50 recommendations for making our country safer, one of which serves as the basis for this legislation.

I also thank Ranking Member THOMPSON and his great staff for all of the work we have been doing to get a lot of these bills passed into law, and I very much appreciate our bipartisan work together.

I am proud to say we have now acted legislatively on more than half of the task force's findings, largely thanks to the hard work of the other members of the task force and their willingness to reach across the aisle and do what is right for our country.

I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 4407, the Counterterrorism Advisory Board Act of 2016.

H.R. 4407 authorizes, within the Department of Homeland Security, the Counterterrorism Advisory Board, or CTAB, to coordinate and integrate Departmental intelligence, activities, and policy related to counterterrorism.

Since 2010, the internal body, which is comprised of top DHS officials, has helped to harmonize counterterrorism programs and activities across the DHS. H.R. 4407 directs the CTAB to meet on a regular basis to coordinate and integrate the Department's counterterrorism efforts, and it sets forth the leadership and composition of the Board. H.R. 4407 also requires the DHS to report to Congress on the Board's status and activities.

This legislation is a product of the House Committee on Homeland Security's bipartisan Task Force on Terrorist and Foreign Fighter Travel, which learned that the CTAB, which has operated for 6 years, was never authorized in law.

□ 1800

To ensure that the board remains an integral part of counterterrorism policy recommendations and responses across the Department, the task force recommended that the board be codified in law. Codification of the board is consistent with the task force's finding that information sharing is critical to preventing foreign fighter travel.

I believe that the CTAB should be a permanent fixture in the Department to help inform the counterterrorism decisionmaking of future Department Secretaries. As such, I support this legislation, which tackles an important task force recommendation and finding, and commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. KATKO) for introducing it as well as making it here for the hearing of this bill today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time to close.

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

Again, H.R. 4407 will authorize within the Department of Homeland Security the counterterrorism advisory board to coordinate and integrate departmental intelligence activities and policies related to counterterrorism. The board already plays a central and necessary role within DHS.

Enactment of H.R. 4407 will ensure that, no matter what happens in the upcoming election or who is the head of the Department, the counterterrorism advisory board will remain intact.

I urge passage of H.R. 4407.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I once again urge my colleagues to support this strong bipartisan piece of legislation. It is commonsense legislation, but it is very important to institutionalize things that are working to some extent within the Department of Homeland Security and the counterterrorism advisory board. The tweaks that we have in this legislation are going to make it a good, firm setting for fighting the counterterrorism activity going forward.

I do want to note for a moment as well that there have been an awful lot of bills that came out of Homeland Security this term, and the vast majority of those bills have had bipartisan support. I am proud of the work we are doing together with our colleagues on both sides of the aisle, and we are going to continue to do that moving forward to keep this country safe.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4407, Counterterrorism Advisory Board Act of 2016, because it will establish a board to coordinate and integrate DHS's intelligence, activities, and clarify policy related to its counterterrorism mission and functions.

As a member of the House Committee on Homeland Security since its establishment, and current Ranking Member of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism and Homeland Security this bill is of importance to me.

It was said of the George W. Bush Administration by the 9–11 Commission that it did not connect the dots that would have allowed the intelligence and law enforcement communities to detect and possibly deter the September 11, 2001 attack against our nation.

We have learned a great deal over the nearly 15 years since Al Qaeda attacked our nation.

One of the more important lessons is the need to have coordination and unity of effort among and within intelligence and law enforcement agencies in our battle to defeat terrorists.

H.R. 4407 establishes a board that will:

(1) advise the Secretary of DHS on the issuance of terrorism alerts, and meet on a regular basis to discuss intelligence; and

(2) coordinate ongoing threat mitigation efforts and departmental activities.

The terrorism alert system initiated following September 2001, caused confusion and uncertainty.

In November 2002, I was proud to join my colleagues in voting to create the Department of Homeland Security.

H.R. 4407 will develop a process for determining when alerts should be issued, which will make it easier for the Department of Homeland Security to develop messages that will guide public and interagency actions.

My work on the Homeland Security Committee has allowed me the privilege of serving as Chair of the Subcommittee on Transportation Security, and the Ranking Member of the Border and Maritime Security Subcommittee.

The Homeland Security Committee has worked over the years since its founding to ensure that this agency is prepared and staffed to meet the challenges and demands of its mandate.

As we have worked to define and support the mission of the Department of Homeland Security we have worked to keep the efforts of the agency focused not only on the threats we have faced, but also the new ones that may come.

It is the responsibility of Congress not only to provide DHS with new guidelines, but also to provide the agency with the funding it needs to do the work of protecting this great nation.

For several Congresses DHS has faced a government shutdown and sequestration that has depleted its resources and stranded its efforts to do all of the work members of this body demands.

Mr. Speaker, since DHS initiated its headquarters consolidation in 2006, it has progressed despite changes in senior leadership and waning funding support from Congress.

As I urge my colleagues to support this bill, I also remind them that the passage of new laws that require more of the agency should also mean that we should require more of ourselves as members of Congress.

We should support the work of the men and women of DHS as they stand on the front line of our nation's domestic security by making sure that they have the tools and the skills needed to do the job we require.

I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 4407.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. KATKO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4407, 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. KATKO. 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.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DOLD) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

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. 4743, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 4407, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The second electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

NATIONAL CYBERSECURITY PREPAREDNESS CONSORTIUM ACT OF 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4743) to authorize the Secretary of Homeland Security to establish a National Cybersecurity Preparedness Consortium, 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 Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 394, nays 3, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 194]

YEAS—394

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Price, Tom
Quigley
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez

Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—3

Amash
Gohmert
Massie

NOT VOTING—36

Brown (FL)
Carter (TX)
Cleaver
Crawford
DeGette
Fattah
Fincher
Fleming
Forbes
Frelinghuysen
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Hultgren
Johnson, Sam
Kelly (IL)
Latta
Lieu, Ted
Maloney, Carolyn
Nolan
Rogers (AL)
Rohrabacher
Rooney (FL)
Rush
Sanchez, Loretta
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Walker
Waters, Maxine
Webster (FL)
Whitfield

□ 1850

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 authorize the Secretary of Homeland Security to work with cybersecurity consortia for training, and for other purposes.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COUNTERTERRORISM ADVISORY BOARD ACT OF 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4407) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish in the Department of Homeland Security a board to coordinate and integrate departmental intelligence, activities, and policy related to counterterrorism, 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 New York (Mr. KATKO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 389, nays 5, not voting 39, as follows:

[Roll No. 195]

YEAS—389

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaHood
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Price, Tom
Quigley
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—5

Amash
Gohmert
Jones
Massie
Yoho

NOT VOTING—39

Bass
Brown (FL)
Carter (TX)
Cleaver
Crawford
DeGette
Fattah
Fincher
Fleming
Forbes
Frelinghuysen
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Hultgren
Johnson, Sam
Kelly (IL)
LaMalfa
Latta
Lieu, Ted
Maloney, Carolyn
Marchant
Nolan
Rohrabacher
Rooney (FL)
Rush
Sanchez, Loretta
Schrader
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Vela
Walker
Waters, Maxine
Webster (FL)
Whitfield

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1857

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.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1900

CUBA DRUG SHIPMENT

(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, the U.S. Deputy Secretary of Homeland Security is currently in Cuba participating in bilateral meetings on law enforcement cooperation with the Castro regime. This will serve as another propaganda coup for the Castro brothers.

In the past, the Obama administration and Cuba have held technical exchanges on counternarcotics. Yet, last month, Panamanian authorities intercepted over 400 kilos of cocaine in a shipment from—guess where—Cuba en route to Belgium.

This is not the first time that the Castro brothers tried to ship illicit materials. In 2013, Mr. Speaker, approximately 240 tons of illegal weapons were intercepted by Panamanians on a ship going from Cuba to North Korea. In fact, this shipment was the largest weapons cache ever intercepted going to North Korea in violation of several U.N. Security Council resolutions.

So how does this happen, Mr. Speaker? Let's not forget that Cuba's military owns and operates Cuba's port facilities.

So how does cocaine, how do shipments, and how do guns get onto these ships? I doubt that our deputy secretary will inquire about the complicity of the Castro regime in these illicit shipments when he meets with his Cuban counterparts. So shame on us, Mr. Speaker.

CELEBRATING THE CARDENAS' 24TH WEDDING ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Mr. Speaker, today is a day that is a very emotional day for my family and me.

Many years ago, there was a beautiful young woman who grew up in Pacoima. She was the daughter of immigrants, and I was lucky enough to meet her and lucky enough for her to accept a date. Some years later, we got married, 24 years ago today, and I just wanted to take an opportunity to thank her for having a moment of lapse and accepting that date and eventually for us getting married. We have four beautiful children that we have raised.

I don't take it for granted, ladies and gentlemen, that as her parents are from Mexico and my parents are from Mexico, from another country, we now have been able to provide a better life for our children that previous generations could not.

So I stand before you as a proud American and a very happy man to know that I am married to a wonderful woman, born Norma Sanchez and now is Norma Cárdenas. She is the mother of our children and someone that I miss very much.

So to you, Norma, I am sorry I couldn't be home. I am thousands of miles away. But thank you for understanding. I look forward to seeing you to celebrate with you soon.

NATIONAL LAW ENFORCEMENT WEEK

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, it is National Law Enforcement Week and a time to honor the men and women in blue that risk their health and safety daily to keep our communities safe.

The shooting of two officers just this last week in New Hampshire shows us that the danger that law enforcement faces is all too real. Whenever I participate in a police ride-along, I am constantly impressed by the professionalism and the commitment to duty from our police officers.

It is important that we recognize their efforts and make sure they have the resources to do their jobs effectively. I was pleased that last week we reauthorized the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program to help local law enforcement agencies obtain potentially lifesaving equipment for their officers.

In addition, we passed my bill to provide law enforcement with more tools to find abducted and missing children.

Mr. Speaker, we owe a debt of gratitude to the Thin Blue Line and the men and women of law enforcement for all that they do to keep us safe.

RECOGNIZING INTERNATIONAL DAY AGAINST HOMOPHOBIA AND TRANSPHOBIA

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

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the International Day Against Homophobia and Transphobia. Every year on May 17, LGBT individuals and their allies use this day to bring awareness to LGBT discrimination.

Since 2004, this day has expanded to every corner of the world. It is celebrated in more than 130 countries, including 37 countries where homosexuality is illegal, where courageous individuals and organizations are standing up for basic human rights.

Sadly, homophobia, transphobia, and LGBT discrimination still exist around the world. Despite last year's victory for marriage equality, many still want to turn the clock back on equality. North Carolina, Mississippi, and Tennessee's recent anti-LGBT laws cast light on this discrimination. Sadly, these hateful bills are nothing more than State-sanctioned hate.

I am proud to have introduced H. Res. 263, supporting the goals and ideals of the International Day Against Homophobia and Transphobia. I would like to thank the 70 cosponsors and encourage all of my colleagues to sign on as cosponsors.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me tomorrow and every day in speaking out against LGBT hatred.

RECOGNIZING MARYANN VOLDERS ON BEING NAMED ADMINISTRATOR OF THE YEAR

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, as co-chairman of the Congressional Career and Technical Education Caucus, it is my pleasure to recognize the efforts of MaryAnn Volders, who was recently named Administrator of the Year by the Pennsylvania Association of Career and Technical Education.

MaryAnn is the vice president of secondary education at the Central Pennsylvania Institute of Science and Technology, or CPI, located in Centre County, in Pennsylvania's Fifth Congressional District. She has been with CPI for the past 9 years, having previously worked with the Tyrone Area School District.

This award is a true sign of Volders' work in helping prepare students for careers in growing technical fields not only across Pennsylvania, but also across the United States. On a day-to-day basis, MaryAnn's work can include everything from working on a grant to assisting students and teachers—working to create the best possible educational environment at CPI.

Her nomination included five letters of support, including one from a student. MaryAnn says a student greeted her with congratulatory roses after she received word that she had won this award and recognition.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

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

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the brave men and women who protect New Hampshire.

Last week in Manchester, our State's largest city, a robbery suspect shot and wounded two police officers. Thankfully, Manchester Police Department caught the suspect. Officers Ryan Hardy and Matthew O'Connor are healing.

Other police officers who risk their lives every day haven't been as lucky. Merrimack native, Ashley Guindon, an officer in Virginia, died in the line of duty earlier this year, a day after being sworn in. Ashley's name will join those on the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial in Washington, D.C.

During National Police Week, officers from around the country are here to pay their respects. Today, I had the pleasure of meeting Hooksett Police Chief Peter Bartlett and Jordan Wells of the Portsmouth PD.

My friends are on the front lines of New Hampshire's heroin epidemic. My bill to increase their access to lifesaving antioverdose medication passed the House, and I am a proud partner in a number of efforts to make their jobs easier and safer.

A police officer's job will always be dangerous. This week is an opportunity for us to thank them, particularly those who have made the ultimate sacrifice.

SECURING AMERICA'S AIRPORTS

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege of serving on the Homeland Security Committee, and in that capacity I have the oversight for any number of agencies, including the Transportation Security Administration agency, along with our ranking member and ranking member of our subcommittee and our chairpersons. Let me be very clear: we want America to be secured.

But I had the privilege of meeting again with the Administrator of TSA,

and as we watched incidents in Arizona and Chicago, I am very sure that as we build the TSOs and as we work to correct these issues, we could not have a better frontline defense for protecting America.

As I have traveled to airports across the Nation and watched civilians or citizens, passengers traveling through, I have seen a smile and a recognition of how important TSOs are. It is important to make sure that equipment works, and it is more important to make sure that we have the right kind of staffing. We are almost 3,000 to 4,000 short of the number of TSOs that we need.

It is also important that we recognize that a professional Federal staff is very important, similar to the many other law enforcement agencies that we have. Privatization is not the answer, but efficiency, expediency, good equipment, and training is. I believe we are moving forward to make sure that we have that kind of trained force to secure the American people and secure the Nation's airports.

COMMEMORATING SMALL BUSINESS WEEK

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month we celebrated Small Business Week, a time when we especially recognize the unique contributions small businesses make providing opportunities for citizens.

South Carolina feels the positive impact of small-business owners. These individuals represent 97 percent of all employers in our State. I am grateful to represent these entrepreneurs who are dedicated to creating jobs that will help citizens around them have meaningful and fulfilling lives.

I appreciate visiting with members of the South Carolina small-business community. I was grateful to tour Dayton Rogers, a plant in Columbia, South Carolina, led by President Ron Lowry, where I was inspired by the enthusiastic personnel.

I participated in a roundtable discussion with the National Federation of Independent Business, NFIB, led by Ben Homeyer about the overreach of government. These meetings made it clear that small businesses are not being supported by this administration because of the burdensome tax regulations.

I look forward to working with my fellow House Republicans as we support reforms to reduce regulations and create jobs and opportunities.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and may the President, by his actions, never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

RECOGNIZING REBUILDING TOGETHER WAYCROSS

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Rebuilding Together Waycross and all the hard work of its volunteers.

The Rebuilding Together organization rebuilds family homes for veterans, people with disability, and low-income families, with the goal of a safe and healthy home for each person in the community.

The nonprofit organization was founded in 1973 in Midland, Texas, by a small group of people who noticed the need to refurbish homes in their community. In the beginning, the group worked on those homes once a year each April, but by 1988, Rebuilding Together gained national recognition.

Rebuilding Together now has over 100,000 volunteers who complete 10,000 projects each year and has spread to rebuilding homes in Waycross, Georgia. Rebuilding Together Waycross is one of four Rebuilding Together networks in the State of Georgia.

I want to thank everyone who is a part of Rebuilding Together, and especially Rebuilding Together Waycross, for the hard work and for the life-changing services that this group has provided to families across America.

MEDIA IGNORES PUBLIC'S VIEWS ON CLIMATE CHANGE

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Americans are skeptical about the news they receive on climate change. A recent Gallup poll found that 46 percent of Americans believe that the Earth's natural changes are the primary cause of climate change. Americans are split as to the cause of any climate change. However, the liberal national media only portrays one side of the story.

Over the last month, every New York Times and Washington Post article on this topic attributed warmer temperatures solely to human activity. Not one mentioned that natural changes could partially be the cause.

What is amazing is that, with all the media bias blaming humans for climate change, half of all Americans still remain skeptical. Americans deserve all the facts about climate change, not just the one side the liberal national media are trying to promote.

□ 1915

CELEBRATING NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, for more than 50 years, May 15 has been recognized as Peace Officers Memorial Day, and the calendar week in which May 15 falls is National Police Week.

During National Police Week, we honor those law enforcement officers who have lost their lives in the line of duty for the safety and protection of others. In 2016, 252 fallen law enforcement heroes were added to the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial. Their sacrifice is not forgotten, and their families remain in our prayers during this week of remembrance.

The men and women who dedicate their lives to law enforcement not only keep our families safe, but they also help to preserve the way of life we hold so dear. They walk the neighborhood beats, patrol our streets, and willingly do the dangerous work that make our lives safer. They deserve our gratitude today and every day.

MICROSTAMPING LIMITS CHOICE

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, tonight I introduced H. Res. 731 expressing Congress' opposition to laws requiring that microstamping technology be included in handguns.

Time and time again, studies have shown that microstamping technology has failed to achieve any reliable effectiveness.

A study by the University of California, Davis—certainly no hotbed of support for the Second Amendment—recommended against imposing microstamping requirements, and the creator of the technology participated in a study which determined it did not work reliably.

Mr. Speaker, the only real impact of microstamping is to increase costs and make it more difficult for Americans to exercise their Second Amendment rights. Unfortunately, that is the true intent of these laws, not to increase safety, but to simply make it more difficult for law-abiding citizens to own firearms.

Even the Ninth Circuit Court agreed—the most overturned court in the country—just today that laws intended solely to prevent Americans from exercising their rights are unconstitutional.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to reject these laws and join me in standing up for the Second Amendment and join on to H. Res. 731.

CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOST). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and add any extraneous material relevant to the subject matter of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening as co-anchor along with my classmate and scholar, Congressman HAKEEM JEFFRIES, from the Eighth District of New York, for tonight's Congressional Black Caucus Special Order hour, Equal Justice Under the Law: Criminal Justice Reform and Challenging the School-to-Prison Pipeline.

Congressman JEFFRIES leads by example. He is a member of the Criminal Justice Task Force, and he has a long personal and professional history of being a Brother's Keeper.

This evening the Congressional Black Caucus comes to the House floor to discuss the current state of America's criminal justice system and the necessary reform, reform that will allow us to invest in our communities and expand opportunities for all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, the school-to-prison pipeline is an epidemic that is plaguing schools across the Nation. Mr. Speaker, the need and appetite to reform our Federal criminal justice system has been building for years, and now it is clear that there is consensus that the time is now to take meaningful action.

The school-to-prison pipeline refers to the policies and practices that pushes our Nation's children, especially our most at-risk children, out of the classroom and into the juvenile and criminal justice system. Far too often, students are expended, expelled, or even arrested for minor offenses that lead to visits to the principal's office a thing of the past.

Statistics reflect that these policies disproportionately target students of color and those with a history of abuse, neglect, poverty, or learning disabilities. Those who are unnecessarily forced out of school become stigmatized and fall behind in their studies, Mr. Speaker. Many eventually decide to drop out of school altogether, and many others commit crimes in their community.

Former U.S. Attorney General Eric Holder discussed the issue in a speech to the American Bar Association in 2013, stating that rigid discipline policies transformed too many educational institutions from the doorway of opportunity into the gateway to the criminal justice system and that a minor school disciplinary offense should put a student in the principal's office, not in the police precinct.

According to recent data by the Department of Education, African American students are arrested far more than their White classmates. Black and Hispanic students represent more than 70 percent of those involved in school-related arrests or referrals to law enforcement. Currently, African Americans make up two-fifths of combined youth today, Mr. Speaker.

In my home State of Ohio, the impact of suspensions and expulsions on communities is striking. In Ohio, a history of prior suspensions from school is the number one factor that leads children to dropping out of school. Children who do not finish high school, as we all are aware, are more likely to end up incarcerated or in our juvenile or criminal justice system and are 3.5 times more likely to be arrested.

Approximately 82 percent of the adult population is composed of high school dropouts. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, this is a pipeline that reflects the prioritization of incarceration over education. But, Mr. Speaker, I come today as a member of the Congressional Black Caucus because I believe we can disrupt the pipeline.

To do this, we need to be honest about the opportunity gaps that exist across our country and in our schools because you cannot talk about the school-to-prison pipeline without discussing what needs to be provided as economic opportunities.

We need better educational chances for our young people. We need more support to our families so that they can do the best job that they can or that they are capable of doing to help support their own children. We must confront prejudices in our Nation head-on.

That is why initiatives like the White House's My Brother's Keeper is so important. My Brother's Keeper Task Force is a coordinated Federal effort to address persistent opportunity gaps faced by boys and young men of color and ensure that all young people can reach their full potential.

Mr. Speaker, lastly, this past weekend I met with the dynamic men of the Columbus chapter of Kappa Alpha Psi Fraternity, Incorporated, in my district and saw My Brother's Keeper work firsthand.

I learned of their many forms of being role models, as being community mentors for at-risk students, particularly young males, who are in need of inspiration and counsel regarding their choice of a life's career.

The mentoring men of Kappa Alpha Psi Fraternity, Incorporated, are men who are doctors, lawyers, government officials, teachers, and entrepreneurs, just to name a few.

Mr. Speaker, these men are role models for the community. They bought a house in my district, and they use that home as an anchor to provide opportunities and leadership development, professional networking, and positive reinforcement.

Tonight it is important for me to put a face on what we need to do as one small example to stop the school-to-prison pipeline. I salute Philip Shotwell, Polemarch; Richard Crockett, 1st Vice Polemarch; Attorney Byron Potts; Dr. Gus Parker; and Board of Directors Nathaniel Jordan for being men who understand, if we are going to stop the school-to-prison pipeline, we need to look at our own districts.

A young man asked them why he should stay in school, and they replied: Young man, you are your own future. We are relying on you to be a law-abiding citizen, educated, self-sufficient, and a good citizen because we don't want you to be a statistic in the school-to-prison pipeline.

Mr. Speaker, tonight you will hear many stories, you will hear facts, and you will hear about legislation.

Let me end by saying that I am proud to be a cosponsor of the Safe, Accountable, Fair, Effective (SAFE) Justice Reinvestment Act of 2015, H.R. 2944, a bill that recognizes the importance of mentoring and reducing recidivism and helps offenders think through the decisions that confront them when they leave prison.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD), our chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus, a person who has a long background in being an advocate and a fighter for those who are in our communities and faced with many of the things that you are going to hear tonight.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman BEATTY for yielding, thank her for her friendship, and thank her for all that she does not just for the Congressional Black Caucus, but for all that she does for the constituents that she represents back in Ohio and for what she does for all people in America.

Let me also thank Congressman JEFFRIES for his great work and his willingness to participate in these Special Order hours. I know that the evening is late sometimes, but the two of them come to the floor and work very hard.

I want to spend my few minutes, if I may, Mr. Speaker, talking about just an overview of the criminal justice system. There is no question that the criminal justice system is broken. All of us I think can agree on that. Those on the left and those on the right, all of us even, for different reasons, perhaps, come to one conclusion, that the criminal justice system is in need of serious, serious reform.

I know that we are debating legislation here in the House regarding reforming the criminal justice system. Our colleagues over in the Senate are doing the same. But it is time for action. It is time for action on criminal justice reform in the 114th Congress.

As many of my colleagues know, I spent 30 years, 30 long years, in a courtroom, half of those as a lawyer, the other half as a judge. Most of the 15 years as a judge I was a trial judge, which meant that I was on the front line in our criminal justice system and I saw it firsthand. I can tell you without question that the criminal justice system in America is in need of serious reform from the top to the bottom.

We have all heard the statistics, and I am going to repeat them again tonight: 2.2 million Americans are in prison. Of that number, that number is disproportionately African American. That is 25 percent of the world's prison population right here in the United States of America.

Just think about that, Mr. Speaker. We are 5 percent of the world's population, but 25 percent of those who are incarcerated are incarcerated in the United States of America. We have a serious problem of mass incarceration that must be reduced.

But the point that I want to put in the RECORD tonight is that, of those who are incarcerated in this country, 90 percent of those are incarcerated at the State level and 10 percent incarcerated at the Federal level—90 percent incarcerated at the State level.

□ 1930

When we discuss criminal justice reform—and Congressman BOBBY SCOTT is going to be speaking in a few minutes, and he talks about this all of the time, as well as Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE—we must not only talk about reform at the Federal level, but we must find ways to require States to reform their criminal justice systems at the local level. We should encourage States to take a serious look at their systems and to seek ways to reduce mass incarceration at the State level without posing any harm to the communities. Too many of those who are incarcerated at the State level are in prison for drug-related offenses and crimes that don't endanger the community whatsoever.

We should encourage States to enact expungement laws. We get telephone calls all the time—and I am sure my colleagues get the same calls as well—from those who are seeking ways to expunge their records so that young men and women who have served in the criminal justice system can get some of those offenses removed from their records, particularly those offenses that deal with petty crimes and misdemeanors and drug-related offenses, because when you have these offenses on your criminal record, it prevents young people from getting the gainful employment that they so richly deserve.

We also need to encourage States to look at ways to remove criminal charges from criminal records that did not result in convictions. I think most of my colleagues can relate to that. We know that, so often, police officers at the local level will charge a young offender with multiple offenses at the time of arrest, and some of the offenses are not even deserving of a charge. Sometimes police have a tendency to overcharge at the time of arrest. Then when the case finally goes to court, those 10 or 12 charges are reduced down to one charge or two charges; the defendant pleads guilty; and the case is disposed of while the other 8 or 10 charges that are dismissed continue to be on the young person's criminal record for a lifetime. So often, just the fact that the individual has been charged with a crime prevents that young person from getting a job. So often, it makes a difference.

Finally, I thank Mrs. BEATTY for talking about using the court system to punish students. That happens. It happens in every State in America. Our public school systems cannot, and should not, use the court system as a means of punishment for students who have behavioral problems in school.

I thank all of my colleagues for all of their work. I thank them for their efforts. I thank them for their tremendous interest in this subject because it is real. We know it. We need criminal justice reform, and we need it now.

Mrs. BEATTY. I thank Congressman BUTTERFIELD.

We certainly agree with you that the criminal justice system is broken. That is why the Congressional Black Caucus is here tonight—to make sure that we are prepared to outline the steps and the legislation that is going to be in the forefront. I thank the gentleman for his leadership in making this a top priority for the Congressional Black Caucus.

Mr. Speaker, it is now my honor and privilege to yield to the gentleman from the Third Congressional District of Virginia. He is a true scholar, an attorney, and someone who is a leader on tonight's topic. He is someone who has worked tirelessly to make sure that we do more than just come and stand and talk about this issue tonight. He comes to talk about real reform, to talk about making a difference in our broken criminal justice system. He is my friend, Congressman BOBBY SCOTT.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I thank the gentlewoman.

I appreciate the gentleman from New York and certainly the gentlewoman from Ohio for organizing this Special Order to discuss the need for criminal justice reform.

Mr. Speaker, we have serious, fundamental problems with our criminal justice system today. For too long, policymakers have chosen to play politics with crime policy by enacting so-called tough on crime slogans and sound bites, such as three strikes and you are out, mandatory minimum sentences, and—if you get it to rhyme, apparently, it is better—if you do the adult crime, you do the adult time. As appealing as these policies sound, their impacts range from a negligible reduction in crime to actually increasing the crime rate.

As a result of these policies, the United States, despite representing only 5 percent of the world's population, has 25 percent of the world's prisoners and now has the highest incarceration rate of any nation's, by far, in the world. There are 2.2 million people behind bars in this country. That is triple the number of prisoners we had just three decades ago. At over 700 persons incarcerated for every 100,000 in the population, the United States far exceeds the world's average incarceration rate of about 100 per 100,000.

Recent studies have questioned the sanity of this mass incarceration. For example, the Pew Research Center on States estimates that after about 350 per 100,000, any crime reduction value begins to diminish, and at over 500 per 100,000, incarceration becomes, actually, counterproductive. As I said, our rate is now at 700 per 100,000.

These counterproductive effects are created because today there are too many children who are being raised by a parent who is in prison and by too many people with felony records who are unable to find jobs. The impact of our tax dollars is also distressing. The Bureau of Prisons is consuming too much of the Department of Justice's budget, meaning that the Department has fewer and fewer resources for other programs that can actually reduce crime and enhance public safety. The tough on crime approach falls the hardest on minorities. While the incarceration rate overall in the United States is approximately 700 per 100,000, for Blacks, the incarceration rate is over 2,200 per 100,000; and in some jurisdictions, they lock up Blacks at the rate of 4,000 per 100,000—a rate 40 times the international average.

The war on drugs has exacerbated this problem. Over 2,000 Federal prisoners are now serving life without parole for nonviolent drug crimes, and many more are serving unduly harsh sentences for nonviolent offenses. The racial disparities are staggering. Despite the fact that Whites engage in drug offenses at a rate equal to or often higher than that of African Americans, African Americans are incarcerated on drug charges at a rate 10 times greater than that of Whites.

We all agree that there is a problem with mass incarceration. So what is the best way to solve it?

When reviewing any legislative package called criminal justice reform, I think there are some key principles that we have to address.

First, reform must meaningfully address the problem of mass incarceration by significantly reducing admissions to prison and shortening a prisoner's length of stay.

Second, any reform must address the primary driver of the ballooning Federal prison populations, and that is mandatory minimum penalties, especially those for drug and firearm offenses.

Third, we must address the disparate impact on race in the Federal criminal justice system that has resulted from the application of many neutrally worded policies and laws.

Fourth, reform must address mental health and addiction issues as a public health issue and require intervention and treatment plans to resolve underlying issues that led those to be involved in the criminal justice system rather than implement so-called tough on crime, lock 'em up approaches. Everybody knows that the war on drugs

has failed. We need to address drug abuse more as a public health issue and less as a criminal justice issue.

Fifth, we must provide comprehensive reentry and rehabilitation services and incentives for completing those programs that are found to actually work, with a particular focus on those with the greatest need.

Finally, any legislation must be based on research and evidence, not on poll-tested slogans and sound bites or political negotiations, which are unrelated to research and evidence.

How do the current proposals stack up?

First, we look at the current bills that have been reported out of the House and Senate Judiciary Committees and notice that they fail to embody any of the principles. In fact, they often take the opposite approach.

While these bills reduce the number of admissions and/or length of stay in some limited cases, they also create new mandatory minimums, even new mandatory minimums or mandatory consecutive enhancements. They enhance existing mandatory minimums to apply to people who would not get them under the present law, and they irrationally limit who can benefit from prospective and retroactive relief provisions. It is unknown whether there will be an overall increase or decrease in prison impact at the 10-year point after implementation, if these bills pass, compared to doing nothing. The United States Sentencing Commission has been unable to quantify the impact of the expansions or the limitations on relief. So the fact that we do not have the numbers means that we cannot determine whether these bills will have any meaningful effect on mass incarceration.

Though the bills do shorten two supersized mandatory minimums, they do not eliminate any mandatory minimum. The Senate bill actually creates two new ones, and both bills create new mandatory consecutive sentencing enhancements, which must be served after any other sentence. Both bills expand mandatory minimums for drug and gun offenses by applying them to people who would not be eligible to receive them today.

If the problem we are trying to address is mass incarceration, why are those in the bill to begin with?

Neither of the bills will do anything to address the disparate racial impact that pervades our criminal justice system. Federal mandatory minimums, in particular those for drug and firearm offenses, have been studied and have been found to have a racially disparate impact. These bills do nothing to eliminate mandatory minimums. Even though they reduce some, they create new ones, expand others, and create new sentencing enhancements. So the bills may actually make racial disparities in sentencing even worse than they are under present law.

Finally, both bills put limits on who can receive prospective and retroactive relief. If you look at the limitations, you will find that they have a racially disparate impact on minorities.

On the issue of the war on drugs, both bills also fail to treat drug abuse and addiction as a public health problem. In fact, the strategy used in the bills to address heroin addiction is not a public health approach, for the bills impose mandatory additional prison time. This is not a public health, research-based approach.

On the comprehensive reentry and rehabilitation services to reduce recidivism, these bills have turned science and empirical evidence upside down. They give the greatest incentives for completing the programs to those with the lowest need while categorically barring offenders with the highest risk from benefiting from the rehabilitation programs. This approach not only violates research, but it will exacerbate the current racial disparities in the criminal justice system.

Mr. Speaker, there is ample research available to show what credible criminal justice reform ought to look like. For example, Texas—one of the Nation's most conservative States—recently passed criminal justice reform legislation that was based on research and evidence, and the result was a significant reduction in crime, a significant reduction in incarceration, and a savings of billions of dollars.

The SAFE Justice Act—the Safe, Accountable, Fair, and Effective Justice Act—which I cosponsored with the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), which the gentlewoman from Ohio pointed out that she is supporting, was based on the Texas model and includes evidence-based prevention and early intervention programs; reducing incarceration even at the State level as well as at the Federal level; comprehensive police training and funding for body cameras, drug and veterans' courts; a significant reduction in the use of mandatory minimum sentences; and rehabilitation for all of those in prison and second-chance programs for those who have been released. It has broad, bipartisan support. All of the provisions in the bill are fully paid for by reallocating the reduction in mandatory minimums, and it shows that we do not have to accept a bill that fails to conform to evidence and research.

Mr. Speaker, criminal justice reform legislation ought to be consistent with the research and evidence that is readily available. From what I can tell, the bills reported out of the House and Senate Judiciary Committees have nothing based in research and evidence and, sadly, seem more concerned about the politics of criminal justice reform, with little regard to actually wanting to end our Nation's addiction to mass incarceration.

The SAFE Justice Act is a better evidence-based approach, which will, if enacted, reduce crime, save money, and reduce racial disparities that pervade our criminal justice system.

I appreciate the gentlewoman from Ohio and the gentleman from New York for hosting tonight's Special Order.

□ 1945

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman SCOTT for clearly articulating to us why we cannot let our criminal justice system remain on this trajectory.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the Congresswoman from the 13th District of California. My colleague and my friend is someone who travels the world advocating for those who live in poverty, advocating for those who are incarcerated in this broken criminal justice system that we are focusing on tonight.

I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I first thank the gentlewoman from Ohio for those very kind and humbling remarks. I want to thank her for her tremendous leadership and for continuing to come down here each and every week to ensure that her voice, the Congressional Black Caucus' voice, and Congressman JEFFRIES' voice are really put forth so that the people of our country will understand the critical issues before us and the fact that the Congressional Black Caucus is really leading on each and every issue. Congresswoman BEATTY and Congressman JEFFRIES really have done a phenomenal job. They both have gone way beyond the call of duty, and so we thank them so much for their efforts.

Make no mistake—and I think we are hearing this over and over again tonight—mass incarceration is a crisis in our country. The United States of America imprisons far more people than any other nation in the world.

When African Americans are incarcerated at six times the rate of Whites, it is no surprise to me. It is no surprise that African Americans constitute nearly half of the total 2.3 million incarcerated Americans in 2008. Together, African Americans and Latinos comprise 58 percent of all prisoners in 2008, even though African Americans and Latinos make up approximately one-quarter of the United States population.

While our prison population grows unchecked and is growing unchecked, we continue to criminalize our students rather than invest in their education. Right now we spend $10,500 a year to educate a child, but we spend $88,000 a year to keep a child locked up. That is unacceptable. Let me repeat that. It costs eight times more money to keep a child in jail than to educate them and prepare them for a good future.

We are not just talking about a few children here. Our country incarcerates five times more children than any other nation in the world. Sadly, two-thirds of these kids will never return to school. When we lock up these children, we are essentially throwing away

the key. Instead of preparing them for a future, we are just getting them ready for a life in a cell.

Now, let me be clear, from the moment many of these children are born, they are funneled into the prison pipeline. Simply put, the system is really stacked against them. For instance, one in three African American children lives in poverty today, while one in four Hispanic children lives in poverty.

Mr. Speaker, while Black children represent just 18 percent of preschool enrollment, they account for nearly half of all preschool suspensions. Now, Congresswoman BEATTY, we are talking toddlers ages 2 to 5. These kids don't even get a start, let alone a head start. They are being suspended from school.

How do you suspend toddlers and babies from school?

Something is wrong with this. So we, I must say, in the Appropriations Committee are trying to address this with the Department of Education. This is immoral.

When they get older, African American students are four times more likely to be expelled from school than their White peers for the same offense. More than half of all students who are involved in school-related arrests or referred to law enforcement are Black or Latino. This has a lasting effect and impact on young students. Studies show that students who are disciplined by schools are more likely to end up in the juvenile justice system where their chances of returning to school are slim to none. This is unacceptable. These young people are having their futures ripped away before they even have a chance.

We need to change the system and end the school-to-prison pipeline. First, we must start by making serious investments in our young people. We should ensure that all students have equal access to high-quality public school education. We must also expand summer youth job opportunities and summer training programs so that our teens have the opportunity to learn workforce skills, contribute to their communities, and start a path to economic opportunity. As a member of the Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, we are working to try to make sure that these resources become a priority of our subcommittee, which they, unfortunately, aren't at this point.

We also need to tear down the institutional racism, quite frankly, that is holding students of color back and trapping our young people in a broken criminal justice system.

I am reminded of when I was in the California legislature. I was on the public safety committee, and proposals were brought to us, plans for building prisons 10 to 12 years out for kids who are just starting kindergarten. That is what we had to deal with. Now we see what has happened to the prison industrial complex in California. That is why we must work together and pass legislation to end mass incarceration and fix our broken criminal justice system. We need to get rid of these outdated minimum sentencing standards. These are relics from the failed war on drugs and disproportionately target people of color.

In California, once again, the three strikes law passed. Of course, I opposed that while in the California legislature. This law has incarcerated young African American men for nonviolent drug offenses 25 years to life. That is 25 years to life for nonviolent drug offenses. We need to repeal that law.

We also need to make sure that law enforcement officers reflect the diversity of communities that they police. So we have introduced H. Res. 262, which supports effective community-oriented policing and encourages greater diversity in law enforcement.

During the last appropriation season, the Congressional Black Caucus worked with Congressman Lacy Clay to direct the Department of Justice to begin collecting training data. Our legislation tracks when officers receive training for use of force, racial and ethnic bias, de-escalation of conflict, and constructive engagement with the public. This was just a small step, and we need to do more.

With regard to reentry, banning the box is essential. We have worked with the White House to try to make sure that Federal contractors ban the box. We haven't accomplished that, but Federal agencies cannot now ask for one's criminal history records. In my district, we do expungement, we do record remedies. We have remedied thousands and thousands of young people who now can go on and move forward with their lives. I want to thank the Family Law Center in Oakland, California, for doing that.

We need to go back to the drawing board and repeal the welfare reform provisions that are denied for life. There is a Federal ban for food stamps, eligibility for public housing, and Pell grants for those who have been incarcerated for drug felonies. Now, you know who that targets; primarily African American and Latino men. They don't even have a second chance when they get out of jail as a result of these lifetime bans.

Finally, let me just say it is time to really look at this problem in a big way and to understand that we have to dismantle, not reform—but we have to dismantle this prison industrial complex and start investing in our communities, especially our young children. And we must understand that, in doing this, we have to look at institutional and systemic racism, which is at the core of many of our policies.

So this is a fight that we are going to win, but it is going to be because all of us here in the Congressional Black Caucus—Congresswoman BEATTY, Congressman JEFFRIES, Congressman SCOTT, and Congresswoman JACKSON LEE, and the entire membership—continue to fight the good fight to make sure that finally we will begin to see a real criminal justice system, which it is not right now.

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman LEE. When people ask us why are we doing this today, I thank the gentlewoman for reminding us that the system is stacked against us and that we have had the future of so many of our young folks ripped away from them.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from the great State of Ohio (Ms. FUDGE). She is from the 11th Congressional District. She is an attorney. She has served as a former mayor. She is the immediate past chair of the Congressional Black Caucus.

She is someone who gives us advice. I remember her saying to us: Push the envelope because you are the voice for the voiceless. Look at the legislative issues that will make a difference in the lives of others.

So tonight we come to talk about equal justice under the law. Mr. Speaker, we come to challenge this House.

It is my great honor to yield to Congresswoman MARCIA FUDGE.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. It is a pleasure to watch my fellow Ohioan and friend and the gentleman from New York on this House floor every Monday night bringing the message of the Congressional Black Caucus because indeed they are the people who carry our message to the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the school-to-prison pipeline is robbing far too many children of productive futures. Instead of learning in classrooms, a large percentage of our Nation's at-risk students sit in jail cells.

The numbers don't lie. Black students are suspended and expelled at a rate three times greater than White students. More than one in four boys of color with disabilities and nearly one in five girls of color with disabilities receives an out-of-school suspension. And studies show that students who are suspended or expelled in school are more likely to end up in prison.

Our Nation's children deserve better. It is time we prioritize education and not incarceration. Comprehensive criminal justice reform must include policies which dismantle the school-to-prison pipeline. We must reauthorize the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act, a bill that funds delinquency prevention and improvements in State and local juvenile justice programs, supports restorative initiatives, and promotes early intervention. Disrupting the pipeline will provide a pathway for a successful future and lessen the burden on our current judicial system.

The number of people incarcerated in America quadrupled between 1980 and 2008. Of the more than 2.3 million Americans incarcerated today, more than 1 million of them are Black.

In my home State of Ohio, more than 50,000 people are incarcerated in a system that was designed to only hold

39,000. And on average, States across this Nation spend $30,000 per year to house one inmate. That is at least $19,000 more per year than we spend to educate one child. It is time we get our priorities straight.

As ranking member of the Education and the Workforce Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, promoting policies that keep our children in school is one of my top priorities.

I ask my colleagues: What are yours?

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman FUDGE for reminding us again of the value and the importance of our work.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, it is indeed my honor to yield time to the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES), who is coanchor of tonight's Congressional Black Caucus Special Order hour.

As I said earlier, Congressman HAKEEM JEFFRIES is not only a scholar, he, too, is an attorney. He is someone who walks the talk. He is someone who has a long history of being a Brother's Keeper.

Mr. Speaker, so tonight, when we discuss this topic, when we talked about the challenge, when we talked about all of the plethora of things that are incorporated in why we must come forward tonight to challenge the criminal justice system which is stacked against us and broken, certainly we have heard the disparities as it relates to African Americans.

So it is indeed my honor to ask my coanchor, Congressman HAKEEM JEFFRIES, to share with us our challenge.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio, my good friend, the distinguished and dynamic anchor for tonight's Special Order, Congresswoman JOYCE BEATTY, for yielding and for her continued leadership and for leading the discussion on the House floor today as it relates the urgency of this Congress and America dealing with the school-to-prison pipeline mass incarceration and the prison industrial complex that so many of my colleagues have explained and exposed here on the House floor today.

A few years ago I had a conversation that has always stuck with me in the area of criminal justice when I was speaking to a formally incarcerated individual who spent several years behind bars incarcerated in a New York State penitentiary. He has turned his life around and he is now an advocate for criminal justice reform. He said to me on his final day, after being imprisoned for years in upstate New York, that he had a conversation with a high-ranking corrections officer, a supervisor who he had gotten to know and thought he had befriended to some degree during his time of incarceration.

□ 2000

On that last day, he said to this young African American incarcerated individual who was on his way out, he said: I just want to thank you.

This gentleman was a little perplexed. He wasn't sure what he was talking about. He said: I just want to thank you for helping me to get my boat; and beyond that, I want to thank your son, who is going to help my son get his boat as well.

That conversation has really haunted me because, in such a powerful and profound way, what it captures is the essence of what the prison industrial complex represents, which is this decision that was made in so many parts of the United States of America, certainly in New York, by Democrats and Republicans.

When the automobile factories and the steel mills, the manufacturing plants began to close in the 1970s and in the 1980s, devastating parts of the upstate economy, a decision was made in place of those factory jobs to build prisons in their place as a means of economic development for depressed upstate communities. But here is the problem. If you build it, someone has got to fill those prisons. In order to fill those prisons, several things have developed which we are in the process of trying to dismantle right now: the school-to-prison pipeline and the criminalization of young people, particularly in communities of color, where they basically are not given a chance from the very beginning. As a result of being channeled unjustly, often, into the criminal justice system at an early age, they essentially become economic commodities for those who have come to rely on prisons to replace the factory and manufacturing jobs that have left the United States of America.

That has been a big problem in New York. It is a problem in other parts of the country. It is a shame here in the United States of America that we have gone from a place where, when the war on drugs began in 1971—President Nixon declared drug abuse public enemy number one—there were less than 350,000 people incarcerated in America. Even when the crime bill that is being heavily debated in the public domain right now was passed in 1994, at the height of the concern about crime here in the United States of America, the incarcerated population was still under 900,000 people. But we have gone from less than 350,000 in 1971 to under 900,000 in 1994 to more than 2.2 million in 2016.

The United States has 5 percent of the world's population and 25 percent of the world's incarcerated individuals. We incarcerate more people than any other country in the world, and it is shameful. The school-to-prison pipeline is a large part of that dynamic, along with the failed war on drugs. So we are going to have to deal with this situation in a meaningful way.

The statistics clearly show that, if you suspend a young person, that individual—often a Black or Latino boy—is less likely to graduate and complete school and more likely to become entangled in the criminal justice system because we have applied an overly punitive approach to discipline, particularly in the inner city.

Now, in this Chamber, I have seen surprising levels of compassion as it relates to dealing with the heroin and opioid crisis that is sweeping across America right now, and I am glad that folks have decided to take a different approach than the approach that was taken in the 1980s with the crack cocaine epidemic that was sweeping across communities that those of us in the Congressional Black Caucus represent.

I welcome this newfound compassion. I just hope that you would extend it now not just to the manner in which we deal with the heroin crisis—that is important—but let's extend it to the overcriminalization that is taking place as relates to young people across America, particularly in Black and Brown communities.

I am glad that we have become enlightened as it relates to moving away from punishment and toward prevention and intervention related to the heroin and opioid crisis. Let's also become enlightened in terms of dealing with breaking the school-to-prison pipeline.

We will have more to say as we move forward with this discussion, but I know there are other Members who would like to contribute to this hour of power that Representative JOYCE BEATTY has brought to the House floor in connection with the CBC Special Order.

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman JEFFRIES for reminding us that the United States makes up less than 5 percent of the world's population, yet incarcerates nearly a quarter of the global prison population.

Thank you for also being on point and reminding us, Mr. Speaker, if we are to reform America's criminal justice system and advance efforts to break the cycles of incarceration in African American communities, in low-income communities, then we must unite and make sure that we pass real legislation.

Mr. Speaker, can you advise me how much time we have left, please.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Ohio has 12 minutes remaining.

Mrs. BEATTY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, it is indeed my honor to yield to the gentlewoman who hails from the 18th Congressional District of Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE). Of the many things that this Congresswoman does, she serves on the Committee on the Judiciary, she has been a longtime advocate for reforming the criminal justice system. I refer to her as a strong voice, a strong advocate, and, truly, a scholar.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I want to add my appreciation to the gentlewoman from Ohio; the gentleman from New York; and the Members who

have spoken, including the chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus, Mr. BUTTERFIELD; the former chair, Ms. FUDGE; and the ranking member on the Committee on Education and the Workforce, Mr. SCOTT.

There could not be a more important topic than the topic that we are speaking about tonight. There are moments in history that I think come at times when urgency is the call of the day. It is often said that Dr. King emphasized in his tenure the urgency of moving forward on civil rights and spoke eloquently about the fact of why we cannot wait. If I might, I want to capture his theme of why we cannot wait to end the school-to-prison pipeline. End it now and begin the whole comprehensive approach of criminal justice reform.

Let me take Texas as an example and cite some very important statistics from the Appleseed Report and as well a comment on the work that we are doing in the Committee on the Judiciary. I am so glad at this moment in history to be the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations and working with the members of my subcommittee, including Mr. JEFFRIES, who is a member, Ms. BASS, who is a member, and a number of other members as well, on this very difficult hurdle that we have.

Let it be very clear that this hurdle of criminal justice reform is, as I heard Mr. JEFFRIES make mention of, that we have taken hold of this issue of opioids and heroin in a way that not one single bill was passed last week that had a criminal focus, particularly out of the Committee on the Judiciary. Not one bill had mandatory minimums.

In the debate last week, on Friday, I reiterated over and over again no mandatory minimums in this legislation. That should be the perfect that we try to achieve going forward on criminal justice reform.

But let me give the beginnings of that very tragic outcome in America, filling up the Nation's prisons, not having criminal justice but criminal unfairness. It starts with a path to incarceration, which includes in the schools, stops, failing public schools, zero tolerance and other school discipline, police in school hallways, disciplinary alternative schools, and court involvement in juvenile detention. All of these are a path for students to incarceration, and it is without understanding what a class C misdemeanor ticket and a trip to court for thousands of Texas students and their families means.

Texas students as young as 6 have been ticketed at school in past years, and it is not uncommon for elementary school students to be ticketed by school-based law enforcement. School-based arrest of students often occurs without prior notice to parents. Police officers in some Texas schools are resorting to use of force, measures more commonly associated with fighting street crime: pepper spray, tasers, and trained canines when a schoolyard fight breaks out or when students are misbehaving in a cafeteria or at a school event.

This should not be the picture for a 6-year-old or a 4-year-old or an 8-year-old or an 11-year-old or a 13-year-old. This should not be equated with school.

Let me read to you part of the Appleseed Report and a quote by Ryan Kellus Turner and Mark Goodner: ''In a little over two decades, a paradigm shift has occurred in the Lone Star State. The misdeeds of children—acts that in the near recent past resulted in trips to the principal's office, corporal punishment, or extra laps under the supervision of a middle school or high school coach . . . '' Now, of course, corporal punishment will be eliminated from that. What is worse, '' . . . now result in criminal prosecution, criminal records, and untold millions of dollars in punitive fines and hefty court costs being imposed against children ages 10 through 16.''

''It is conservatively estimated that more than 275,000 non-traffic tickets are issued to juveniles in Texas each year . . . '' And based on the information from the Texas Office of Court Administration, the number of non-traffic tickets issued to students may well grossly exceed that number because it was very difficult to get it. ''Texas can interrupt this destructive cycle and prevent the loss of more young people to the 'school-to-prison pipeline' through early interventions focused less on punishment and more on creating positive school environments that address students' academic and behavioral needs.''

Let me just say that ''police officers in some Texas schools are resorting to 'use of force.' '' Now, they are supposed to be there as SROs. SROs are supposed to have educational training. SROs are supposed to be able to have the understanding of how to deal with counseling issues and teaching that is evidence based, but here is the problem. The problem is that they are focused more on law enforcement.

I am glad to be part of this Special Order tonight that deals with the pipeline that has started working our children toward incarceration: overcrowded schools, lack of qualified teachers, inadequate resources, and then the zero tolerance for school discipline of children and the rate of suspension having increased dramatically in recent years from 1.7 million in 1974 to 3.1 million in 2000; and it has gone beyond that, and the greatest emphasis has been on children of color.

So here is my call to the United States Congress. We have to begin the process of dismantling the school-to-prison pipeline. We have to understand that children can learn. No child is a throwaway. I offer that often in my remarks in my district.

The detention system is an unfair system. I don't know how many of you realize that when a child is sent to juvie, that child can remain there until they reach the age of 21. How does that happen? Even if their sentence is not as egregious as one might think—a simple misbehavior in school. The way that happens is because in juvenile, you can assess more time on a child without telling that child's parent because that child did not follow orders or, in essence, that child did not behave or that child chewed gum when you told them not to.

□ 2015

We in the Judiciary Committee are working on juvenile justice reform. One of them that I am most concerned about and want to move is ending solitary confinement for juveniles, recognizing Kalief's Law, involving the death of one inside the New York prison at Rikers Island. The individual in solitary confinement had not been rendered guilty yet.

And so we want to eliminate putting juveniles in solitary confinement. Because the tragedy, Mr. Speaker, was that that youngster was released, ultimately, but after he was released, he, in essence, committed suicide.

So I want to close my remarks by indicating that I want to turn this system upside down. I want to make sure that we deal with juvenile justice reform. I want to ban the box. We have done that in legislation that has not yet passed. I want to make sure that we have alternative sentencing.

At the same time, the Judiciary Committee has moved two bills out of committee. I want to see these bills have a vigorous discussion and debate on the floor of the House so that we can move to conference.

Time is going by. Let us not let the perfect be, in essence, the downfall of change. H.R. 3713 provides for the reduction of sentencing for many who are languishing, by law, in prison today in the Federal system.

As I have spoken to people across the country, they have indicated that, even though some States like my State of Texas have made enormous, enormous strides—I am proud of that—it has not happened around the country.

The bully pulpit of the Federal Government can be the most effective tool to moving toward criminal justice reform and sentencing reduction dealing with felony drug offenses. We are moving toward that point.

A vote on the floor of the House and moving toward conference can move our efforts toward legislation that can truly be responsive to both concerns and as well positives that are in that bill.

So as we deal with this prison pipeline, we have to not only talk, we have to do. And when we do, we have to make sure that we respond to the concerns, but we also have to make sure that we move legislation that can ultimately come out of the Senate and go to conference and make a difference in the lives of so many.

I want to thank the gentlewoman from Ohio. I also want to say how

timely the Congressional Black Caucus is. All that have been crying out, from Black Lives Matter to the Mother of the Movement, say that we need changes dealing with the whole vastness of criminal justice reform: police-community relations, police actions, actions dealing with guns, actions dealing with the loss of life of our young people.

Let's get a framework that can allow us to debate, to fix, to amend, and to get a product that will ultimately be signed by the President of the United States on behalf of the people of the United States who are crying out for relief.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues of the Congressional Black Caucus, Congressman HAKEEM JEFFRIES (D–NY) and Congresswoman JOYCE BEATTY (D–OH) who are anchoring this Special Order on Ending the School-to-Prison Pipeline.

The over-criminalization of school children in America can no longer be swept under the rug, ignored or irrationally justified.

We are in a state of national crisis and it is time to act.

Upon taking office, every Member of Congress makes a solemn pledge: to protect and defend the American people.

This is the most important oath we take as elected officials—and, to honor this promise, we must do everything in our power to stem the School-to-Prison Pipeline in our nation.

The three most important concerns for Members of Congress today are No. 1 Children, No. 2 Children, and No. 3 Children.

House Republicans are still unwilling to act to stop the criminalization of our children in schools and instead work towards providing children the opportunity to thrive in American communities.

This Congress has a moral obligation to do our part to end the epidemic of losing our children to the correctional system.

Now is the time for Republicans to join Democrats in protecting the lives of America's youth by taking common sense steps in redirecting those who go astray.

Over the past year, several proposals have been introduced to address the need for overarching reform of our nation's criminal justice system.

Americans must consider the educational environment in which we place our students, from preschool to high school, subjecting them to disciplinary policies that more closely resemble policing than teaching.

Around the country, advocates are collecting data illustrating the devastating effects of what they call the ''school-to-prison pipeline,'' where student behavior is criminalized, children are treated like prisoners and, all too often, actually end up behind bars.

The school-to-prison pipeline refers to interlocking sets of relationships at the institutional/structural and the individual levels.

All of these policies and practices work together to push our nation's schoolchildren—youth of color, especially, our most at-risk children—out of schools and into unemployment and into the juvenile and criminal justice legal systems.

This pipeline reflects the prioritization of incarceration over education.

For a growing number of students, the path to incarceration includes the ''stops'' deterring matriculation such as:

1) Failing Public Schools;

2) Zero-Tolerance and Other School Discipline;

3) Policing School Hallways;

4) Disciplinary Alternative Schools; and

5) Court Involvement and Juvenile Detention.

In a little over two decades, a paradigm shift has occurred in the Lone Star State.

The misdeeds of children—acts that in the near recent past resulted in trips to the principal's office, corporal punishment, or extra laps under the supervision of a middle school or high school coach, now result in criminal prosecution, criminal records, and untold millions of dollars in punitive fines and hefty court costs being imposed against children in elementary and high schools.

Disrupting class, using profanity, misbehaving on a school bus, student fights, and truancy once meant a trip to the principal's office.

Today, such misbehavior results in a Class C misdemeanor ticket and a trip to court for thousands of Texas students and their families each year.

It is conservatively estimated that more than 275,000 non-traffic tickets are issued to juveniles in Texas each year.

While it is impossible to pinpoint how many of these tickets are issued by campus police, the vast majority of these tickets are issued for offenses most commonly linked to school-related misbehavior—disruption of class, disorderly conduct, disruption of transportation, truancy, and simple assaults related to student fights.

''Criminalization'' of student misbehavior extends to even the youngest students.

In Texas, students as young as six have been ticketed at school in the past five years, and it is not uncommon for elementary-school students to be ticketed by school-based law enforcement.

School-based arrest of students often occurs without prior notice to parents or a lawyer being present during initial questioning of the student.

The increase in ticketing and arrest of students, in Texas and nationwide, has coincided with the growth in school-based policing.

Campus policing is the largest and fastest growing area of law enforcement in Texas, according to its own professional association.

With counselors stretched to handle class scheduling and test administration duties, school administrators and teachers are increasingly turning to campus police officers to handle student behavior problems.

Today in Texas, most public schools have a police officer assigned to patrol hallways, lunchrooms, school grounds, and after-school events.

Police officers in some Texas schools are resorting to ''use of force'' measures more commonly associated with fighting street crime—pepper spray, Tasers and trained canines—when a schoolyard fight breaks out or when students are misbehaving in a cafeteria or at a school event.

The intent is to keep schools and students safe, but there can be unintended consequences to disciplining public school students in a way that introduces them to the justice system or exposes them to policing techniques more commonly used with adults.

Texas can interrupt this destructive cycle and prevent the loss of more young people to the ''school-to-prison pipeline'' through early interventions focused less on punishment and more on creating positive school environments that address students' academic and behavioral needs.

We must seek appropriate recommendations for reform.

For most students, the pipeline begins with inadequate resources in public schools.

Overcrowded classrooms, a lack of qualified teachers, and insufficient funding for ''extras'' such as counselors, special education services, and even textbooks, lock students into second-rate educational environments.

This failure to meet educational needs increases disengagement and dropouts, increasing the risk of later court involvement.

Even worse, schools may actually encourage dropouts in response to pressures from test-based accountability regimes such as the No Child Left Behind Act, which create incentives to push out low-performing students to boost overall test scores.

Lacking resources, facing incentives to push out low-performing students, and responding to a handful of highly-publicized school shootings, schools have embraced zero-tolerance policies that automatically impose severe punishment regardless of circumstances.

Under these policies, students have been expelled for bringing nail clippers or scissors to school.

Rates of suspension have increased dramatically in recent years—from 1.7 million in 1974 to 3.1 million in 2000—and have been most dramatic for children of color.

Overly harsh disciplinary policies push students down the pipeline and into the juvenile justice system.

Suspended and expelled children are often left unsupervised and without constructive activities.

They also can easily fall behind in their coursework, leading to a greater likelihood of disengagement and drop-outs.

All of these factors increase the likelihood of court involvement.

As harsh penalties for minor misbehavior become more pervasive, schools increasingly ignore or bypass due process protections for suspensions and expulsions.

The lack of due process is particularly acute for students with special needs, who are disproportionately represented in the pipeline despite the heightened protections afforded to them under law.

Many under-resourced schools become ''pipeline gateways'' by placing increased reliance on police rather than teachers and administrators to maintain discipline.

Growing numbers of districts employ school resource officers to patrol school hallways, often with little or no training in working with youth.

As a result, children are far more likely to be subject to school-based arrests—the majority of which are for non-violent offenses, such as disruptive behavior—than they were a generation ago.

The rise in school-based arrests, the quickest route from the classroom to the jailhouse, most directly exemplifies the criminalization of school children.

In some jurisdictions, students who have been suspended or expelled have been completely denied their right to an education.

In others, they are sent to disciplinary alternative schools.

Growing in number across the country, these shadow systems—sometimes run by private, for-profit companies—are immune from educational accountability standards (such as minimum classroom hours and curriculum requirements) and may fail to provide meaningful educational services to the students who need them the most.

As a result, struggling students return to their regular schools unprepared, are permanently locked into inferior educational settings, or are funneled through alternative schools into the juvenile justice system.

Youth who become involved in the juvenile justice system are often denied procedural protections in the courts.

Studies demonstrate that as many as 80 percent of court-involved children do not have lawyers.

Students who commit minor offenses may end up in secured detention if they violate boilerplate probation conditions prohibiting them from activities like missing school or disobeying teachers.

Students pushed along the pipeline find themselves in juvenile detention facilities, many of which provide few, if any, educational services.

Students of color, who are far more likely than their white peers to be suspended, expelled, or arrested for the same kind of conduct at school, and those with disabilities are particularly likely to travel down this pipeline.

Though many students are propelled down the pipeline from school to jail, it is difficult for them to make the journey in reverse.

Students who enter the juvenile justice system face many barriers to their re-entry into traditional schools.

The vast majority of these students never graduate from high school.

Numerous studies have also shown that as many as 70–80 percent of youth involved in the justice system meet the criteria for a disability.

We must move away from the engrained culture of criminalization as the answer to our problems.

It is no secret that 1 in every 3 black males born today can expect to go to prison at some point in their life, compared with 1 in every 6 Latino males, and 1 in every 17 white males.

It is a statistic we know well because it is one that has been reported since 2001 and has remained unchanged for nearly 15 years.

It is time we stop repeating and start understanding and unraveling the fateful 1 in 3 trend that continues to sweep entire generations of young men of color into a lifetime of systematic and barriers.

The United States currently has the largest number of prisoners in the world due to its skyrocketing national imprisonment rate.

Rather than investing in premier educational responses, the United States pays the highest cost globally for incarceration.

Federal, state, and local leaders are looking for innovative ways to improve public health and public safety outcomes, while reducing the costs of criminal justice and corrections.

A number of innovative strategies can save public funds and improve public health by keeping low-risk, non-violent, drug-involved offenders out of prison or jail, while still holding them accountable and ensuring the safety of our communities.

The Obama Administration is committed to funding and evaluating the long-term effects of these innovative criminal justice and corrections interventions.

I too call upon my colleagues to come together and pass legislation that will help stop the derailment of children's lives.

Meanwhile, Federal agencies will continue to seek opportunities to expand smart probation and problem-solving court initiatives around the country in collaboration with state, local, and tribal agencies.

In recognition of the considerable potential in cost savings, improved outcomes for offenders, and improved public safety, a growing number of state and local officials around the country are starting their own promising initiatives to break the cycle of drug use, crime, and incarceration.

Nearly every state is struggling with significant shortfalls in revenue and making significant cuts to spending in order to close budget gaps.

In making these cuts, many states are focusing attention on corrections spending, one of the fastest growing lines in state budgets over the past two decades.

Many states are pursuing a justice reinvestment approach, using data to determine what has been driving the growth in the prison population and how that growth might be stopped.

In addition, small investments have been made in programs designed to reduce recidivism.

New policies have been enacted, slowing the growth of prison populations or even downsizing corrections systems, saving states hundreds of millions of dollars.

A portion of those savings are being reinvested in community-based services and supports, including substance abuse treatment.

However, to have meaningful impact on behaviors that contribute to crime, recidivism, and substance abuse, states must focus on a handful of proven strategies that will maximize the impact of limited investments being made in the treatment of substance use disorders and community supervision.

I am a strong supporter of education and I am particularly sensitive and protective of measures to keep students safe in school.

In this same spirit, we must invest in a multi-step, collaborative process that involves the combined efforts of law enforcement, prosecutors, influential community members, social services, reentry services, community corrections, faith-based organizations, and city management.

We have seen too often the horrific abuses of school officers dragging, punching, slapping, and more to students.

First and foremost school-based law enforcement personnel need to be removed from the educational setting.

And if law enforcement are not removed, they should be required to receive post-certification training in issues specific to youth, including:

1) de-escalation and mediation techniques;

2) restraint techniques to be used when force cannot be avoided;

3) signs and symptoms of trauma, abuse and neglect in children and youth, as well as appropriate responses;

4) signs and symptoms of mental illness in children and youth, and appropriate responses; and

5) manifestations of other disabilities, such as autism, and appropriate responses, adolescent development, Juvenile law, and Special education and applicable general education law.

Prohibit school districts from receiving any revenue from Class C ticketing for truancy or any other offense.

Eliminate Disruption of Class and Disruption of Transportation as penal code offenses.

Prohibit ticketing of students under the age of 14.

Young children are simply not equipped to understand a Class C misdemeanor ticket as a meaningful consequence of misbehavior, and the consequences of court involvement on academic success are too great to allow this practice to continue.

Ticketing of older students should be a last resort.

Ticketing, arrest and use of force in schools is preposterously reshaping today's school disciplinary policies disproportionately to actual need.

We must acknowledge this epidemic and move to correct the inevitable injustice that follows when our children are derailed from their futures.

I thank my colleagues of the Congressional Black Caucus, Congressman HAKEEM JEFFRIES (D–NY) and Congresswoman JOYCE BEATTY (D–OH) for hosting this Special Order on Ending the School-to-Prison Pipeline.

It is an invaluable and much needed effort.

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, let me just end by saying that the urgency is now. In the words of Nelson Mandela, ''It always seems impossible until it's done.'' Tonight the Congressional Black Caucus says: Let's get it done.

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

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, our children represent the future of our nation. Our future is more promising when our children have a clear path to succeed and have the opportunities to become active members of the community. Over time, a culture of favoring incarceration over education has become more prominent throughout our society—particularly as it relates to minority and low-income populations. Financial shortfalls at all levels of government are also placing downward pressure on states and municipalities to cut back on public services and educational or community-based programs in favor of harsh criminalization or incarceration.

The result is the ''school-to-prison pipeline,'' which poses a very real threat to our children and our society. This pipeline refers to harsh policies and practices that cultivate a culture where young individuals are pushed into the juvenile and criminal justice systems through harsh punishments in schools. Inadequate resources in public schools, economic instability, zero-tolerance policies, and harsh punishments for non-violent offenses are all contributing to the school-to-prison pipeline. As a result, the United States suffers from the largest number of prisoners in the world and the economic and social burden of the high costs of incarceration.

Zero tolerance policies are dangerous to have in our schools. These policies impose extremely severe punishments on students, regardless of the circumstances, which can result in suspension or even expulsion from school. Children of color and students with special needs have experienced a dramatic increase in these suspensions and expulsions, which greatly increase their probability of entering into the juvenile justice system. Schools

are also beginning to display an overreliance on law enforcement to maintain discipline through the use of school resource officers.

Mr. Speaker, the school-to-prison pipeline is the result of a dangerous precedent being set in our schools. Zero tolerance policies and the overreliance on law enforcement to keep order in our schools not only detracts from the culture of learning we expect in our schools, but also condemns countless children to a life of suffering for making simple mistakes during their youth. Our society will suffer if we continue on this path of forcing children into the criminal justice system and it is time that we considered serious reforms to keep children in our communities and outside the juvenile justice system.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2120

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. FOXX) at 9 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4909, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017

Mr. BYRNE, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114–569) on the resolution (H. Res. 732) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4909) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. SWALWELL of California (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of family health emergency.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on May 13, 2016, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H.R. 4336. To amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the inurnment in Arlington National Cemetery of the cremated remains of certain persons whose service has been determined to be active service.

H.R. 4238. To amend the Department of Energy Organization Act and the Local Public Works Capital Development and Investment Act of 1976 to modernize terms relating to minorities.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 17, 2016, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

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. 1887. A bill to amend certain appropriation Acts to repeal the requirement directing the Administrator of General Services to sell Federal property and assets that support the operations of the Plum Island Animal Disease Center in Plum Island, New York, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114–568). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BYRNE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 732. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4909) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes (Rept. 114–569). 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. ROGERS of Kentucky:

H.R. 5243. A bill making appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, to strengthen public health activities in response to the Zika virus, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, 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. KNIGHT (for himself and Ms. BROWNLEY of California):

H.R. 5244. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national memorial and national monument to commemorate those killed by the collapse of the Saint Francis Dam on March 12, 1928, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 5245. A bill to direct the Federal Trade Commission to prescribe rules to protect consumers from unfair and deceptive acts and practices in connection with primary and secondary ticket sales, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WEBER of Texas:

H.R. 5246. A bill to remove the Federal claim to navigational servitude for a parcel of land in Texas City, Texas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GARAMENDI (for himself, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Mr. PETERS):

H.R. 5247. A bill to provide short-term water supplies to drought-stricken California and provide for long-term investments in drought resiliency throughout the Western United States; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Science, Space, and Technology, and Energy and Commerce, 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. BISHOP of Georgia (for himself, Mr. DENT, and Ms. BROWN of Florida):

H.R. 5248. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify the eligibility of children of Vietnam veterans born with spina bifida for benefits of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. CAPPS (for herself, Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Ms. MATSUI):

H.R. 5249. A bill to direct the NIH to intensify and coordinate fundamental, translational, and clinical research with respect to the understanding of pain, the discovery and development of therapies for chronic pain, and the development of alternatives to opioids for effective pain treatments; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DELANEY (for himself and Mr. TAKAI):

H.R. 5250. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to reform the HUBZone program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Ms. ESTY (for herself and Ms. DELAURO):

H.R. 5251. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax credit for property owners who remove hazards relating to lead, asbestos, and radon; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HURD of Texas:

H.R. 5252. A bill to designate the United States Customs and Border Protection Port of Entry located at 1400 Lower Island Road in Tornillo, Texas, as the ''Marcelino Serna Port of Entry''; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HURD of Texas (for himself, Mr. MCCAUL, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. KATKO, and Ms. MCSALLY):

H.R. 5253. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 and the Immigration and Nationality Act to improve visa security, visa applicant vetting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, 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. MURPHY of Florida (for himself, Mr. POLIQUIN, and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 5254. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax credit to seniors who install modifications on their residences that would enable them to age in place, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 5255. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to permit the Federal Trade Commission to enforce such Act against certain tax-exempt organizations; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi (for himself, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr.

KEATING, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Ms. CLARKE of New York):

H.R. 5256. A bill to enhance the overseas operations of the Department of Homeland Security aimed at preventing terrorist threats from reaching the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, Ways and Means, and Agriculture, 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. ZINKE (for himself and Mr. DESANTIS):

H.R. 5257. A bill to provide for a career military justice litigation track for judge advocates in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LAMALFA:

H. Res. 731. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that mandates imposed on manufacturers requiring inclusion of unproven and unreliable technology in firearms is costly and punitive, and the prohibition of firearms without such features is an infringement on the rights of citizens under the Second Amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. BASS (for herself, Mr. MARINO, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. HAHN, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. COHEN, Ms. LEE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. HECK of Washington, Ms. NORTON, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. VARGAS, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. POCAN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. MULLIN, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. HARTZLER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. COOPER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. RICHMOND, and Mr. MURPHY of Florida):

H. Res. 733. A resolution recognizing National Foster Care Month as an opportunity to raise awareness about the challenges of children in the foster-care system, and encouraging Congress to implement policy to improve the lives of children in the foster-care system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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. ROGERS of Kentucky:

H.R. 5243.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: ''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . . .'' In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: ''The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . . .'' Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mr. KNIGHT:

H.R. 5244.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 18, relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress.

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 5245.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WEBER of Texas:

H.R. 5246.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. GARAMENDI:

H.R. 5247.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8, clause 18

By Mr. BISHOP of Georgia:

H.R. 5248.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mrs. CAPPS:

H.R. 5249.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority in which this bill rests is the power of the Congress to regulate Commerce, as enumerated by Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 5250.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution, which provides Congress with the ability to enact legislation necessary and proper to effectuate its purposes in taxing and spending.

By Ms. ESTY:

H.R. 5251.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. HURD of Texas:

H.R. 5252.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Sections 1 and 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. HURD of Texas:

H.R. 5253.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 1; and Article 1, section 8, clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. MURPHY of Florida:

H.R. 5254.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 5255.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. I, Sec. 8, Cl. 3.: ''To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.''

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi:

H.R. 5256.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. ZINKE:

H.R. 5257.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8: ''to provide for the common Defence'', ''to raise and support Armies'', ''to provide and maintain a Navy'' and ''to make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces''

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 27: Mr. ROTHFUS.

H.R. 194: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. TIPTON, and Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 210: Mr. RENACCI.

H.R. 244: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.

H.R. 266: Mr. CHABOT, Mr. PALMER, Mr. FLEMING, and Mr. HUELSKAMP.

H.R. 292: Mr. BLUM.

H.R. 430: Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 448: Mr. VARGAS, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. MEEKS.

H.R. 504: Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 592: Mr. WENSTRUP.

H.R. 624: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H.R. 667: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

H.R. 711: Mr. TURNER.

H.R. 746: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 756: Miss RICE of New York and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 842: Mr. BLUM and Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 879: Mr. COOK and Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

H.R. 897: Mr. SCALISE.

H.R. 921: Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. KLINE, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BLUM, Mr. NOLAN, and Mr. WENSTRUP.

H.R. 1122: Mr. POMPEO.

H.R. 1185: Mr. BYRNE.

H.R. 1196: Mr. BUCSHON.

H.R. 1197: Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 1220: Mr. BLUM.

H.R. 1221: Ms. GRAHAM.

H.R. 1274: Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 1312: Ms. GRAHAM.

H.R. 1356: Mrs. RADEWAGEN.

H.R. 1460: Mr. MOULTON and Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 1519: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 1594: Mr. SIMPSON.
H.R. 1600: Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 1718: Mr. TURNER, Mr. BUCSHON, and Mr. ROSS.
H.R. 1763: Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 1814: Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 1855: Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 2058: Mr. MARCHANT.
H.R. 2076: Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 2121: Mr. TURNER.
H.R. 2144: Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 2189: Mrs. WAGNER and Mr. MARINO.
H.R. 2296: Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 2315: Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 2316: Mr. NEWHOUSE.
H.R. 2350: Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. BEATTY, and Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 2500: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2515: Mr. ENGEL and Mr. BEYER.
H.R. 2694: Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. DELANEY.
H.R. 2773: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 2802: Mr. TIBERI.
H.R. 2817: Mr. HECK of Nevada.
H.R. 2903: Mr. HECK of Nevada and Mr. KNIGHT.
H.R. 3099: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H.R. 3119: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa and Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 3222: Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana.
H.R. 3229: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 3284: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. WALZ, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. JEFFRIES, and Mr. GALLEGO.
H.R. 3299: Mr. RUSH and Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 3365: Mr. NADLER and Mr. CARNEY.
H.R. 3381: Mr. JOYCE.
H.R. 3526: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 3535: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 3556: Ms. LEE and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 3660: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.
H.R. 3666: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H.R. 3676: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 3684: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 3693: Mr. ROHRABACHER.
H.R. 3706: Mr. WALZ and Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 3742: Mr. KING of New York, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. JONES, Mr. BUCSHON, Ms. GRAHAM, Mr. WENSTRUP, and Mr. FORTENBERRY.
H.R. 3817: Mr. FOSTER.
H.R. 3870: Mr. HECK of Nevada.
H.R. 3882: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 3883: Mr. PITTENGER.
H.R. 3884: Mr. PITTENGER.
H.R. 3885: Mr. PITTENGER.
H.R. 3929: Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. COOPER, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, and Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 3945: Mrs. RADEWAGEN.
H.R. 3965: Ms. DUCKWORTH.
H.R. 4062: Mr. LUETKEMEYER and Mr. SCHRADER.
H.R. 4131: Mr. REICHERT and Mr. WALDEN.
H.R. 4144: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
H.R. 4153: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 4172: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 4183: Mr. CURBELO of Florida.
H.R. 4215: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 4230: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 4277: Mr. KIND and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 4365: Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. JOLLY, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H.R. 4450: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 4481: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 4499: Ms. ESTY.
H.R. 4553: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 4585: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. POCAN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 4606: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 4613: Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 4614: Mr. WESTERMAN.
H.R. 4625: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 4640: Mr. COLE.
H.R. 4657: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 4668: Mr. DELANEY.
H.R. 4683: Mrs. RADEWAGEN.
H.R. 4706: Mr. WALZ.
H.R. 4715: Mr. JOLLY.
H.R. 4764: Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. COLLINS of New York, and Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 4773: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania and Mr. ROSKAM.
H.R. 4775: Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 4792: Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 4795: Mr. CHABOT and Mr. BOUSTANY.
H.R. 4797: Ms. LEE.
H.R. 4815: Mr. BRAT.
H.R. 4828: Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. HUDSON, and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.
H.R. 4848: Mr. BOUSTANY.
H.R. 4884: Mr. MCKINLEY.
H.R. 4904: Mr. GOSAR, Mrs. LUMMIS, and Mr. JOYCE.
H.R. 4928: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BABIN, and Mr. DESJARLAIS.
H.R. 4941: Mr. COLLINS of New York.
H.R. 4942: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 4979: Mr. OLSON, Mr. FLORES, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. COLLINS of New York, and Mr. HARPER.
H.R. 5001: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 5008: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. VISCLOSKY, and Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 5014: Mr. POLIS and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 5025: Mr. OLSON and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 5044: Ms. MOORE, Mr. TONKO, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. PIERLUISI, Ms. GRAHAM, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. MENG, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. HIGGINS, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
H.R. 5067: Mr. YODER, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 5073: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida and Mr. JONES.
H.R. 5090: Mr. BECERRA, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. ALLEN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. GABBARD, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. MENG, Mr. KLINE, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. VELA, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. TONKO, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. KEATING, Mr. HULTGREN, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 5119: Mr. FLEMING, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. MEADOWS and Mr. GIBSON.
H.R. 5170: Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BARR, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 5183: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 5210: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. WENSTRUP, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 5218: Mr. CRAMER.
H.R. 5224: Mr. GOSAR and Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana.
H.R. 5226: Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. BUCK, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. BLUM, Mr. WALKER, and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
H.J. Res. 89: Mr. CARTER of Texas.
H.J. Res. 92: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
H. Con. Res. 40: Mr. HECK of Nevada.
H. Con. Res. 89: Mr. ROKITA and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H. Con. Res. 129: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. KILMER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mr. GRAYSON.
H. Res. 28: Mr. SHUSTER.
H. Res. 220: Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
H. Res. 263: Mr. LEVIN, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. YARMUTH.
H. Res. 290: Mr. DONOVAN.
H. Res. 343: Mr. MEADOWS.
H. Res. 569: Ms. ADAMS and Ms. GRAHAM.
H. Res. 586: Mr. DEUTCH.
H. Res. 590: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
H. Res. 617: Mr. COFFMAN.
H. Res. 647: Mr. PETERS and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.
H. Res. 650: Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. AMODEI, and Mr. PALLONE.
H. Res. 683: Mr. NADLER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
H. Res. 694: Ms. EDWARDS and Ms. MATSUI.
H. Res. 729: Mr. HOYER, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.

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. ROGERS OF KENTUCKY

H.R. 5243, making appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, to strengthen public health activities in response to the Zika virus, and for other purposes, does not contain any congressional earmark, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

Amendment No. 1 to be offered by Representative MAC THORNBERRY to H.R. 4909, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.