



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JUNE 16, 2015

No. 96

## House of Representatives

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

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,  
June 16, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable RANDY HULTGREN to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,  
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

### MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

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

### RICHARD ALBERO'S 1,150-MILE WALK

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

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a man who has literally walked the walk in support of our Nation's wounded warriors.

Mr. Speaker, 65-year-old Richard Albero, a former Naval officer and math teacher from Dunedin, Florida, recently completed an 86-day, 1,150-mile walk from home plate at Steinbrenner Field in Tampa during a spring training game to home plate at

Yankee Stadium in New York City. He did so to honor his fallen nephew. Richard's nephew, Gary, worked at the World Trade Center and lost his life in the 9/11 attacks.

In addition to honoring his nephew, Richard also chose to do something very special. He walked to raise money for the Wounded Warrior Project. His goal was to raise \$25,000.

During Richard's trek up the East Coast, which began on March 2, he went through six pairs of shoes. He suffered blisters on his feet and traveled over countless hills and endured the many elements, yet Richard never gave up.

Very recently, just a few weeks ago, he completed his walk, arriving at Yankee Stadium to a cheering crowd. Along the way, Richard blew past his goal for raising money and raised \$55,000 for the Wounded Warrior Project.

Mr. Speaker, Richard's nephew would be most proud and the Members of this body should be most proud as well as we reflect on and remember those who lost their lives and those who pay tribute to them today, those like Richard Albero.

May God bless Mr. Albero. May God bless our men and women in uniform who protect us each and every day. And may God bless these United States.

### TRANSPORTATION FUNDING

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, there is a tremendous crisis facing America, but it is not one you hear much about on Capitol Hill. It is killing hundreds of people a year, injuring thousands more. It is crippling America's global standing, as we have fallen in the world ranking from number 1 down to 27 and falling further. It is

having a profound effect on our global economic competitiveness, while costing American families hundreds of dollars a year in extra expenses.

Of course, it is complicating the lives of American business and families by losing millions of hours that otherwise could be put to productive work, at exercise, or with their families, and on the job.

If it were any other subject, there would be cries of outrage and alarm and calls for action. You would see a flurry of action here on Capitol Hill.

Sadly, this decline, this cost, this damage is the result of our very real infrastructure crisis, a crisis to which Congress has been indifferent at best and negligent at worse.

Despite countless examples of the crying need for infrastructure investment, Congress has been paralyzed, trying to pay for 2015 costs of infrastructure with 1993 dollars. Congress has not taken any systematic action since 1993, and the time has long since passed for action.

Thirty-three short-term extensions of transportation finance is not a substitute for action. No nation became great building its infrastructure 9 months at a time.

To be fair, there are people on Capitol Hill who do care about this and have proposed action:

My friend and colleague PETER DEFazio, the ranking member on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, has proposed a barrel tax on petroleum. He has proposed a financial fee on transactions, both of which would go a long way toward solving this problem.

My Ways and Means colleagues JIM RENACCI and BILL PASCRELL have proposed a mechanism that would be a failsafe, that if Congress didn't act to fund infrastructure, the gas tax would be indexed and increased.

Our Maryland colleague JOHN DELANEY has identified vast sums of

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H4385

corporate money parked overseas that could be made available for infrastructure investment in the United States if it were returned for that purpose.

And I have proposed, along with two dozen of my colleagues, that we simply bite the bullet and do what Ronald Reagan did in 1992—raise the gas tax for the 1st time in 22 years.

When I introduced this proposal in this Congress, it was supported by the widest array of groups on any major contested issue on Capitol Hill. It was supported by the top echelons of business, of organized labor, of the building trades, construction companies, local government, transit, bicycles, truckers, AAA, all in alignment that Congress should step up and remedy this situation.

There are solutions. There are people who think about it. We need to have the same level of courage and urgency that has been shown by people at the State and local level where they don't have the luxury of living in a Capitol Hill bubble. They have to deal with the consequences, and they have stepped up, 19 States since 2012—in fact, 6 States already this year. Idaho, Utah, Iowa, South Dakota, Nebraska, and Georgia, deep red States, have all raised the gas tax in 2015.

I am pleased that tomorrow the Ways and Means Committee will have its first hearing on transportation finance in the 56 months since my Republican colleagues took over. It is no substitute for Congress rolling up its sleeves and acting, but it is an important start. And I hope it will signify a full-court press in that committee to finally get down to cases and solve this problem.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Wanda Neiman, one of his secretaries.

#### RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 8 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

#### AFTER RECESS

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

#### PRAYER

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

Guide the Members of this people's House with the spirit of understanding, which might lead them to their best

judgment. We live in a world of human failure and broken promises; may they be tolerant of the faults of others because they are aware of their own shortcomings.

Bless all with a quiet respect for the diversity of opinions to be found here. Through honest dialogue and contemplative listening, may Your servants search all the avenues open to them to meet today's challenges with integrity and justice.

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

Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

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

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania 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.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

#### HOLDING THE PRESIDENT ACCOUNTABLE ON TRADE

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, last week, the House approved part of a legislative package on trade promotion authority, or TPA.

There have been many mischaracterizations of what TPA is. Every day I hear from constituents who want me to hold President Obama accountable. Well, TPA does just that

by providing accountability to the President's trade negotiation efforts through enhanced congressional oversight and additional transparency. The allegations that TPA is something for President Obama is false.

It is important to recognize that more than 95 percent of the world's customers live beyond U.S. borders, and 1.2 million jobs in North Carolina rely on trade with them. Trade-related employment in North Carolina grew 3.8 times faster than total State employment from 2004 to 2013.

While I heard many different perspectives on TPA from my constituents, the argument from North Carolina families, farmers, and employers that negotiating these trade agreements is in the economic best interest of our State was a deciding factor for my vote in favor of TPA.

#### REBUILDING OUR NATION'S INFRASTRUCTURE

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, it is long past time for Congress to come together and pass a bold, bipartisan plan to rebuild our Nation's infrastructure.

Right now, China is spending 10 times as a percentage of GDP what we are on infrastructure. They are making huge investments in roads, bridges, ports, and rail. Meanwhile, Congress has simply not acted to put us on a competitive path in this global economy.

Now, a lot of debate has occurred here in the last weeks and days about our position in global trade, and we should have a trade deal that protects American jobs.

Meanwhile, what are we doing about China outspending us on infrastructure, which makes us less competitive? How are we supposed to compete with them when we haven't done anything to deal with our crumbling roads and bridges that are essential to making our manufacturers competitive in delivering their products to market?

It is time for bold action, big action on infrastructure, like the development of a national infrastructure bank that would leverage public capital with private capital to rebuild our crumbling roads and bridges.

Mr. Speaker, it is long past time for action. There is bipartisan support for this. We need to bring a big infrastructure bill to the floor of the House.

#### MAJORITY OF PENNSYLVANIANS SUPPORT HYDRAULIC FRACTURING

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, a recent poll conducted by Robert Morris University reveals that 57.1 percent of Pennsylvanians support natural gas production and hydraulic fracturing, with nearly half

saying they would welcome the industry into their hometown. This poll comes just 2 weeks after the Environmental Protection Agency released a report indicating that fracking poses “no widespread systemic harm to drinking water.”

Mr. Speaker, Pennsylvania is the third largest natural gas producer in the Nation and continues to drive record-breaking oil and natural gas production. The Marcellus shale, which extends through most of Pennsylvania, has grown from less than 2 billion cubic feet per day in 2007 to 16 billion in 2014 and has jolted Pennsylvania’s economy.

As co-chair of the bipartisan Congressional Natural Gas Caucus, I will continue to explore and promote best practices so that we can highlight the safety and the positive impacts of natural gas.

#### MEN’S HEALTH WEEK

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

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as we celebrate national Men’s Health Week, I urge all Americans to take action to reduce health risks and prevent disease. It can be as simple as exercising, eating right, or setting up an appointment for a checkup.

I also rise as the CBC Health Braintrust chair to bring awareness to the critical state of Black men’s health and the need to expand educational opportunities and treatment options to reduce incidence of disease in communities of color.

Black men suffer disproportionately from many chronic and infectious diseases, many of which are preventable. Today, almost 40 percent of Black men are obese, which contributes to stroke, heart disease, and diabetes. In 2015, Black men were found to be twice as likely to die from prostate cancer as White men and have a higher incidence and death rate from colorectal cancer. Your skin color and ZIP Code shouldn’t determine your health outcomes.

Together, through legislation and community engagement, we can reduce health inequities and provide a healthier and more prosperous life for all Americans.

#### PROTECT MEDICAL INNOVATION ACT

(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, I rise today in support of H.R. 160, the Protect Medical Innovation Act, that will be considered on the floor this week.

One of the most fundamental flaws of what is known as the Affordable Care Act is trying to offset the trillion-dollar price tag by imposing an arbitrary 2.3 percent tax on lifesaving medical devices, such as pacemakers and heart

valves. It actually discourages the type of innovation that will improve our healthcare system for people needing these devices.

Hindered with these new high costs, our small businesses are finding it increasingly difficult to innovate, curtailing medical advancements and often delaying the availability of new treatments and cures for patients. I personally visited a number of these companies and understand how important their work is to improving our healthcare system.

Taxing innovation is not a 21st century healthcare solution. This devastating tax is reported to have already caused a net loss of over 33,000 jobs.

American families and small businesses deserve better, and the House is committed to advancing commonsense ideas to ease the burdens of the President’s healthcare law. H.R. 160 is one of those solutions.

I ask my colleagues to join me in support of repealing this job- and innovation-killing tax that only limits options for those who really need these lifesaving devices.

#### CRIMINAL JUSTICE REFORM

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as we rally around the obvious in the need for criminal justice reform and, in essence, the rehabilitation of our criminal justice laws as we deal with the interaction of law enforcement and civilians, having a pathway for respect for both, one of the most forgotten aspects is dealing with the treatment of juveniles in the criminal justice system.

I intend, over the next couple of weeks, to introduce a series of legislative initiatives that address that form of the criminal justice system, which we find, as parents and family members, touches all juveniles.

One of the things that the bill recognizes is that a young person’s brain is still developing into his or her early twenties, and that those who commit crimes before this point should be treated differently by the criminal justice system.

The purpose of this effort is to improve the treatment of young offenders within the Federal criminal justice system and to put them on a path toward successful reentry by providing options for the sentencing judges: a safety valve for young offenders which would, in essence, break through the mandatory minimum; an early release for young offenders; and, particularly, alternatives such as massive use of home arrest.

Our children are our future. They get on the wrong path. Let’s not celebrate that wrong path and force them to live that wrong path. Let’s save their lives.

#### AXING THE TAX

(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 today on behalf of the estimated 145 million Americans who are at risk of losing their employer-sponsored healthcare insurance due to an excise tax included in the President’s healthcare law. Beginning in 2018, employers will be required to pay a 40 percent tax on their employees’ healthcare plans due to ObamaCare.

I am already hearing from constituents back home who hear from their employers and employees alike that are preparing for this devastating tax by looking at increasing deductibles, reducing benefits, and shifting costs to consumers and property taxpayers alike. This tax is set to cost New Hampshire’s largest city, Manchester, over \$5 million.

Americans simply can’t afford another costly tax, and that is why I introduced H.R. 879, a bill to repeal the so-called Cadillac tax. As we prepare to vote on a series of healthcare bills this week, I urge my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring this commonsense bill.

H.R. 879 is a win for employers. It is also a win for municipalities. And, most importantly, it is a win for all those hard-working Americans who expected the President to keep his promise that, if you like your healthcare plan, you can keep it.

#### EXPORT-IMPORT BANK REAUTHORIZATION

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

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, in just 6 legislative days, the charter of the Export-Import Bank will expire.

The Ex-Im Bank has proven an important tool in expanding U.S. exports and creating American jobs. It has done that with bipartisan support at zero cost to the taxpayers.

I would like to mention two companies in particular that have received support from the Ex-Im Bank: Able Industrial Products in Ontario and Desiccare in Pomona. These aren’t giant, faceless corporations. They are very small businesses that provide jobs for the Inland Empire residents.

The world economy is getting more competitive, and the Ex-Im Bank is helping to level the playing field for American companies. If my colleagues truly want to protect U.S. jobs and U.S. workers, we can’t afford to let the Ex-Im Bank expire. It is time to allow a vote.

□ 1215

#### TRIBUTE TO DORELLA ANDERSON

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

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Dorella Alexis Anderson, a resident of Riverside, California, who passed away last month.

For more than 40 years, Dorella worked at the Riverside Community Settlement Association, which provided a number of services for residents in the Eastside area of Riverside.

A lifetime member of the Riverside African American Historical Society, Dorella worked to preserve the rich African American history in Riverside. She worked on numerous charitable endeavors in Riverside, including Toys for Tots, and gave back to the community in countless ways.

Dorella was a wife, a mother, a grandmother, a great-grandmother, a sister, an aunt, and a friend. Her dedication toward our community cements her legacy as one of our greatest residents. She will be missed.

#### CARRY-ON FREEDOM ACT

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, last week the International Air Transport Association recommended a new guideline that would reduce the size of carry-on luggage. The new carry-on size limit is 21 percent smaller than the size currently permitted by most major domestic airlines.

Eight major international carriers have already adopted the new size limits, and the trade association is suggesting more airlines will be adopting it soon. If implemented by our domestic carriers, this will force consumers to spend more on checked baggage fees and/or purchase new luggage to meet this new guideline.

Enough is enough. Airline passengers are tired of getting squeezed by airlines, both physically and fiscally. The seats are smaller, the legroom is less, the prices are more, and the profits are more.

That is why I introduced the Carry-on Freedom Act. The bill would prohibit airlines who charge for checked baggage from reducing the size of carry-on baggage from the current size standards and would protect consumers from even more cost to travel. I urge my colleagues to stand up for consumers and pass the Carry-on Freedom Act.

#### PROSTATE CANCER IS A NATIONAL EPIDEMIC

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

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, prostate cancer is a national epidemic, the most common cancer in men. One in seven men will be diagnosed, with more than 220,000 new cases each year, and 28,000 men will die from prostate cancer this year. Prostate cancer, Mr. Speaker, disproportionately impacts African American men, who have the

highest prostate cancer rates of any racial or ethnic group. Black men are twice as likely to be diagnosed with prostate cancer, nearly 2½ times as likely to die from that disease.

Last week, I introduced the National Prostate Cancer Plan Act along with Congressmen MIKE MCCAUL, ELIJAH CUMMINGS, and WALTER JONES. The bill would establish the National Prostate Cancer Council and direct them to develop and implement a national strategic plan to accelerate the innovation of diagnostic tools to improve early detection and reduce unnecessary treatment.

Prostate cancer can strike anyone. Many of us have either been personally affected by this disease or have lost a loved one. Enactment of this bill would be a giant step forward in our battle to combat this treatable disease so that men can live longer and healthier.

My bill, Mr. Speaker, has been endorsed by the American Urological Association, American Medical Association, Prostate Cancer Foundation, ZERO, and PCRI.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in this effort by cosponsoring H.R. 2730.

#### WOMAN ON THE TWENTY ACT

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

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, the American people have spoken. I join over 1 million Americans who voted in an online poll conducted by Women on 20s, a nonprofit grassroots organization, to put a woman on the \$20 bill.

To celebrate the amazing achievements of women throughout our history, I introduced the legislation to Put a Woman on the Twenty Act, H.R. 2147, which would empower the Secretary of Treasury to put a woman on the face of a \$20 bill as soon as possible.

Since the first general circulation of paper currency in this country, no woman has ever held the honor of being featured on paper money, and I would say to Secretary Lew that you need look no further than the people's choice winner, Harriet Tubman, for inspiration. In her words, "Every great dream begins with a dreamer." In her dreams, she always had a vision. More than ever, my vision is a redesign of the \$20 bill.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me and support putting a woman on the \$20 bill.

#### CONGRATULATIONS TO THE GUAM MEN'S NATIONAL SOCCER TEAM

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

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Guam men's national soccer team, Team Matao, as they lead group D in the second round of the FIFA World Cup Asian qualifiers. It was a David versus Goliath mo-

ment yesterday when Team Matao defeated India with a 2-1 victory. This follows Team Matao's 1-0 victory over Turkmenistan last week.

I congratulate Guam Football Association President Richard Lai, coach Gary White, and all of Team Matao on their great victory. Biba Guam.

#### HONORING DR. DENNIS GALLON ON HIS RETIREMENT

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

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today for myself and on behalf of my colleague Congresswoman LOIS FRANKEL to honor one of south Florida's most respected leaders in higher education.

After 18 years of service, our friend Dr. Dennis Gallon is retiring as president of Palm Beach State College. Under his watch, Palm Beach State College has become the eighth-largest producer of associate degree graduates in America. From expanding STEM education programs coveted by local employers to creating an honors college for high-achieving students, Palm Beach State College flourished under Dr. Gallon's leadership.

Just last year, the United States Department of Education reported that Palm Beach State College offers the sixth-lowest tuition rates nationwide. Dr. Dennis Gallon's commitment to high-quality, affordable higher education is truly admirable, and his tenure as president of Palm Beach State College deserves our praise and gratitude.

Congresswoman FRANKEL, and I am sure Congressman HASTINGS, and I proudly thank him for his remarkable service.

#### RENEW THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

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

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, there are just 6 more working days before the Ex-Im Bank expires, and given the critical importance of this program, I thought it would be useful to provide a quick index of hard numbers showing what this would mean to the United States economy:

Sixty—the number 60. That is the approximate number of Ex-Im credit agencies that are competing with us around the world that are waiting for our Bank to expire so they can grab that American export business.

3,340. That is the number of small businesses that are supported right now by the Ex-Im Bank, helping them to export their goods and provide jobs.

164,000. That is the number of American jobs that are provided right now this year by the Ex-Im Bank that we would lose immediately.

1.3 million. That is the number of private sector jobs that have been created by the Bank since 2009, with no additional cost to the American taxpayer. In fact, it makes money to help us pay down our debt.

And, finally, zero. That is what we gain by killing our Bank. Zero. We don't get the revenue. We don't get the jobs. We don't get to export our goods. Let's renew it.

#### REMEMBERING DOMENIC D'AMBROSIO

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

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Speaker, today I come to the floor of the House with a heavy heart. This past weekend, the city of Lynn lost a dedicated public servant, a tireless local volunteer, and an inspiring advocate for the people of our community. Domenic D'Ambrosio, known by many as Dom, was loved by many for his uncanny ability to connect with people. Whether they were old friends or someone he was meeting for the first time, Dom's compassion for others was contagious, encouraging all of us to be better members of our community.

At a time when public opinion of Congress is at an all-time low, Dom's belief in this institution and the power of the democratic process could not have been stronger. I thank him for bringing a reinvigorating energy to our Nation's political dialogue and for reminding us why we are so fortunate to have a free and democratic government, and why we should all take part in making it better.

My thoughts and prayers are with his wife, Kelly, his family, and friends. The Sixth District of Massachusetts lost a true champion, but I know that his legacy will live on through our shared commitment to public service. Dom, you will be missed.

#### JUNE IS ALZHEIMER'S AND BRAIN AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the month of June as Alzheimer's and Brain Awareness Month. Approximately 340,000 Texans and 5.4 million Americans currently have Alzheimer's disease. One in nine Americans over 65 is projected to develop Alzheimer's, and it is the sixth-leading cause of death in the United States.

The rapidly growing number of older Americans will lead to a corresponding rapid growth in the prevalence of Alzheimer's disease. The devastating emotional and financial impact of this debilitating disease is known by too many. My mother-in-law battled this disease, so I know firsthand how difficult it can be for patients and their loved ones.

I strongly support efforts to advocate and raise awareness and robust funding for research to find treatments and cure for this disease. Congress has a real opportunity to dramatically impact the lives of millions of Americans by funding research and outreach programs for Alzheimer's.

I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing the month of June as Alzheimer's and Brain Awareness Month. Together we can help turn the world purple for Alzheimer's, and by doing so, promote care, support, and research of this terrible disease.

#### REAUTHORIZE THE EXPORT- IMPORT BANK

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

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge Republican leadership to stop blocking the will of the House and immediately call for a vote to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank, set to expire June 30.

This May I hosted Fred Hochberg, chairman of the Ex-Im Bank, in my district to tour Innova Technologies, a leader in civil-structural engineering and one of 32 Nevada companies working with the Bank. At a time when our local economy was fighting to recover from the recession and unemployment was rampant, the Bank provided critical support that allowed Innova not just to survive but nearly double its workforce.

In 2014 alone, the Bank supported 164,000 jobs and reduced the Federal deficit by \$675 million. In Nevada, it helped increase our export value by \$165 million. Now is the time for a long-term reauthorization to renew, reenergize, and reform the Bank so it can continue supporting businesses and creating jobs in Nevada and across the country.

#### MAKING IN ORDER AT ANY TIME CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 55, REMOVAL OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES FROM IRAQ AND SYRIA

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order at any time to consider H. Con. Res. 55 in the House if called up by the chair of the Committee on Foreign Affairs or his designee; that the concurrent resolution be considered as read; and that the previous question be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question, except for 2 hours of debate equally divided among and controlled by Representative ROYCE of California, Representative ENGEL of New York, and Representative MCGOVERN of Massachusetts or their respective designees.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, June 16, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,  
The Speaker, U.S. Capitol,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on June 16, 2015 at 11:02 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 565.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

□ 1230

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2596, INTELLIGENCE AU- THORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 315 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 315

*Resolved*, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2596) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and amendments specified in this section and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-19. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in

the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on the recorded vote ordered on the question of reconsideration of the vote on the question of concurring in the matter comprising the remainder of title II of the Senate amendment to H.R. 1314 may continue to be postponed through the legislative day of Thursday, July 30, 2015.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on House Resolution 315, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring forward today this rule on behalf of the Rules Committee. This rule provides for a robust amendment debate on a wide variety of issues related to the authorization of funds for 16 intelligence agencies.

This rule provides for the consideration of H.R. 2596, the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016. The Rules Committee met on this measure yesterday evening and heard testimony from both the chairman of the committee and the ranking member, in addition to receiving amendment testimony from multiple Members.

This rule brought forward by the committee is a structured rule. There were 29 amendments in total submitted to the Rules Committee. Of those 29, I am pleased that the full House will debate and vote on 16 of those amendments, over half that were submitted.

The majority of the amendments made in order are bipartisan, a fact demonstrating the unity of this body in advancing funds that will go directly to fighting against terrorism proliferation and weapons of mass destruction.

“To provide for the common defense” is a common phrase to us all, and one that clearly sets forth the more basic responsibility of our government, a responsibility that the members of the Rules Committee, the Intelligence Committee, and, yes, I believe the entire House do not take lightly.

This rule provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and the ranking member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

As most of the intelligence budget involves highly classified programs, all Members were given the opportunity to review the classified annexes to the underlying legislation prior to Rules Committee consideration.

Members should also be aware that section 2 of the rule provides that the motion to reconsider the vote on Trade Adjustment Assistance, or title II of the Senate amendment to H.R. 1314, may continue to be postponed through Thursday, July 30, 2015.

This postponement was necessary to allow House and Senate leadership, in addition to the President, sufficient time to consider legislative options related to this action on trade promotion authority and Trade Adjustment Assistance.

I am proud of the work undertaken by the Intelligence Committee to advance this vitally important legislation whose consideration is provided for by this rule.

There are a few key provisions that I want to ensure Members are aware of because I believe they speak to the overwhelming awareness the Intelligence Committee possesses of the responsibility of Congress to protect this Nation from terrorism, and also of our unwavering fidelity to the United States Constitution.

First, section 302 of the underlying legislation provides that the authorization of appropriations by this act shall not be deemed to constitute authority for the conduct of any intelligence activity that is not otherwise authorized by the Constitution or the laws of the United States.

Sections 303 and 304 require specific elements of the executive branch to provide Congress with timely notifying requirements on key intelligence activities. Congressional notification requirements generally remain a vitally important mechanism to ensure that Congress is able to conduct robust oversight.

Notification requirements specific to the intelligence community are even more essential, given the classified and delicate nature of the situations our intelligence agencies face every day.

The classification of documents and the decisionmaking factors that go into such classification have historically been an area of great interest and, at times, concerns by Members of this body and the citizens that we represent.

In response to the valid concerns and interest by Members and the public at

large, in the Intelligence Committee’s report on H.R. 2596, they specifically state that the committee “seeks to improve its visibility into the classification process and better understand how the intelligence community determines the classification level of especially sensitive reporting and analysis.”

In the underlying legislation, the committee carries out this goal by directing the Director of National Intelligence to provide, within 60 days of the enactment, a report to the congressional intelligence committees outlining each instance in the past 5 years that the Office of Director of National Intelligence or any other entity within the executive branch directed an element of the intelligence community to begin disseminating existing un compartmented intelligence reporting or analysis through a compartment or subcompartment.

This requirement is just one of several additional reporting requirements in the legislation to serve to enhance Congress’ role in and understanding of the classification process, again, emphasizing Congress’ oversight role. The committee has done a good job in clarifying that.

The underlying legislation also directs the Central Intelligence Agency to provide the congressional intelligence committees with all intelligence reports based on the documents collected in the May 1, 2011, raid that killed Osama bin Laden.

We live in a dangerous world and face constant and evolving threats from terrorist groups like al Qaeda, Boko Haram, al Shabaab, and ISIS. These groups successfully use the Internet to anonymously build their resources, both human and financial.

The United States Government must maintain and enhance their ability to counter extremists online. By understanding how and where terrorist groups operate, we can more effectively fight for freedom at home and abroad. I am pleased to see strong provisions in the legislation that will further this goal.

These provisions that I have just spoken of are just a few examples of the thoughtful and difficult work the Intelligence Committee undertook to bring forward this legislation that authorizes critical national security functions while staying within the funding constraints of the Budget Control Act, or BCA.

I want to thank the Intelligence Committee and their staff for their hard work on the authorization measure.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank the gentleman, my friend from Georgia, for yielding the customary 30 minutes for debate.

Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for consideration of H.R. 2596, the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016, as well as provides that the

motion to reconsider the vote on passage of the Trade Adjustment Assistance measure may continue to be postponed until the end of the legislative day on July 30.

First, I commend the efforts of Chairman NUNES and Ranking Member SCHIFF for their effort in crafting a bill with largely bipartisan support that provides our Nation's intelligence community with the resources they need to keep us safe. Our national security relies on the continued strength of our intelligence community.

As we face ongoing security challenges both at home and abroad from threats such as ISIL, lone wolf attacks, the emergence of cybercrime, as well as the specter of unknown challenges that may be awaiting us, a strong intelligence apparatus is of the utmost importance.

This legislation will do much to meet those challenges. Specifically, this bill supports investments in cutting-edge technology like spy satellites, enhances our Nation's human intelligence capabilities, provides resources to safeguard valuable signals intelligence collection, and partners with our foreign allies to maximize the reach of our intelligence efforts.

This investment in our country's intelligence infrastructure comes at a critically important time. As you know, the Office of Personnel Management recently suffered a disastrous breach. Hackers were able to target OPM and gain access to personnel data, including employees' names, addresses, Social Security numbers, and numerous other personal details.

Perhaps most disturbing, OPM houses the applications and files submitted by those applying for security clearances, with data going back until 1985. These files were compromised as well, leading some experts to argue that the compromise of these files could have tremendous negative effects for our human intelligence gathering capabilities.

These cyber attacks represent a critical threat to our national security. We all love the convenience that technology provides us, but we must also be prepared to invest in technologies that will protect us from those who wish to sabotage our security in the virtual world. It is time for the OPM to implement and abide by best practices so that we never face a data breach like the one we saw last week.

To the extent that Congress will play a role in securing our virtual infrastructure, we should work as quickly as possible to ensure that our employees and our most sensitive material are not needlessly exposed to those who wish to do us harm.

Mr. Speaker, while I support the strong national security protections this authorization provides, I am extremely disappointed yet again in how my Republican colleagues have skirted the fiscal cuts imposed by sequestration in order to fund the things that they care about, while ignoring the ef-

fects such fool-headed cuts have on the vital domestic programs that they don't seem to care about. We have people hurting all over this Nation because of this irresponsible and senseless policy of sequestration.

Republicans claim to be using this policy as an important tool to rein in out-of-control government spending; yet, when sequestration affects programs and areas of the budget they care about, they magically get around this dilemma by using accounting gimmicks.

That is just what they have done here in this measure. The majority has yet again used the overseas contingency operations account to evade sequestration spending caps.

Wouldn't it be nice if Republicans wanted to evade spending caps for the Department of Education so that we can get around sequestration and properly educate our children? Or if they could use accounting tricks to get around sequestration to fully fund and repair our crumbling infrastructure? Or if they were also inclined to use their budgetary magic to get around sequestration caps to properly fund critically important agencies like the Environmental Protection Agency so that our children and grandchildren can continue to have access to clean water and clean air?

Alas, all we get from the majority is more of the same budgetary double standard, using tricks to get around spending caps on things you like to spend money on and then cry, "sequester, sequester," on things you don't like to spend money on.

□ 1245

Let's stop pretending. That isn't a plan to rein in government spending. That is just spending taxpayer money on things you deem worthy of unfettered spending and ignoring programs, for political reasons, that you don't even like, even though such programs remain vital to our country's success.

Mr. Speaker, many on my side of the aisle have taken issue with the detention facility in Guantanamo Bay since day one; I certainly have. Once again, the Republicans look to continue the operation of this prison, when we should be working to bring about its orderly closure.

We are better than this prison. As a country dedicated to the rule of law, as a country that inspires people the world over to work for and even die for the establishment of democratic rule, we are better than this prison. This prison is an exercise in Kafkaesque justice, which has long worked to undermine our standing with our allies and helped terrorist organizations recruit more and more fighters.

Look, I don't think that anyone is arguing that, if we close the prison, then the myriad terrorist groups who use it as a recruiting tool will no longer have people joining their ranks, but it would be one less arrow in their quiver.

For that reason, we need to work together to close the prison as quickly as

possible. In doing so, we will not jeopardize the safety of our country, but will act more fully to reflect our commitment to democracy and the rule of law.

We know and I know, having been in the judiciary, that our justice system is more than capable of handling the prosecution of terrorists, no matter where they are, including those held in Guantanamo Bay.

We have successfully tried Richard Reid, Umar Farouk Abdulmutallab, Faisal Shahzad, and Dzhokhar Tsarnaev—the Boston bomber—and we have either sentenced them to death or life imprisonment in our most secure prisons.

At last night's Rules Committee meeting, my friends on the other side of the aisle decided to make a last-minute change to today's rule—or, I might add, to further pollute today's rule. That last-minute change allows for the postponement of the motion to reconsider TAA.

Over the course of my tenure in Congress, I voted to support thousands of pieces of legislation. In the 20-plus years that I have served in this body, I can think of only three votes which I deeply regret making, and one of those was in support of NAFTA.

In the years since, I have seen after NAFTA a decrease in American jobs, a rollback of critical environmental protections here and in Mexico, where I was promised that the environmental circumstances in the maquiladoras would be cleaned up and they were not and a stagnation of wages that has prevented the financial upward mobility of working class and middle class Americans and has ground poor Americans into poverty beyond belief.

If we are going to create trade policy that is worthy of future generations, then we must ensure that that policy strengthens, not weakens, labor rights. It must strengthen, not weaken, environmental protections. It must ensure other countries' responsibility to adhere to basic human rights. It must expand and strengthen our middle class, not squeeze hard-working Americans in favor of corporate interests.

The legislation included in this rule today is part of a trade package that does nothing to bolster these important priorities.

Finally, as I have stated time and again, I take issue with the manner in which these important measures are being considered. Legislation as important as the ones at hand deserve an open and transparent process where Members of both parties and both Houses of Congress may debate and offer amendments as they please.

This process, envisioned and designed by our Founding Fathers to serve as a safeguard to democracy, continues to be eroded by the majority's insistence on grouping multiple, unrelated bills together under one rule and limiting the number of amendments that can be made in order, as well as the time available for debate.

There were amendments offered last night. For example, Congresswoman SPEIER offered whistleblower protection, not made in order. My colleague Representative SCHWEIKERT from Arizona and I offered a very sensible measure under the intelligence provision to allow for us, as a sense of Congress only, to say that we will participate with Tunisia's intelligence operation in a more pronounced manner—totally innocuous, but at the very same time, helping a country that may very well make the bridge to democracy and certainly has been an ally in intelligence—and a needed one, in light of the number of people that come up from north Africa through Tunisia and wind up fighting in the Middle East.

If we are truly to operate as the deliberative body the U.S. House of Representatives was created to function as, we must do more to ensure that our Nation's most critical pieces of legislation are afforded the time and consideration they rightly deserve.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Florida. One of the things that I, coming on to the Rules Committee, have found is really the vigorous debates that we do have—and the gentleman from Florida, we have had many of those, and that is a good place for it.

It is a good place for it also here on the floor to discuss what really, as was focused on very clearly, is a rule for a bill, and then there is a procedural issue that we are extending the TAA reconsideration until July 30. I am understanding what he is saying, but I do want to make Members clear that is what is happening.

We are working on the majority side for a process that is open. Sixteen amendments are going to be made in order, and they are going to be debated right here on the floor of this House and voted. I think that is what the Republican majority is focused on.

One of the things that came up—and I want it to be clear, Mr. Speaker, is about priorities. It is about priorities. When we are dealing with authorizations and spending bills, is what we are dealing with in the majority here, we have made it very clear, I believe, from the Republican majority standpoint, although I personally and others may have discussions on how we use overseas contingency funds, and those have been debated on this floor and should be continued to be debated on this floor.

However, one of the things that we are doing, and I believe, from our perspective, is we are putting priorities first—priorities for national defense; securing our national interest; and in light of this bill, making sure that our country is safe, abroad and here, from attacks from people who don't like us.

I don't buy the argument—and the debate on Guantanamo is a different issue—but the argument that if we closed it up, it takes away one recruiting piece. I am sorry. Boko Haram, al Qaeda, these others do not hate us only because of a prison; they just hate us because we are free. They hate us because we have a society that is open.

I understand the debate that we want to have, but let's make it crystal clear. There was no Guantanamo when they rammed planes into our World Trade Center. There was no Guantanamo at that time. They just don't like us. Let's make that very clear.

Funding is appropriate. We will debate those entirely upon this House and continue to. The Republicans will still look out for jobs and those working in the middle class, and those that are trying to find their families' priorities in their own economic sphere and looking at it in a country that is in debt and trying to make sure we make good fiscal decisions.

Our priorities are that we help businesses start, we encourage the creation of jobs, not a government strangulation of jobs, and that is what resources do.

With this bill, it is very focused, though. This is about our intelligence community. This is a rule that supports an authorization coming from a very difficult community that does a very difficult job. We are supporting a rule that funds those agencies so that it keeps us safe and does the things that keeps America free. That is the continued argument that we will continue to have.

I appreciate, Mr. Speaker, the other debates that we want to have here, but let's be focused. This rule is about that. It is also about a policy decision or a procedural decision in this rule.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, the vote on Trade Adjustment Assistance failed in the House of Representatives last Friday by a 3-1 margin; yet this rule today would extend the revote on Trade Adjustment Assistance through the end of July. This is one more attempt to play games with the future of hard-working families.

American workers demand and they deserve respect. They deserve a living wage and the right not to have their jobs shipped overseas. That is what we are united in fighting for.

A vote for this rule is a vote for fast track. A vote for fast track is a vote against jobs and against wages.

United States trade policy has been failing American workers, failing American consumers and families for 20 years.

The U.S.-Korea Free Trade Agreement has already cost up to 75,000 jobs, and it was just passed 3 years ago. Up to 5 million jobs have been destroyed

by currency manipulation; and a number of the signatories to this trade agreement, their policy is to manipulate their currency to have their goods sold at a lower price than American goods, putting American workers out of jobs and lowering their wages.

Joseph Stiglitz, the Nobel Laureate in Economics, has written: "Inequality is not inevitable. It is a choice that we make with the rules that we create to structure our economy."

Trade policy is one of those choices. If we approve fast track, we throw away our ability, our constitutional authority to represent the people who sent us here in good faith. We throw away that ability to be able to fix the flaws in the trade agreement, like the Trans-Pacific Partnership, to the detriment of millions of American families.

I urge a "no" vote on this rule.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Friday, this House sent a strong message to the Fast-Trackers: Not so fast.

Forty-eight hours ago, Republican leaders were telling the world that, at this moment, we would be voting to approve Fast Track; but now, the Fast-Trackers have become backtrackers, pushing back the vote.

The only reason that they seek this postponement in this rule of up to 6 weeks is that they do not have the votes to approve Fast Track today, and the only way they can get those votes today is to use this strange shenanigan of connecting it and cloaking it in a rule for the authorization of our intelligence agencies.

After Friday's Fast Track vote, one official said those who "vote against this Trade Adjustment Assistance are adding their names to the death certificate for [it]." Well, let's play it straight for a change. TAA is not authorized now. It expired last year. Its future depends, not upon this authorization, but upon an adequate level of funding.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act, and many more have not been authorized for years, but they continue to operate perfectly well, based upon appropriated funds. This TAA argument is phony.

□ 1300

Really, it doesn't take much intelligence to see what is happening here. These Fast-Trackers are desperate, and this postponement vote for this extent, of this nature, is unprecedented in the history of this Congress. It has never happened before in American history that someone has asked to postpone a vote for up to 6 weeks.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DOGGETT. And understand what that means. Understand that they are looking for the ideal time—morning, noon, or night—to muscle through a broken trade policy that a majority of this House and of the American people do not want.

This rule provides that the Speaker at any time of day can come with no notice, no debate, and say, we are voting to send this bill to the President's desk.

What really needs adjusting is not trade assistance but the no-compromise, no-amendment attitude on trade that gives us broken trade policies.

This vote wouldn't be so close if this process hadn't been so closed.

Reject this rule. Vote for democracy. Don't change the precedents of the House. Don't let this be muscled through.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT), my good friend.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen, what is about to happen on this floor with this rule is a direct violation of the United States Constitution; for in the United States Constitution, it clearly says that the United States Congress shall have the power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations." And in this rule is a clear violation of that.

We already voted it down overwhelmingly 302-126, Republicans and Democrats. It was the foremost bipartisan vote in this 21st century, the very thing that the American people are crying for.

Now, why did Alexander Hamilton and Thomas Jefferson and James Madison all agree? Very strong, very independent minds. Alexander Hamilton and Thomas Jefferson could hardly bear to be in the same room with each other, but they agreed on this because they knew that every State had Representatives in Congress to look out for jobs that could be shipped overseas. This is the primary reason, ladies and gentlemen.

Look at every trade agreement. This country has lost over 2 million manufacturing jobs to China as a result of the China deal. Over 150,000 jobs to Mexico. Yes, it created jobs—not in the United States. And what kind of jobs? These are jobs that impacted at the lower- and middle-income levels of our economy. It is the middle class that is the heart and the soul of America.

Let this Congress stand up and reject this rule.

We proved our mettle with that 302 vote. Congress, I am asking you, the American people are asking you: Do what Alexander Hamilton and Thomas Jefferson and James Madison asked us to do, and let it be the Congress that regulates commerce with foreign nations.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I will continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, intelligence is critical to our national security. It should not be besmirched by a controversial and unrelated procedural shenanigan, unprecedented in the annals of the House of Representatives.

In the words of the President of the United States, It is time to play it straight. TAA and TPA, that package was voted on. It was defeated. We are done. Play it straight.

Write new legislation. Put together a new package. Bring it to the floor of the House. See if it has a majority. That is playing it straight.

Instead, in an unprecedented move, a vote we took last week is being held in never-never land to be revoted on as late as the end of July. That is right. Early June votes tabulated in late July.

If you are against unprecedented shenanigans, vote "no" on the rule. If you are for playing it straight, vote "no" on the rule. If you are against TAA, vote "no" on the rule. If you are against TPA, if you are against fast track, vote "no" on the rule.

If you vote for an unprecedented procedural shenanigan, an unprecedented procedural mutation today, you can be sure it will be used against you and your district and your beliefs tomorrow. And if you are not against fast track, you should be because it gives an enormous gift to China, and we get nothing in return.

China's number one tactic for running up the largest trade surplus against us in history is currency manipulation. This deal that is put on the fast track enshrines the view that currency manipulation is just fine. Go to it. A giant gift to China.

In addition, the rules of origin provisions say that goods that the manufacturer admits are 50 or 60 percent made in China—which means actually 70 or 80 percent made in China—get fast-tracked into the United States.

Vote "no" on this procedural mutation.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, just for a moment, let's focus back on the rule and the underlying bill and the procedural issue that has been discussed. It is out in the open. It was not snuck in or anything else. It has been there and has been discussed.

But also, I want to get back to the fact of the rule, itself, which is stand alone. We are going to be voting on an intelligence bill. We are going to have a debate on an intelligence bill.

And, among other things, I will give us a reminder of what this legislation does:

It sustains critical capabilities to fight terrorism and counter the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. That is a separate bill. This is what we are going to be discussing. It

has funds to assist our efforts to recover unauthorized disclosures of intelligence capabilities. It sustains activities in Afghanistan and Iraq to continue the fight against ISIS, al Qaeda, and the Taliban. It invests in the resiliency of our national security space architecture. It provides policy discretion on sensitive intelligence operations. It promotes intelligence integration and sharing through investment in intelligence communitywide information technology enterprises. It enhances investment in military intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance aircraft. It funds initiatives to thwart cyber attacks and insider threats. And it requires a report every 60 days on foreign fighters in Syria and Iraq.

This is the bill, the underlying bill that we are discussing. And I just wanted to make a reminder of that. As we have discussions on different parts of this rule, let's be reminded also that we are dealing with a stand-alone bill that we will work.

Mr. HASTINGS. Will the gentleman yield for just a question?

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Florida for just a question.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, all of the things that the gentleman from Georgia said are in the measure are true. But does he also agree that it is unprecedented that we have included a measure to delay an already-voted-on rule? Never before has that been done.

Or to your knowledge, has it been?

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Well, I think it is a fact that it is a part of this rule. The gentleman from Florida states it in whatever adjectival terms he wants to give. But it is in the rule. We have not made it secretive that it is part of this rule. And we can discuss either part.

I will just simply focus on the intelligence part.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), my good friend.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding and for the astute question that he asked, which is one that I would like to follow up on.

Mr. Speaker, let me say to the gentleman from Georgia that he is quite right. There are very serious and important components of the intelligence bill covered by this rule.

As many of us have experienced over the last couple of days, we are in and out of intelligence and security briefings because that is the era in which we live. And in most instances, Members draw their concern from the responsibility they have for protecting the American people.

I am on the Homeland Security Committee and have continued on that committee since the tragedy, the heinous act of 9/11, and before, when the

select committee was in place. So I have no quarrel with some of the important elements of this legislation. But the gentleman from Georgia should recognize that this is an aberration.

There are two or three points that I would like to make:

First of all, we are long overdue for getting rid of the sequester. This joke was played on Members and the American people only because of the supercommittee—not because of any individual Members, but there was a supercommittee structure put in place, the time ran out, and they could not come to a budget conclusion. So this was the ultimate end. Members didn't vote on this. They voted on the supercommittee, and then this was the hatchet that fell when the supercommittee did not work. So sequester should be something that Speaker BOEHNER puts on the floor and immediately gets rid of.

And the reason why I say that is because I am going to talk about the shenanigans dealing with the trade bill. But what I am going to say is that the overseas contingency fund is being used to bolster up this bill, the intelligence bill. But I can't get those resources to be utilized for infrastructure or summer jobs or fixing the education system that we have responsibilities for or providing opportunities for young people to finish their education or criminal justice reform. So this is being 43 percent pumped up when used by funds that are not in the stream.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentleman.

The funding is not in the stream of funding that other appropriators have to utilize. That is wrong.

Then I might conclude on the shenanigans of the trade fix, if you will. I am for TAA, the Trade Adjustment Assistance. I want it to be voted on straight up or down, like many Members do, to provide for workers and not have, unfortunately, the addition that was added coming from the other body. So now we know that, whatever shenanigans that will come up, it probably won't be in the way that will help American workers.

Mr. Speaker, this rule should be voted down because we need an opportunity to work on behalf of the American workers, to get rid of sequester, and to find a way to move this country forward.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps I should say to the membership of this body that if they vote against this rule, it doesn't mean that we would not have an intelligence authorization. It simply would mean that those of us—my friend from Georgia and myself—would have to go back to the Rules Committee and fash-

ion a rule that does not include an unprecedented matter that should not be in this Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 in the first place.

And toward that end, among the things that were sought to be included, if we were going to include the TAA measure, then the ranking member, Ms. SLAUGHTER, proposed on behalf of the minority that we also include a vote on the Trans-Pacific Partnership, TPP, for the reason, one, TAA was overwhelmingly—3-1—defeated; TPP passed by a very thin margin.

So if we are going to twist arms and find methodologies to employ to try to change the minds of Members over a 6-week period of time, then perhaps it would be those of us who are opposed to the measure would have an opportunity to try to persuade some of those people who caused the thin margin of it to pass on TPP. We felt that was a fairness measure. At least if you were going to include it, that should have been included as well.

Before proceeding, Mr. Speaker, perhaps I should learn how much time each side has at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 4½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Georgia has 19½ minutes remaining.

□ 1315

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I am waiting for one additional speaker, but perhaps I can engage in a colloquy with my colleague from Texas.

Mr. DOGGETT. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HASTINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DOGGETT. You served both on the Intelligence Committee and on the Rules Committee. There is reason to authorize intelligence, but am I correct it has nothing to do with this sneak attack to put in a postponement that has never been done in American history, where never has anyone sought to delay for 6 weeks the consideration of this bill that we are doing today; isn't that correct?

Mr. HASTINGS. I think you are absolutely correct, and it is unprecedented. At the very same time, as my friend from Georgia pointed out, they have done so transparently by putting it here, but that does not mean it would not be used at some point in the future.

Mr. DOGGETT. Does this rule provide any notice to Members of the House, or can this be entirely a surprise attack? Can they come out here on the floor at any time, perhaps when the floor is as empty as it is now, and give no notice to the Members of the House that they are about to move to send this bill to the President's desk, have absolutely no debate on that rule, but then have a vote here, perhaps a day when some Members are out on important business in their district, basically picking the best time because

they are so desperate to force through a bill that they know a majority of this House does not support and that the American people don't support because it will just foist off on us a broken, failed trade policy that does not respect the interests of the American people? Is that what is happening here?

Mr. HASTINGS. That is certainly allowed. Anytime before July 30, the measure could be brought to the floor, and it could be brought to the floor without any notice to the membership because it is a motion to reconsider. It is a part of this particular rule sought by the Speaker of the House, I might add, and therefore it could be brought at any time under the aegis of the Speaker's authority.

Mr. DOGGETT. Was the gentleman present in the Rules Committee when every single constructive improvement to this fast-track bill was rejected by the Rules Committee—not with your vote, of course—but a majority of the Rules Committee said “no” to telling the Members of this Congress as much about this deal as the Vietnamese Politburo already knows, saying “no” to at least meeting the standards on the environment that the Bush administration agreed to, saying “no” to putting the foreign corporations on the same level as our American corporations and businesses so that foreign corporations wouldn't have an advantage to come in and attack health, safety, and environmental rules that might be established by the Congress or the State of Florida or a city like San Antonio or Austin? Because under this fast-track bill, we are headed toward jeopardizing those rules, those State laws, and those Federal laws that deal with the needs of the American family and letting these foreign corporations circumvent them as they did in Canada, recently, to demand millions of dollars of taxpayer money for a decision locally to just prevent the expansion of a quarry. We can't have that happen. But the Rules Committee would not allow us to address those problems.

Mr. HASTINGS. Many of those measures in a 5½-hour, into-the-night session that the Rules Committee operated.

Mr. DOGGETT. I thank the gentleman.

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

I would urge that Members understand that we have already voted on this measure, and it was defeated, as I say, 3-1.

Robust funding for our intelligence infrastructure is clearly needed and, indeed, welcomed, but enough is enough. It is time for Republicans to stop squeezing important domestic programs through their arbitrary implementation of sequester. We must invest in education in this country; we must invest in our decaying infrastructure; we must invest in a clean environment; and we must invest in a strong middle class.

Republicans want to make investments in our intelligence community.

Great. So do I. We all do. But at some point, we have to start asking: What is it that that community is protecting? Without investments in education, infrastructure, and our middle class, we risk undermining what makes this country so exceptional and worth protecting in the first place.

I urge a “no” vote on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I appreciate the discussion we have had over the last little bit. I appreciate the gentleman from Florida. Again, although we have some differences—those have been evident today—the rule provides for ample debate on the floor and the opportunity to debate and vote on up to 16 amendments offered by a largely bipartisan group of Members.

I look forward to those debates. I look forward to the debate on how best to provide tools for our intelligence community and to combat the dangerous threats that we face while still respecting both the constitutional and budgetary restraints. Those are things that sometimes, I think, in the midst of discussion today, got lost in that this is a separate vote that we are going to be voting on our intelligence bill. There is a procedural issue that is part of this that is, again, not snuck in. It has been posted; it has been online; and it is there for Members to see.

When we look at priorities, again, I think, for us, it goes back to, again, in the overall budgetary and authorization process, the Republican majority stands for protecting our national interests, protecting and empowering the voters who actually send us here, not for growing and empowering an ever-encroaching Federal Government. This is what the budgets reflect. This is what the authorizations reflect. These are the priorities of the American people, and these are the priorities of the Republican majority.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. 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, this 15-minute vote on adoption of House Resolution 315 will be followed by a 5-minute vote on agreeing to the Speaker’s approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 236, nays 189, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 366]

YEAS—236

Abraham	Amodoi	Barletta
Aderholt	Ashford	Barr
Allen	Babin	Benishak

Bilirakis	Harper	Pitts
Bishop (MI)	Harris	Poe (TX)
Bishop (UT)	Hartzler	Poliquin
Black	Heck (NV)	Pompeo
Blackburn	Hensarling	Price, Tom
Blum	Herrera Beutler	Ratcliffe
Bost	Hice, Jody B.	Reichert
Boustany	Hill	Renacci
Brady (TX)	Holding	Ribble
Brat	Hudson	Rice (SC)
Bridenstine	Huelskamp	Rigell
Brooks (IN)	Huizenga (MI)	Roby
Buchanan	Hultgren	Roe (TN)
Buck	Hunter	Rogers (AL)
Bucshon	Hurd (TX)	Rogers (KY)
Burgess	Hurt (VA)	Rohrabacher
Calvert	Issa	Rokita
Carter (GA)	Jenkins (KS)	Rooney (FL)
Carter (TX)	Jenkins (WV)	Ros-Lehtinen
Chabot	Johnson (OH)	Roskam
Clawson (FL)	Johnson, Sam	Ross
Coffman	Jolly	Rothfus
Cole	Jordan	Rouzer
Collins (GA)	Joyce	Royce
Collins (NY)	Katko	Russell
Comstock	Kelly (PA)	Ryan (WI)
Conaway	King (IA)	Salmon
Cook	Kinzinger (IL)	Sanford
Cooper	Kline	Scalise
Costa	Knight	Schweikert
Costello (PA)	Labrador	Scott, Austin
Cramer	LaMalfa	Sensenbrenner
Crawford	Lamborn	Sessions
Crenshaw	Lance	Shimkus
Culberson	Latton	Shuster
Curbelo (FL)	LoBiondo	Simpson
Davis, Rodney	Long	Smith (MO)
Denham	Loudermilk	Smith (NE)
Dent	Love	Smith (NJ)
DeSantis	Lucas	Smith (TX)
DesJarlais	Luetkemeyer	Stefanik
Diaz-Balart	Lummis	Stewart
Dold	MacArthur	Stivers
Donovan	Marchant	Stutzman
Duffy	Marino	Thompson (PA)
Duncan (SC)	McCarthy	Thornberry
Duncan (TN)	McCaul	Tiberi
Elmrs (NC)	McClintock	Tipton
Emmer (MN)	McHenry	Trott
Farenthold	McKinley	Turner
Fincher	McMorris	Upton
Fitzpatrick	Rodgers	Valadao
Fleischmann	McSally	Wagner
Fleming	Meadows	Walberg
Flores	Meehan	Walden
Forbes	Messer	Walker
Fortenberry	Mica	Walorski
Fox	Miller (FL)	Walters, Mimi
Franks (AZ)	Miller (MI)	Weber (TX)
Frelinghuysen	Moolenaar	Webster (FL)
Garrett	Mooney (WV)	Wenstrup
Gibbs	Mullin	Westerman
Gibson	Mulvaney	Westmoreland
Goodlatte	Murphy (PA)	Whitfield
Gosar	Neugebauer	Williams
Gowdy	Newhouse	Wilson (SC)
Granger	Noem	Wittman
Graves (GA)	Nugent	Womack
Graves (LA)	Nunes	Woodall
Graves (MO)	Olson	Yoder
Griffith	Palazzo	Yoho
Grothman	Palmer	Young (AK)
Guinta	Paulsen	Young (IA)
Guthrie	Pearce	Young (IN)
Hanna	Perry	Zeldin
Hardy	Pittenger	Zinke

NAYS—189

Adams	Cárdenas	Davis, Danny
Aguilar	Carney	DeFazio
Amash	Carson (IN)	DeGette
Bass	Cartwright	Delaney
Beatty	Castor (FL)	DeLauro
Becerra	Castro (TX)	DelBene
Bera	Chu, Judy	DeSaulnier
Beyer	Ciulline	Deutch
Bishop (GA)	Clark (MA)	Dingell
Blumenauer	Clarke (NY)	Doggett
Bonamici	Clay	Doyle, Michael
Boyle, Brendan	Cleaver	F.
F.	Clyburn	Duckworth
Brady (PA)	Cohen	Edwards
Brooks (AL)	Connolly	Ellison
Brown (FL)	Conyers	Engel
Brownley (CA)	Courtney	Eshoo
Bustos	Crowley	Esty
Butterfield	Cuellar	Farr
Capps	Cummings	Fattah
Capuano	Davis (CA)	Foster

Frankel (FL)	Loeb sack	Roybal-Allard
Fudge	Lofgren	Ruiz
Gabbard	Lowenthal	Ruppersberger
Gallego	Lowey	Rush
Garamendi	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Ryan (OH)
Gohmert	Luján, Ben Ray (NM)	Sánchez, Linda T.
Graham	Lynch	Sarbanes
Grayson	Maloney,	Schakowsky
Green, Al	Carolyn	Schiff
Green, Gene	Maloney, Sean	Schrader
Grijalva	Massie	Scott (VA)
Gutiérrez	Matsui	Scott, David
Hahn	McCollum	Serrano
Hastings	McDermott	Sherman
Heck (WA)	McGovern	Sinema
Higgins	McNerney	Sires
Himes	Meeks	Slaughter
Hinojosa	Meng	Smith (WA)
Honda	Moore	Speier
Hoyer	Moulton	Swalwell (CA)
Huffman	Murphy (FL)	Takai
Israel	Nadler	Takano
Jackson Lee	Napolitano	Thompson (CA)
Jeffries	Neal	Thompson (MS)
Johnson (GA)	Nolan	Titus
Johnson, E. B.	Norcross	Tonko
Jones	O'Rourke	Torres
Kaptur	Pallone	Tsongas
Keating	Pascrell	Van Hollen
Kelly (IL)	Payne	Vargas
Kennedy	Pelosi	Veasey
Kildee	Perlmutter	Vela
Kilmer	Peters	Velázquez
Kind	Kuster	Peterson
King (CA)	Pingree	Visclosky
Kirkpatrick	Pocan	Walz
Kirby	Polis	Wasserman
Kosten	Posey	Schultz
Kucinich	Price (NC)	Waters, Maxine
Kyburz	Quigley	Watson Coleman
Kyburz	Rangel	Welch
Kyburz	Rice (NY)	Wilson (FL)
Kyburz	Richmond	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—8

Barton	Kelly (MS)	Sanchez, Loretta
Byrne	King (NY)	Sewell (AL)
Chaffetz	Reed	

□ 1356

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mses. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and SINEMA changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker’s approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker’s approval of the Journal.

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

AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA CONCERNING PEACEFUL USES OF NUCLEAR ENERGY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 114-43)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message

from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I am pleased to transmit to the Congress, pursuant to sections 123 b. and 123 d. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2153(b), (d)) (the "Act"), the text of a proposed Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Korea Concerning Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy (the "Agreement"). I am also pleased to transmit my written approval, authorization, and determination concerning the proposed Agreement, and an unclassified Nuclear Proliferation Assessment Statement (NPAS) concerning the proposed Agreement. (In accordance with section 123 of the Act, as amended by Title XII of the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act of 1998 (Public Law 105-277), two classified annexes to the NPAS, prepared by the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, summarizing relevant classified information, will be submitted to the Congress separately.) The joint memorandum submitted to me by the Secretaries of State and Energy and a letter from the Chairman of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission stating the views of the Commission are also enclosed. An addendum to the NPAS containing a comprehensive analysis of the export control system of the Republic of Korea (ROK) with respect to nuclear-related matters, including interactions with other countries of proliferation concern and the actual or suspected nuclear, dual-use, or missile-related transfers to such countries, pursuant to section 102A(w) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3024(w)), is being submitted separately by the Director of National Intelligence.

The proposed Agreement has been negotiated in accordance with the Act and other applicable law. In my judgment, it meets all applicable statutory requirements and will advance the nonproliferation and other foreign policy interests of the United States.

The proposed Agreement contains all of the requirements established by section 123 a. of the Act. It provides a comprehensive framework for peaceful nuclear cooperation with the ROK based on a mutual commitment to nuclear nonproliferation. It would permit the transfer of material, equipment (including reactors), components, information, and technology for nuclear research and nuclear power production. It would not permit the transfer of Restricted Data, and sensitive nuclear technology or technology or information that is not in the public domain concerning fabrication of nuclear fuel containing plutonium could only be transferred if specifically provided by an amendment to the proposed Agreement or a separate agreement. Any

special fissionable material transferred could only be in the form of low enriched uranium, with two exceptions: small quantities of material for use as samples; or for other specified applications such as use in loading and operation of fast reactors or the conduct of fast reactor experiments. The proposed Agreement would also obligate the United States to endeavor to take such actions as may be necessary and feasible to ensure a reliable supply of low enriched uranium fuel to the ROK, similar to terms contained in other recent civil nuclear cooperation agreements.

The proposed Agreement would also establish a new standing High-Level Bilateral Commission (HLBC) to be led by the Deputy Secretary of Energy for the Government of the United States of America and the Vice Minister of Foreign Affairs for the Government of the ROK. The purpose of the HLBC is to facilitate peaceful nuclear and strategic cooperation between the parties and ongoing dialogue regarding areas of mutual interest in civil nuclear energy, including the civil nuclear fuel cycle.

The proposed Agreement will have an initial term of 20 years and would renew for one additional period of 5 years unless either party gives written notice at least 2 years prior to its expiration that it does not want to renew the proposed Agreement. The proposed Agreement also requires the parties to consult as soon as possible after the seventeenth anniversary of its entry into force to decide whether to pursue an extension of the proposed Agreement. In the event of termination of the proposed Agreement, key nonproliferation conditions and controls will continue in effect as long as any nuclear material, moderator material, byproduct material, equipment, or component subject to the proposed Agreement remains in the territory of the party concerned or under its jurisdiction or control anywhere, or until such time as the parties agree that, in the case of nuclear material or moderator material, such items are no longer usable for any nuclear activity relevant from the point of view of international safeguards or have become practically irrecoverable, or in the case of equipment, components, or byproduct material, such items are no longer usable for nuclear purposes.

The ROK has a strong track record on nonproliferation and its government has consistently reiterated its commitment to nonproliferation. The ROK is a party to the Treaty on the Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons, has an International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards agreement and Additional Protocol in force, is a member of the four multilateral nonproliferation export control regimes (Missile Technology Control Regime, Wassenaar Arrangement, Australia Group, and Nuclear Suppliers Group, for which it served as Chair in 2003-2004 and is scheduled to do so again in 2015-2016), and is an active participant in the Pro-

liferation Security Initiative. A more detailed discussion of the ROK's civil nuclear program and its nuclear nonproliferation policies and practices, including its nuclear export policies and practices, is provided in the NPAS and in two classified annexes to the NPAS submitted to you separately. As noted above, the Director of National Intelligence will provide an addendum to the NPAS containing a comprehensive analysis of the export control system of the ROK with respect to nuclear-related matters.

I have considered the views and recommendations of the interested departments and agencies in reviewing the proposed Agreement and have determined that its performance will promote, and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to, the common defense and security. Accordingly, I have approved the proposed Agreement and authorized its execution and urge that the Congress give it favorable consideration.

This transmission shall constitute a submittal for purposes of both sections 123 b. and 123 d. of the Act. My Administration is prepared to begin immediately the consultations with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the House Foreign Affairs Committee as provided in section 123 b. Upon completion of the 30 days of continuous session review provided for in section 123 b., the 60 days of continuous session review provided for in section 123 d. shall commence.

BARACK OBAMA.  
THE WHITE HOUSE, June 16, 2015.

#### INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016

##### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 2596, the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 315 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2596.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1406

##### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2596) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States

Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes, with Mr. BISHOP of Utah in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from California (Mr. NUNES) and the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. NUNES).

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The Intelligence Authorization Act is the annual blueprint for the work of the intelligence community and America's military intelligence efforts. The bill sets priorities for our critical intelligence efforts and the legal framework of guidance and oversight for those efforts. As you may recall, the House has passed intelligence authorization bills with strong bipartisan support in the past several Congresses.

The ranking member, Mr. SCHIFF, and I worked in a bipartisan manner to draft this legislation in front of you today. Passing annual intelligence authorization legislation is the most effective way for Congress to exercise oversight over the executive branch and helps ensure that the country's intelligence agencies have the resources and authorities necessary to keep Americans safe. This legislation passed unanimously out of our committee.

As most of the intelligence budget involves highly classified programs, the bulk of the committee's recommendations each year are found in the classified annex of the bill, which has been available for Members to review since June 4. Among other initiatives, the bill provides authorization for critical national security functions, including fighting terrorism, countering the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, funding efforts to recover from unauthorized disclosures of intelligence capabilities, and investing in the resiliency of our national security space architecture.

At an unclassified level, I can report that the annex for fiscal year 2016 authorizes funding that is slightly below the President's budget request level. Its funding levels are in line with the House-passed Defense Appropriations bill for the National Intelligence Program and with the National Defense Authorization Act for the Military Intelligence Program. Overall, this bill sustains today's intelligence capabilities and provides for future capabilities while staying within the funding constraints of the Budget Control Act and the budget resolution.

Mr. Chair, we are currently facing one of the most challenging global environments in our Nation's history. Nearly 14 years after the 9/11 attacks, the U.S. continues to hunt al Qaeda and its affiliates. We have taken the fight to the enemy and achieved tremendous success. But despite various

strategies employed by two administrations to prevent the spread of radical Islam, that threat remains. The Arab Spring civil war in Syria and the emergence of the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant in places such as north Africa highlight only a few of the many events in the past several years that now define U.S. policy failures in the Middle East. In just over a year, ISIL has exploded from a largely localized force in Iraq to seriously challenge al Qaeda as the vanguard of global jihad.

Moreover, nation-states like Russia and China continue to expand their spheres of influence and diminish U.S. clout worldwide. Russia has taken advantage of indecisiveness in Europe and exploited uneven leadership in the U.S. to pressure Ukraine and its neighbors on core Russian interests. China bullies its neighbors in the South and East China Sea and, if left unchecked, will likely exercise de facto control over maritime trade in its perceived territorial waters in the next decade. Meanwhile, North Korea and Iran continue to pose significant proliferation risks and remain strategic threats to the U.S. and its allies. State actors can bring a tremendous amount of resources to counter U.S. policy, placing an immense burden on the intelligence community to collect information on and to assess these activities carefully and accurately.

Perhaps more troubling, state and nonstate actors alike are developing new ways to project power, particularly in cyberspace. Cyber attacks are becoming so pervasive that network defenders are overwhelmed. Attackers seem to gain access to sensitive systems at will. The most recent attacks on the Office of Personnel Management servers, possibly one of the most significant national security incidents in the past decade, highlight the continued threat to our Nation's infrastructure.

Mr. Chair, in this year's intelligence authorization bill, the committee has taken a great deal of care in addressing the wide range of issues described above. This bill is an essential tool in supporting our Nation's efforts to tackle today's challenges while also directing the intelligence community to make strategic investments in the future. In particular, I believe that the bill goes a long way toward encouraging the intelligence community to make much-needed investments, such as recovering from unauthorized disclosures of intelligence capabilities.

Additionally, this year's authorization bill comes on the heels of the committee's recent bipartisan successes on key national security issues, like reauthorizing important provisions related to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, and overwhelmingly passing bipartisan legislation on cyber threat sharing information. I applaud Ranking Member SCHIFF for his help on these issues, and I look forward to working together in the future.

Finally, I want to thank all the Intelligence Committee staff on both

sides of the aisle for their support drafting this bill. The committee staff spent countless hours assisting Members and finalizing the legislation.

In particular, I would like to recognize our Sandia National Labs fellow, Mr. Randy Smith. He has been with the committee for almost 2 years and will be leaving us soon to return to Sandia. He has been a tremendous asset to this committee, and I would like to thank him for all his hard work.

I would also like to thank the men and women of the intelligence community for all their efforts to continue to protect this Nation.

I look forward to passing this legislation.

Mr. Chair, the intelligence authorization act is the annual blueprint for the work of the intelligence community and America's military intelligence efforts. The bill sets the priorities for our critical intelligence efforts, and the legal framework of guidance and oversight for those efforts. As you may recall, the House has passed intelligence authorization bills with strong bipartisan support in the past several Congresses.

The Ranking Member, Mr. SCHIFF, and I worked in a bipartisan manner to draft the legislation in front of you today. Passing annual intelligence authorization legislation is the most effective way for Congress to exercise oversight over the executive branch and helps ensure that the country's intelligence agencies have the resources and authorities necessary to keep Americans safe. This legislation passed unanimously out of our Committee.

As most of the intelligence budget involves highly classified programs, the bulk of the Committee's recommendations each year are found in the classified annex to the bill, which has been available for Members to review since June 4th. Among other initiatives, the bill provides authorization for critical national security functions, including: fighting terrorism and countering the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, funding efforts to recover from unauthorized disclosures of intelligence capabilities, and investing in the resiliency of our national security space architecture.

At an unclassified level, I can report that the annex for Fiscal Year 2016 authorizes funding that is slightly below the President's budget request level. Its funding levels are in line with the House-passed Defense Appropriations bill for the National Intelligence Program and with the National Defense Authorization Act for the Military Intelligence Program. Overall, this bill sustains today's intelligence capabilities and provides for future capabilities while staying within the funding constraints of the Budget Control Act and the Budget Resolution.

Mr. Chair, we are currently facing one of the most challenging global environments in our nation's history. Nearly 14 years after the 9/11 attacks, the U.S. continues to hunt al-Qa'ida and its affiliates. We have taken the fight to the enemy and achieved tremendous success, but despite various strategies employed by two administrations to prevent the spread of radical Islam, the threat remains. The Arab Spring, civil war in Syria, and the emergence of the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant in places such as Northern Africa highlight only a few of the many events in the past several years that now define U.S. policy failures in the Middle East. In just over a year, ISIL has

exploded from a largely localized force in Iraq to seriously challenge al-Qa'ida as the vanguard of the global jihad.

Moreover, nation states like Russia and China continue to expand their spheres of influence and diminish U.S. clout worldwide. Russia has taken advantage of indecisiveness in Europe and exploited uneven leadership in the U.S. to pressure Ukraine and its neighbors on core Russian interests. China bullies its neighbors in the South and East China Sea, and if left unchecked, will likely exercise de facto control over maritime trade in its perceived territorial waters in the next decade. Meanwhile, North Korea and Iran continue to pose significant proliferation risks and remain strategic threats to the U.S. and its allies. State actors can bring a tremendous amount of resources to counter U.S. policy, placing an immense burden on the Intelligence Community to collect information on, and assess, these activities carefully and accurately.

Perhaps more troubling, state and non-state actors alike are developing new ways to project power, particularly in cyberspace. Cyber attacks are becoming so pervasive that network defenders are overwhelmed; attackers seem to gain access to sensitive systems at will. The most recent attacks on the Office of Personnel Management servers—possibly one of the most significant national security incidents in the past decade—highlight the continued threat to our nation's infrastructure.

Mr. Chair, in this year's intelligence authorization bill, this Committee has taken a great deal of care in addressing the wide range of issues described above. This bill is an essential tool in supporting our nation's efforts to tackle today's challenges, while also directing the Intelligence Community to make strategic investments in the future. In particular, I believe that this bill goes a long way toward encouraging the Intelligence Community to make much-needed investments, such as recovering from unauthorized disclosures of intelligence capabilities.

Additionally, this year's authorization bill comes on the heels of the Committee's recent bipartisan successes on key national security issues, including reauthorizing important provisions related to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, and overwhelmingly passing bipartisan legislation on cyber threat information sharing. I applaud Ranking Member SCHIFF for his help on these issues and look forward to working together in the future.

Finally, I want to thank all the Intelligence Committee staff on both sides of the aisle for their support drafting this bill. The Committee staff spent countless hours assisting Members and finalizing the legislation. In particular, I would like to recognize our Sandia National Labs fellow, Randy Smith. He has been with the Committee for almost two years and will be leaving us soon to return to Sandia. He has been a tremendous asset to this Committee and I thank him for all his hard work. I would also like to thank the men and women of the Intelligence Community for all their efforts protecting this nation. I look forward to passing this legislation.

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

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First, I want to say thank you to Chairman NUNES. This Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 is

our third major piece of legislation together, and it once again demonstrates the fruits of our commitment to bipartisanship.

We also have our difference of opinion from time to time, and on this bill, we have some differences. But I know that as long as we continue to work together, there is no end to the good that we can accomplish.

Through our cyber bill and our surveillance reform bill, we have been guided by two core principles: first, that national security is truly the security of the entire Nation and all Americans; second, that national security can and must coexist with privacy and civil liberties. I believe the bill today largely furthers these principles as well.

The IAA funds, equips, and sets the priorities for the U.S. intelligence community; and it is a crucial vehicle by which Congress provides oversight of the IC and ensures that U.S. intelligence professionals and intelligence programs have the funds and authorities they need to keep us safe, as well as our allies and partners.

As the annual IAA provides hundreds of pages of detailed guidance, strict authorizations, and precise limitations, it is also the single most important means by which Congress conducts its oversight of the intelligence community.

□ 1415

As in past years, this year's IAA is a carefully considered bill and the result of thoughtful oversight.

The Fiscal Year 2016 IAA funds the intelligence community at about 1 percent below the President's budget request and about 7 percent above last year's enacted budget level.

The bill makes cuts to less-effective programs, adds money to underfunded programs, and requires intelligence agencies to regularly inform Congress of their activities, ensuring funds are spent responsibly and lawfully.

Notably, the bill today holds, or "fences," significant amounts of money to make sure Congress' direction is followed to the letter and on time.

I want to highlight just a few particular aspects of the bill. It continues the committee's longstanding emphasis on counterintelligence and security reforms. It also continues to support our overhead architecture by funding our most critical space programs, investing in space protection and resiliency, preserving investments in cutting-edge technologies, and enhancing oversight of contracting and procurement practices.

It also promotes enhancements to our foreign partner capabilities, which are critical to multiplying the reach and impact of our own intelligence efforts. It enhances human intelligence, or HUMINT, capabilities, which are often the key to understanding and predicting global events.

It provides resources to safeguard vulnerable signals intelligence, or

SIGINT, collection while enhancing oversight of these and other sources of intelligence. It emphasizes collection to monitor and ensure compliance with treaties and potential international agreements. It greatly enhances oversight of Defense special operation forces activities worldwide.

The bill also incorporates some excellent provisions championed by the Democratic members of the Intelligence Committee, as well as the Republican members.

In particular, I want to highlight Mr. HIMES' provision to enhance the quality of metrics we receive to enable more thorough oversight; Ms. SEWELL's multiple provisions to enhance diversity within the intelligence community; Mr. CARSON's provisions to better understand FBI resource allocation against domestic and foreign threats and the role of the FBI and DNI in countering violent extremism, particularly in minors; Ms. SPEIER's provision to provide greater human rights oversight of the IC's relationship with certain foreign partners; Mr. QUIGLEY's provision regarding intelligence support to Ukraine; and Mr. SWALWELL's provision to ensure that Department of Energy National Labs can work with State and local government recipients of homeland security grants.

All this said, while I believe the bill largely reflects sound choices, I am concerned that it uses the overseas contingency operations—or OCO—funding as a way to evade the sequestration levels mandated by the ill-conceived Budget Control Act.

Again, I largely support the funding levels and the programs which the IAA authorizes, but I cannot endorse how it has funded them. We need to be serious and thoughtful about the budget and undo sequestration—not just employ accounting tricks to evade its levels only for defense and national security-related items.

Even some domestic programs and agencies that contribute to our homeland security cannot qualify for OCO dollars, while vital programs like our children's education and our social services are left to languish.

Instead of arbitrary, across-the-board cuts, let's do what this bill does substantively: make cuts to some areas and add money to others in a deliberate, well thought out manner. It is time to forthrightly deal with sequestration for all of our national priorities, not just for defense.

I am also opposed to provisions in this bill which would tie the hands of the administration and prevent the orderly transfer of detainees from the detention center at Guantanamo Bay. These restrictions have never been included in prior versions of the IAA, and there is no reason to introduce them into the IAA process now.

The bill goes even further than restricting transfer of detainees to the United States and includes a new provision which restricts transfers to "combat zones," a term that is so

broad as to include allies and partners such as Jordan.

As I have long said, keeping the Guantanamo prison serves as a recruitment tool for militants, undercuts our relationships with our allies, and undermines our international standing.

With that said, the bill, as a whole, is largely a strong product, and I appreciate the close partnership we have enjoyed with the chairman in working on it. But, unfortunately, I cannot support the bill so long as it includes these Guantanamo restrictions and employs the OCO budget gimmick at the expense of our domestic spending priorities.

I look forward to a robust amendment process today, and I am committed to working with the chairman, the Senate, the administration, the other committees of jurisdiction, and all Members of Congress to make critical improvements to the bill as it moves forward, and to resolve the issues to keep alive the string of consecutive signed IAAs.

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

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chair, at this time I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PITTENGER).

Mr. PITTENGER. I thank the chairman for his vital leadership on the Intelligence Committee.

I rise in support of this legislation providing the intelligence community the authorization needed to protect and defend the United States and support critical national security programs protecting Americans from nation states and Islamic terrorists.

In December, NSA Director Admiral Rogers warned that China has the capability of shutting down the U.S. electric grid through cyber attack. Homeland security Secretary Johnson has warned about the threat of attacks launched by sleeper cells in most of our States. ISIS continues to expand into new territory, while Americans are more at risk because President Obama has no strategy for defeating ISIS, whom he initially referred to as the JV team.

This is not the time to impede our intelligence efforts. America faces grave danger from those who wish to destroy our way of life. Please join me in full bipartisan support of the Intelligence Authorization Act. Let us be united in confronting the perilous threats of our adversaries.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, at this time I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), the ranking member on the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. ENGEL. I thank my friend for yielding.

I want to say that I appreciate the bipartisan, hard work of Chairman NUNES and Ranking Member SCHIFF, but I want to bring to the House's attention recent reports that this bill makes drastic cuts in our so-called covert support to the moderate Syrian opposition.

A headline in the Saturday Washington Post read: "Secret CIA effort in Syria faces large funding cut." If these reports are true, just as the moderate Syrian forces may be starting to make progress, especially in the south, then I am afraid we may be making a big mistake.

Unfortunately, most Members of the House don't know for certain if this legislation will reduce our support for the moderate opposition. Those funding decisions are made behind closed doors. And that is why I believe this bill is not the right place for us to be making decisions that have a major impact on our Syria strategy.

I have no doubt that Chairman NUNES and Ranking Member SCHIFF are determined to get the intelligence piece of our Syria response right, but this is not merely an intelligence issue, and our overall strategy in Syria goes far beyond what is included in any covert program. I believe we shouldn't be dealing with this problem in a piecemeal way.

As we have been doing in the Foreign Affairs Committee on a bipartisan basis, I urge my colleagues to take a step back, look at the big picture, and address our Syria policy in a way that makes sense and involves all the relevant players.

I am troubled if it is true that this bill makes drastic cuts in our so-called covert support to the moderate Syria opposition. And I commend the hard work of our chairman and ranking member.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would urge my colleague, the ranking member on the Foreign Affairs Committee, that we shouldn't always believe what is in the newspaper. There have been lots of different reports about lots of different things.

I would say that Mr. SCHIFF and I worked in a bipartisan manner to look at all programs across the spectrum of the 17 agencies. And we would be glad to spend some time with the gentleman from New York down in the committee spaces to raise the concerns that he brought up about a newspaper article. As I said, I think there are a lot of things that we read in the newspaper.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The Intelligence Authorization Act is the vehicle by which we ensure that U.S. intelligence professionals and programs have the funds and the authorities that they need. It is the single most important means by which Congress can conduct its oversight. We need to pass this legislation, just as the committee has done over the last several years.

It is my hope that as the legislation moves forward, we will be able to dispose of the Guantanamo provisions—I will have an amendment to address that in a few minutes—and that we can also resolve the issues regarding the overseas contingency account. I look

forward to working with my colleague as the bill moves forward to address those issues.

I want to join the chairman in saluting the members of the intelligence community—the men and women who do such an extraordinary job for us each and every day. They have our sincerest gratitude and full appreciation for their dedication, their patriotism, and their unparalleled skills. I also want to thank again our chairman for his leadership, his commitment to bipartisanship, and his determination to do what is right. I want to thank our colleagues on the committee, who have done an extraordinary job in helping to put this bill together.

I also want to join the chairman in thanking our wonderful staff on our side of the aisle. I want to thank Carly Blake, Linda Cohen, Allison Getty, Robert Minehart, Amanda Rogers Thorpe, Rheanne Wirkkala, as well as Patrick Boland and our shared technical and security staff, including Kristin Jepson, Brandon Smith, and Kevin Klein. We have an extraordinary team on the committee. It is a great pleasure to serve and work with each and every one of them.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank the ranking member for his continued cooperation to work in a bipartisan fashion. As I think most Americans know, the threats continue to add up every day, and it is up to the men and women in the intelligence community to help keep us safe. I know the ranking member and I are committed to doing just that.

With that, I look forward to debate on the amendments and passage of the final underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-19. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 2596

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

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.**

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the "Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016".

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

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.  
Sec. 2. Definitions.

**TITLE I—INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES**

- Sec. 101. Authorization of appropriations.  
 Sec. 102. Classified schedule of authorizations.  
 Sec. 103. Personnel ceiling adjustments.  
 Sec. 104. Intelligence Community Management Account.

**TITLE II—CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM**

- Sec. 201. Authorization of appropriations.

**TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS****Subtitle A—General Matters**

- Sec. 301. Increase in employee compensation and benefits authorized by law.  
 Sec. 302. Restriction on conduct of intelligence activities.  
 Sec. 303. Prior congressional notification of initiations of certain new special access programs.  
 Sec. 304. Prior congressional notification of transfers of funds for certain intelligence activities.  
 Sec. 305. Designation of lead intelligence officer for tunnels.  
 Sec. 306. Clarification of authority of Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board.  
 Sec. 307. Reporting process required for tracking certain requests for country clearance.  
 Sec. 308. Prohibition on sharing of certain information in response to foreign government inquiries.  
 Sec. 309. National Cyber Threat Intelligence Integration Center.  
 Sec. 310. Intelligence community business system transformation.  
 Sec. 311. Inclusion of Inspector General of Intelligence Community in Council of Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency.  
 Sec. 312. Authorities of the Inspector General for the Central Intelligence Agency.  
 Sec. 313. Provision of information and assistance to Inspector General of the Intelligence Community.  
 Sec. 314. Clarification relating to information access by Comptroller General.  
 Sec. 315. Use of homeland security grant funds in conjunction with Department of Energy national laboratories.  
 Sec. 316. Technical amendments relating to pay under title 5, United States Code.

**Subtitle B—Matters Relating to United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba**

- Sec. 321. Prohibition on use of funds for transfer or release of individuals detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.  
 Sec. 322. Prohibition on use of funds to construct or modify facilities in United States to house detainees transferred from United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.  
 Sec. 323. Prohibition on use of funds to transfer or release individuals detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to combat zones.

**Subtitle C—Reports**

- Sec. 331. Reports to Congress on individuals formerly detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.  
 Sec. 332. Reports on foreign fighters.  
 Sec. 333. Reports on prisoner population at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.  
 Sec. 334. Report on use of certain business concerns.  
 Sec. 335. Repeal of certain reporting requirements.

**SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.**

In this Act:

(a) **CONGRESSIONAL INTELLIGENCE COMMITTEES.**—The term “congressional intelligence committees” means—

(1) the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and  
 (2) the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

(b) **INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.**—The term “intelligence community” has the meaning given that term in section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4)).

**TITLE I—INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES****SEC. 101. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 for the conduct of the intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the following elements of the United States Government:

- (1) The Office of the Director of National Intelligence.
- (2) The Central Intelligence Agency.
- (3) The Department of Defense.
- (4) The Defense Intelligence Agency.
- (5) The National Security Agency.
- (6) The Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Air Force.
- (7) The Coast Guard.
- (8) The Department of State.
- (9) The Department of the Treasury.
- (10) The Department of Energy.
- (11) The Department of Justice.
- (12) The Federal Bureau of Investigation.
- (13) The Drug Enforcement Administration.
- (14) The National Reconnaissance Office.
- (15) The National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency.
- (16) The Department of Homeland Security.

**SEC. 102. CLASSIFIED SCHEDULE OF AUTHORIZATIONS.**

(a) **SPECIFICATIONS OF AMOUNTS AND PERSONNEL LEVELS.**—The amounts authorized to be appropriated under section 101 and, subject to section 103, the authorized personnel ceilings as of September 30, 2016, for the conduct of the intelligence activities of the elements listed in paragraphs (1) through (16) of section 101, are those specified in the classified Schedule of Authorizations prepared to accompany the bill H.R. 2596 of the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress.

(b) **AVAILABILITY OF CLASSIFIED SCHEDULE OF AUTHORIZATIONS.**—

(1) **AVAILABILITY.**—The classified Schedule of Authorizations referred to in subsection (a) shall be made available to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and to the President.

(2) **DISTRIBUTION BY THE PRESIDENT.**—Subject to paragraph (3), the President shall provide for suitable distribution of the classified Schedule of Authorizations, or of appropriate portions of the Schedule, within the executive branch.

(3) **LIMITS ON DISCLOSURE.**—The President shall not publicly disclose the classified Schedule of Authorizations or any portion of such Schedule except—

(A) as provided in section 601(a) of the Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007 (50 U.S.C. 3306(a));

(B) to the extent necessary to implement the budget; or

(C) as otherwise required by law.

**SEC. 103. PERSONNEL CEILING ADJUSTMENTS.**

(a) **AUTHORITY FOR INCREASES.**—The Director of National Intelligence may authorize employment of civilian personnel in excess of the number authorized for fiscal year 2016 by the classified Schedule of Authorizations referred to in section 102(a) if the Director of National Intelligence determines that such action is necessary to the performance of important intelligence functions, except that the number of personnel employed in excess of the number authorized under such section may not, for any element of the intelligence community, exceed 3 percent of

the number of civilian personnel authorized under such schedule for such element.

(b) **TREATMENT OF CERTAIN PERSONNEL.**—The Director of National Intelligence shall establish guidelines that govern, for each element of the intelligence community, the treatment under the personnel levels authorized under section 102(a), including any exemption from such personnel levels, of employment or assignment in—

(1) a student program, trainee program, or similar program;

(2) a reserve corps or as a reemployed annuitant; or

(3) details, joint duty, or long-term, full-time training.

(c) **NOTICE TO CONGRESSIONAL INTELLIGENCE COMMITTEES.**—The Director of National Intelligence shall notify the congressional intelligence committees in writing at least 15 days prior to each exercise of an authority described in subsection (a).

**SEC. 104. INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT.**

(a) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated for the Intelligence Community Management Account of the Director of National Intelligence for fiscal year 2016 the sum of \$501,850,000. Within such amount, funds identified in the classified Schedule of Authorizations referred to in section 102(a) for advanced research and development shall remain available until September 30, 2017.

(b) **AUTHORIZED PERSONNEL LEVELS.**—The elements within the Intelligence Community Management Account of the Director of National Intelligence are authorized 785 positions as of September 30, 2016. Personnel serving in such elements may be permanent employees of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence or personnel detailed from other elements of the United States Government.

(c) **CLASSIFIED AUTHORIZATIONS.**—

(1) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—In addition to amounts authorized to be appropriated for the Intelligence Community Management Account by subsection (a), there are authorized to be appropriated for the Community Management Account for fiscal year 2016 such additional amounts as are specified in the classified Schedule of Authorizations referred to in section 102(a). Such additional amounts for advanced research and development shall remain available until September 30, 2017.

(2) **AUTHORIZATION OF PERSONNEL.**—In addition to the personnel authorized by subsection (b) for elements of the Intelligence Community Management Account as of September 30, 2016, there are authorized such additional personnel for the Community Management Account as of that date as are specified in the classified Schedule of Authorizations referred to in section 102(a).

**TITLE II—CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM****SEC. 201. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**

There is authorized to be appropriated for the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability Fund for fiscal year 2016 the sum of \$514,000,000.

**TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS****Subtitle A—General Matters****SEC. 301. INCREASE IN EMPLOYEE COMPENSATION AND BENEFITS AUTHORIZED BY LAW.**

Appropriations authorized by this Act for salary, pay, retirement, and other benefits for Federal employees may be increased by such additional or supplemental amounts as may be necessary for increases in such compensation or benefits authorized by law.

**SEC. 302. RESTRICTION ON CONDUCT OF INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES.**

The authorization of appropriations by this Act shall not be deemed to constitute authority for the conduct of any intelligence activity

which is not otherwise authorized by the Constitution or the laws of the United States.

**SEC. 303. PRIOR CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION OF INITIATIONS OF CERTAIN NEW SPECIAL ACCESS PROGRAMS.**

(a) **LIMITATION.**—Except as provided in subsection (b), none of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for the intelligence community for fiscal year 2016 may be used to initiate any new special access program pertaining to any intelligence or intelligence-related activity or covert action unless the Director of National Intelligence or the Secretary of Defense, as appropriate, submits to the congressional intelligence committees and the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate, by not later than 30 days before initiating such a program, written notification of the intention to initiate the program.

(b) **WAIVER.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director of National Intelligence or the Secretary of Defense, as appropriate, may waive subsection (a) with respect to the initiation of a new special access program if the Director or Secretary, as the case may be, determines that an emergency situation makes it impossible or impractical to provide the notice required under such subsection by the date that is 30 days before such initiation.

(2) **NOTICE.**—If the Director or Secretary issues a waiver under paragraph (1), the Director or Secretary, as the case may be, shall submit to the congressional intelligence committees and the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate, by not later than 48 hours after the initiation of the new special access program covered by the waiver, written notice of the waiver and a justification for the waiver, including a description of the emergency situation that necessitated the waiver.

(c) **SPECIAL ACCESS PROGRAM DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “special access program” has the meaning given such term in Executive Order 13526 as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

**SEC. 304. PRIOR CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION OF TRANSFERS OF FUNDS FOR CERTAIN INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES.**

(a) **LIMITATION.**—Except as provided in subsection (b), none of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for the intelligence community for fiscal year 2016 may be used to initiate a transfer of funds from the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund or the Counterterrorism Partnerships Fund to be used for intelligence activities unless the Director of National Intelligence or the Secretary of Defense, as appropriate, submits to the congressional intelligence committees, by not later than 30 days before initiating such a transfer, written notice of the transfer.

(b) **WAIVER.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director of National Intelligence or the Secretary of Defense, as appropriate, may waive subsection (a) with respect to the initiation of a transfer of funds if the Director or Secretary, as the case may be, determines that an emergency situation makes it impossible or impractical to provide the notice required under such subsection by the date that is 30 days before such initiation.

(2) **NOTICE.**—If the Director or Secretary issues a waiver under paragraph (1), the Director or Secretary, as the case may be, shall submit to the congressional intelligence committees, by not later than 48 hours after the initiation of the transfer of funds covered by the waiver, written notice of the waiver and a justification for the waiver, including a description of the emergency situation that necessitated the waiver.

**SEC. 305. DESIGNATION OF LEAD INTELLIGENCE OFFICER FOR TUNNELS.**

The Director of National Intelligence shall designate an official to manage the collection

and analysis of intelligence regarding the tactical use of tunnels by state and nonstate actors.

**SEC. 306. CLARIFICATION OF AUTHORITY OF PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES OVERSIGHT BOARD.**

Section 1061(g) of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 2000ee(g)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(5) **LIMITATIONS.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize the Board, or any agent thereof, to gain access to information that an executive branch agency deems related to covert action, as such term is defined in section 503(e) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3093(e)).”

**SEC. 307. REPORTING PROCESS REQUIRED FOR TRACKING CERTAIN REQUESTS FOR COUNTRY CLEARANCE.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—By not later than September 30, 2016, the Director of National Intelligence shall establish a formal internal reporting process for tracking requests for country clearance submitted to overseas Director of National Intelligence representatives by departments and agencies of the United States. Such reporting process shall include a mechanism for tracking the department or agency that submits each such request and the date on which each such request is submitted.

(b) **CONGRESSIONAL BRIEFING.**—By not later than December 31, 2016, the Director of National Intelligence shall brief the congressional intelligence committees on the progress of the Director in establishing the process required under subsection (a).

**SEC. 308. PROHIBITION ON SHARING OF CERTAIN INFORMATION IN RESPONSE TO FOREIGN GOVERNMENT INQUIRIES.**

(a) **PROHIBITION.**—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act for any element of the intelligence community may be used to respond to, share, or authorize the sharing of any non-public information related to intelligence activities carried out by the United States in response to a legislative or judicial inquiry from a foreign government into the intelligence activities of the United States.

(b) **CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.**—Not later than 30 days after an element of the intelligence community receives a legislative or judicial inquiry from a foreign government related to intelligence activities carried out by the United States, the element shall submit to the congressional intelligence committees written notification of the inquiry.

(c) **CLARIFICATION REGARDING COLLABORATION WITH FOREIGN PARTNERS.**—The prohibition under subsection (a) shall not be construed as limiting routine intelligence activities with foreign partners, except in any case in which the central focus of the collaboration with the foreign partner is to obtain information for, or solicit a response to, a legislative or judicial inquiry from a foreign government related to intelligence activities carried out by the United States.

**SEC. 309. NATIONAL CYBER THREAT INTELLIGENCE INTEGRATION CENTER.**

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—Title I of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3021 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating section 119B as section 119C; and

(2) by inserting after section 119A the following new section:

**“SEC. 119B. CYBER THREAT INTELLIGENCE INTEGRATION CENTER.**

“(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—There is within the Office of the Director of National Intelligence a Cyber Threat Intelligence Integration Center.

“(b) **DIRECTOR.**—There is a Director of the Cyber Threat Intelligence Integration Center, who shall be the head of the Cyber Threat Intelligence Integration Center, and who shall be appointed by the Director of National Intelligence.

“(c) **PRIMARY MISSIONS.**—The Cyber Threat Intelligence Integration Center shall—

“(1) serve as the primary organization within the Federal Government for analyzing and integrating all intelligence possessed or acquired by the United States pertaining to cyber threats;

“(2) ensure that appropriate departments and agencies of the Federal Government have full access to and receive all-source intelligence support needed to execute the cyber threat intelligence activities of such agencies and to perform independent, alternative analyses;

“(3) disseminate cyber threat analysis to the President, the appropriate departments and agencies of the Federal Government, and the appropriate committees of Congress;

“(4) coordinate cyber threat intelligence activities of the departments and agencies of the Federal Government; and

“(5) conduct strategic cyber threat intelligence planning for the Federal Government.

“(d) **LIMITATIONS.**—The Cyber Threat Intelligence Integration Center—

“(1) may not have more than 50 permanent positions;

“(2) in carrying out the primary missions of the Center described in subsection (c), may not augment staffing through detailees, assignees, or core contractor personnel or enter into any personal services contracts to exceed the limitation under paragraph (1); and

“(3) shall be located in a building owned or operated by an element of the intelligence community as of the date of the enactment of this section.”

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS AMENDMENTS.**—The table of contents in the first section of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended by section 102 of this title, is further amended by striking the item relating to section 119B and inserting the following new items:

“Sec. 119B. Cyber Threat Intelligence Integration Center.

“Sec. 119C. National intelligence centers.”

**SEC. 310. INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY BUSINESS SYSTEM TRANSFORMATION.**

Section 506D of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3100) is amended to read as follows:

**“INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY BUSINESS SYSTEM TRANSFORMATION**

“SEC. 506D. (a) **LIMITATION ON OBLIGATION OF FUNDS.**—(1) Subject to paragraph (3), no funds appropriated to any element of the intelligence community may be obligated for an intelligence community business system transformation that will have a total cost in excess of \$3,000,000 unless the Chief Information Officer of the Intelligence Community makes a certification described in paragraph (2) with respect to such intelligence community business system transformation.

“(2) The certification described in this paragraph for an intelligence community business system transformation is a certification made by the Chief Information Officer of the Intelligence Community that the intelligence community business system transformation—

“(A) complies with the enterprise architecture under subsection (b) and such other policies and standards that the Chief Information Officer of the Intelligence Community considers appropriate; or

“(B) is necessary—

“(i) to achieve a critical national security capability or address a critical requirement; or

“(ii) to prevent a significant adverse effect on a project that is needed to achieve an essential capability, taking into consideration any alternative solutions for preventing such adverse effect.

“(3) With respect to a fiscal year after fiscal year 2010, the amount referred to in paragraph (1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) shall be equal to the sum of—

“(A) the amount in effect under such paragraph (1) for the preceding fiscal year (determined after application of this paragraph), plus

“(B) such amount multiplied by the annual percentage increase in the Consumer Price Index (all items; U.S. city average) as of September of the previous fiscal year.

“(b) ENTERPRISE ARCHITECTURE FOR INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY BUSINESS SYSTEMS.—(1) The Director of National Intelligence shall develop and implement an enterprise architecture to cover all intelligence community business systems, and the functions and activities supported by such business systems. The enterprise architecture shall be sufficiently defined to effectively guide, constrain, and permit implementation of interoperable intelligence community business system solutions, consistent with applicable policies and procedures established by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

“(2) The enterprise architecture under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

“(A) An information infrastructure that will enable the intelligence community to—

“(i) comply with all Federal accounting, financial management, and reporting requirements;

“(ii) routinely produce timely, accurate, and reliable financial information for management purposes;

“(iii) integrate budget, accounting, and program information and systems; and

“(iv) provide for the measurement of performance, including the ability to produce timely, relevant, and reliable cost information.

“(B) Policies, procedures, data standards, and system interface requirements that apply uniformly throughout the intelligence community.

“(c) RESPONSIBILITIES FOR INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY BUSINESS SYSTEM TRANSFORMATION.—The Director of National Intelligence shall be responsible for the entire life cycle of an intelligence community business system transformation, including review, approval, and oversight of the planning, design, acquisition, deployment, operation, and maintenance of the business system transformation.

“(d) INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY BUSINESS SYSTEM INVESTMENT REVIEW.—(1) The Chief Information Officer of the Intelligence Community shall establish and implement, not later than 60 days after October 7, 2010, an investment review process for the intelligence community business systems for which the Chief Information Officer of the Intelligence Community is responsible.

“(2) The investment review process under paragraph (1) shall—

“(A) meet the requirements of section 11312 of title 40, United States Code; and

“(B) specifically set forth the responsibilities of the Chief Information Officer of the Intelligence Community under such review process.

“(3) The investment review process under paragraph (1) shall include the following elements:

“(A) Review and approval by an investment review board (consisting of appropriate representatives of the intelligence community) of each intelligence community business system as an investment before the obligation of funds for such system.

“(B) Periodic review, but not less often than annually, of every intelligence community business system investment.

“(C) Thresholds for levels of review to ensure appropriate review of intelligence community business system investments depending on the scope, complexity, and cost of the system involved.

“(D) Procedures for making certifications in accordance with the requirements of subsection (a)(2).

“(e) RELATION TO ANNUAL REGISTRATION REQUIREMENTS.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to alter the requirements of section 8083 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2005 (Public Law 108–287; 118 Stat. 989), with regard to information technology systems (as defined in subsection (d) of such section).

“(f) RELATIONSHIP TO DEFENSE BUSINESS ENTERPRISE ARCHITECTURE.—Intelligence community business system transformations certified under this section shall be deemed to be in compliance with section 2222 of title 10, United States Code. Nothing in this section shall be construed to exempt funds authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Defense for activities other than an intelligence community business system transformation from the requirements of such section 2222, to the extent that such requirements are otherwise applicable.

“(g) RELATION TO CLINGER-COHEN ACT.—(1) Executive agency responsibilities in chapter 113 of title 40, United States Code, for any intelligence community business system transformation shall be exercised jointly by—

“(A) the Director of National Intelligence and the Chief Information Officer of the Intelligence Community; and

“(B) the head of the executive agency that contains the element of the intelligence community involved and the chief information officer of that executive agency.

“(2) The Director of National Intelligence and the head of the executive agency referred to in paragraph (1)(B) shall enter into a memorandum of understanding to carry out the requirements of this section in a manner that best meets the needs of the intelligence community and the executive agency.

“(h) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) The term ‘enterprise architecture’ has the meaning given that term in section 3601(4) of title 44, United States Code.

“(2) The terms ‘information system’ and ‘information technology’ have the meanings given those terms in section 11101 of title 40, United States Code.

“(3) The term ‘intelligence community business system’ means an information system, including a national security system, that is operated by, for, or on behalf of an element of the intelligence community, including a financial system, mixed system, financial data feeder system, and the business infrastructure capabilities shared by the systems of the business enterprise architecture, including people, process, and technology, that build upon the core infrastructure used to support business activities, such as acquisition, financial management, logistics, strategic planning and budgeting, installations and environment, and human resource management.

“(4) The term ‘intelligence community business system transformation’ means—

“(A) the acquisition or development of a new intelligence community business system; or

“(B) any significant modification or enhancement of an existing intelligence community business system (other than necessary to maintain current services).

“(5) The term ‘national security system’ has the meaning given that term in section 3552(b) of title 44, United States Code.”

**SEC. 311. INCLUSION OF INSPECTOR GENERAL OF INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY IN COUNCIL OF INSPECTORS GENERAL ON INTEGRITY AND EFFICIENCY.**

Section 11(b)(1)(B) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (Public Law 95–452; 5 U.S.C. App.) is amended by striking “the Office of the Director of National Intelligence” and inserting “the Intelligence Community”.

**SEC. 312. AUTHORITIES OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL FOR THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY.**

(a) INFORMATION AND ASSISTANCE.—Paragraph (9) of section 17(e) of the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949 (50 U.S.C. 3517(e)(9)) is amended to read as follows:

“(9)(A) The Inspector General may request such information or assistance as may be necessary for carrying out the duties and responsibilities of the Inspector General provided by this section from any Federal, State, or local governmental agency or unit thereof.

“(B) Upon request of the Inspector General for information or assistance from a department

or agency of the Federal Government, the head of the department or agency involved, insofar as practicable and not in contravention of any existing statutory restriction or regulation of such department or agency, shall furnish to the Inspector General, or to an authorized designee, such information or assistance.

“(C) Nothing in this paragraph may be construed to provide any new authority to the Central Intelligence Agency to conduct intelligence activity in the United States.

“(D) In this paragraph, the term ‘State’ means each of the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and any territory or possession of the United States.”

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS RELATING TO SELECTION OF EMPLOYEES.—Paragraph (7) of such section (50 U.S.C. 3517(e)(7)) is amended—

(1) by inserting “(A)” before “Subject to applicable law”; and

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

“(B) Consistent with budgetary and personnel resources allocated by the Director, the Inspector General has final approval of—

“(i) the selection of internal and external candidates for employment with the Office of Inspector General; and

“(ii) all other personnel decisions concerning personnel permanently assigned to the Office of Inspector General, including selection and appointment to the Senior Intelligence Service, but excluding all security-based determinations that are not within the authority of a head of other Central Intelligence Agency offices.”

**SEC. 313. PROVISION OF INFORMATION AND ASSISTANCE TO INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.**

Section 103H(j)(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3033) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “any department, agency, or other element of the United States Government” and inserting “any Federal, State (as defined in section 804), or local governmental agency or unit thereof”; and

(2) in subparagraph (B), by inserting “from a department, agency, or element of the Federal Government” before “under subparagraph (A)”.

**SEC. 314. CLARIFICATION RELATING TO INFORMATION ACCESS BY COMPTROLLER GENERAL.**

Section 348(a) of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–259; 124 Stat. 2700; 50 U.S.C. 3308) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) REQUESTS BY CERTAIN CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—Consistent with the protection of classified information, the directive issued under paragraph (1) shall not prohibit the Comptroller General from obtaining information necessary to carry out the following audits or reviews:

“(A) An audit or review carried out—

“(i) at the request of the congressional intelligence committees; or

“(ii) pursuant to—

“(I) an intelligence authorization Act;

“(II) a committee report or joint explanatory statement accompanying an intelligence authorization Act; or

“(III) a classified annex to a committee report or joint explanatory statement accompanying an intelligence authorization Act.

“(B) An audit or review pertaining to intelligence activities of the Department of Defense carried out—

“(i) at the request of the congressional defense committees (as defined in section 101(a)(16) of title 10, United States Code); or

“(ii) pursuant to a national defense authorization Act.”

**SEC. 315. USE OF HOMELAND SECURITY GRANT FUNDS IN CONJUNCTION WITH DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL LABORATORIES.**

Section 2008(a) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 609(a)) is amended in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by inserting “including by working in conjunction with a National Laboratory (as defined in section 2(3) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15801(3))” after “plans.”.

**SEC. 316. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS RELATING TO PAY UNDER TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE.**

Section 5102(a)(1) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in clause (vii), by striking “or”;

(2) by inserting after clause (vii) the following new clause:

“(viii) the Office of the Director of National Intelligence;”;

(3) in clause (x), by striking the period and inserting a semicolon.

**Subtitle B—Matters Relating to United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba**

**SEC. 321. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR TRANSFER OR RELEASE OF INDIVIDUALS DETAINED AT UNITED STATES NAVAL STATION, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA.**

No amounts authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available to an element of the intelligence community may be used during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on December 31, 2016, to transfer, release, or assist in the transfer or release, to or within the United States, its territories, or possessions, Khalid Sheikh Mohammed or any other individual detained at Guantanamo (as such term is defined in section 322(c)).

**SEC. 322. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS TO CONSTRUCT OR MODIFY FACILITIES IN UNITED STATES TO HOUSE DETAINEES TRANSFERRED FROM UNITED STATES NAVAL STATION, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—No amounts authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available to an element of the intelligence community may be used during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on December 31, 2016, to construct or modify any facility in the United States, its territories, or possessions to house any individual detained at Guantanamo for the purposes of detention or imprisonment in the custody or under the control of the Department of Defense.

(b) **EXCEPTION.**—The prohibition in subsection (a) shall not apply to any modification of facilities at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

(c) **INDIVIDUAL DETAINED AT GUANTANAMO DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “individual detained at Guantanamo” means any individual located at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, as of October 1, 2009, who—

(1) is not a citizen of the United States or a member of the Armed Forces of the United States; and

(2) is—  
(A) in the custody or under the control of the Department of Defense; or

(B) otherwise under detention at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

**SEC. 323. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS TO TRANSFER OR RELEASE INDIVIDUALS DETAINED AT UNITED STATES NAVAL STATION, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA, TO COMBAT ZONES.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—No amounts authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available to an element of the intelligence community may be used during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on December 31, 2016, to transfer, release, or assist in the transfer or release of any individual detained in the custody or under the control of the Department of Defense at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to a combat zone.

(b) **COMBAT ZONE DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “combat zone” means any area designated as a combat zone for purposes of section 112 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 for which the income of a member of the Armed Forces was excluded during 2014, 2015, or 2016 by reason of the member’s service on active duty in such area.

**Subtitle C—Reports**

**SEC. 331. REPORTS TO CONGRESS ON INDIVIDUALS FORMERLY DETAINED AT UNITED STATES NAVAL STATION, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA.**

(a) **ADDITIONAL MATTERS FOR INCLUSION IN REPORTS.**—Subsection (c) of section 319 of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2009 (Public Law 111–32; 123 Stat. 1874; 10 U.S.C. 801 note) is amended by adding after paragraph (5) the following new paragraphs:

“(6) A summary of all contact by any means of communication, including telecommunications, electronic or technical means, in person, written communications, or any other means of communication, regardless of content, between any individual formerly detained at Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and any individual known or suspected to be associated with a foreign terrorist group.

“(7) A description of whether any of the contact described in the summary required by paragraph (6) included any information or discussion about hostilities against the United States or its allies or partners.

“(8) For each individual described in paragraph (4), the period of time between the date on which the individual was released or transferred from Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and the date on which it is confirmed that the individual is suspected or confirmed of reengaging in terrorist activities.

“(9) The average period of time described in paragraph (8) for all the individuals described in paragraph (4).”.

(b) **FORM.**—Subsection (a) of such section is amended by adding at the end the following: “The reports may be submitted in classified form.”.

(c) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section or the amendments made by this section shall be construed to terminate, alter, modify, override, or otherwise affect any reporting of information required under section 319(c) of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2009 (Public Law 111–32; 123 Stat. 1874; 10 U.S.C. 801 note), as in effect immediately before the enactment of this section.

**SEC. 332. REPORTS ON FOREIGN FIGHTERS.**

(a) **REPORTS REQUIRED.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 60 days thereafter, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to the congressional intelligence committees a report on foreign fighter flows to and from Syria and to and from Iraq. The Director shall define the term “foreign fighter” in such reports.

(b) **MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.**—Each report submitted under subsection (a) shall include each of the following:

(1) The total number of foreign fighters who have traveled to Syria or Iraq since January 1, 2011, the total number of foreign fighters in Syria or Iraq as of the date of the submittal of the report, the total number of foreign fighters whose countries of origin have a visa waiver program described in section 217 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1187), the total number of foreign fighters who have left Syria or Iraq, the total number of female foreign fighters, and the total number of deceased foreign fighters.

(2) The total number of United States persons who have traveled or attempted to travel to Syria or Iraq since January 1, 2011, the total number of such persons who have arrived in Syria or Iraq since such date, and the total number of such persons who have returned to the United States from Syria or Iraq since such date.

(3) The total number of foreign fighters in Terrorist Identities Datamart Environment and the status of each such foreign fighter in that database, the number of such foreign fighters who are on a watchlist, and the number of such foreign fighters who are not on a watchlist.

(4) The total number of foreign fighters who have been processed with biometrics, including face images, fingerprints, and iris scans.

(5) Any programmatic updates to the foreign fighter report since the last report was issued, including updated analysis on foreign country cooperation, as well as actions taken, such as denying or revoking visas.

(6) A worldwide graphic that describes foreign fighters flows to and from Syria, with points of origin by country.

(c) **FORM.**—The reports submitted under subsection (a) may be submitted in classified form.

(d) **TERMINATION.**—The requirement to submit reports under subsection (a) shall terminate on the date that is three years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

**SEC. 333. REPORTS ON PRISONER POPULATION AT UNITED STATES NAVAL STATION, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA.**

(a) **REPORTS REQUIRED.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 30 days thereafter, the Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency, in coordination with the Director of National Intelligence, shall submit to the Members of Congress specified in subsection (b) a report on the prisoner population at the detention facility at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

(b) **SPECIFIED MEMBERS AND COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.**—The Members of Congress specified in this subsection are the following:

(1) The majority leader and minority leader of the Senate.

(2) The Chairman and Ranking Member of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate.

(3) The Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

(4) The Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

(5) The Speaker of the House of Representatives.

(6) The minority leader of the House of Representatives.

(7) The Chairman and Ranking Member of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives.

(8) The Chairman and Ranking Member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

(9) The Chairman and Ranking Member of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(c) **MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.**—Each report submitted under subsection (a) shall include each of the following:

(1) The name and country of origin of each prisoner detained at the detention facility at United States Naval Station Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, as of the date of such report.

(2) A current summary of the evidence, intelligence, and information used to justify the detention of each prisoner listed under paragraph (1) at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

(3) A current accounting of all the measures taken to transfer each prisoner listed under paragraph (1) to the individual’s country of citizenship or another country.

(4) A current description of the number of individuals released or transferred from detention at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, who are confirmed or suspected of returning to terrorist activities after such release or transfer.

(5) An assessment of any efforts by foreign terrorist organizations to recruit individuals released from detention at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

(6) A summary of all contact by any means of communication, including telecommunications, electronic or technical means, in person, written

communications, or any other means of communication, regardless of content, between any individual formerly detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and any individual known or suspected to be associated with a foreign terrorist group.

(7) A description of whether any of the contact described in the summary required by paragraph (6) included any information or discussion about hostilities against the United States or its allies or partners.

(8) For each individual described in paragraph (4), the period of time between the date on which the individual was released or transferred from United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and the date on which it is confirmed that the individual is suspected or confirmed of reengaging in terrorist activities.

(9) The average period of time described in paragraph (8) for all the individuals described in paragraph (4).

**SEC. 334. REPORT ON USE OF CERTAIN BUSINESS CONCERNS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to the congressional intelligence communities a report on the representation, as of the date of the report, of covered business concerns among the contractors that are awarded contracts by elements of the intelligence community for goods, equipment, tools, and services.

(b) **MATTERS INCLUDED.**—The report under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) The representation of covered business concerns as described in subsection (a), including such representation by—

(A) each type of covered business concern; and

(B) each element of the intelligence community.

(2) If, as of the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director does not record and monitor the statistics required to carry out this section, a description of the actions taken by the Director to ensure that such statistics are recorded and monitored beginning in fiscal year 2016.

(3) The actions the Director plans to take during fiscal year 2016 to enhance the awarding of contracts to covered business concerns by elements of the intelligence community.

(c) **COVERED BUSINESS CONCERNS DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “covered business concerns” means the following:

(1) Minority-owned businesses.

(2) Women-owned businesses.

(3) Small disadvantaged businesses.

(4) Service-disabled veteran-owned businesses.

(5) Veteran-owned small businesses.

**SEC. 335. REPEAL OF CERTAIN REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.**

(a) **QUADRENNIAL AUDIT OF POSITIONS REQUIRING SECURITY CLEARANCES.**—Section 506H of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3104) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (a); and

(2) by redesignating subsections (b) and (c) as subsections (a) and (b), respectively.

(b) **REPORTS ON ROLE OF ANALYSTS AT FBI AND FBI INFORMATION SHARING.**—Section 2001(g) of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (Public Law 108–458; 118 Stat. 3700; 28 U.S.C. 532 note) is amended by striking paragraphs (3) and (4).

(c) **REPORT ON OUTSIDE EMPLOYMENT BY OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 102A(u) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3024) is amended—

(A) by striking “(1) The Director” and inserting “The Director”; and

(B) by striking paragraph (2).

(2) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Subsection (a) of section 507 of such Act (50 U.S.C. 3106(a)) is amended—

(A) by striking paragraph (5); and

(B) by redesignating paragraph (6) as paragraph (5).

(3) **TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.**—Subsection (c)(1) of such section 507 is amended by striking “subsection (a)(1)” and inserting “subsection (a)”.

(d) **REPORTS ON NUCLEAR ASPIRATIONS OF NON-STATE ENTITIES.**—Section 1055 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (50 U.S.C. 2371) is repealed.

(e) **REPORTS ON ESPIONAGE BY PEOPLE’S REPUBLIC OF CHINA.**—Section 3151 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (42 U.S.C. 7383e) is repealed.

(f) **REPORTS ON SECURITY VULNERABILITIES OF NATIONAL LABORATORY COMPUTERS.**—Section 4508 of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2659) is repealed.

The CHAIR. No amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in House Report 114–155. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

**AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. ISRAEL**

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 114–155.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 12, line 10, strike “The Director” and insert “(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director”.

Page 12, after line 13, insert the following:

(b) **ANNUAL REPORT.**—Not later than the date that is 10 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, and biennially thereafter until the date that is four years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to the congressional intelligence committees and the congressional defense committees (as such term is defined in section 101(a)(16) of title 10, United States Code) a report describing—

(1) trends in the use of tunnels by foreign state and nonstate actors; and

(2) collaboration efforts between the United States and partner countries to address the use of tunnels by adversaries.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 315, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment with my very good friend from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) and my very good friend from Florida (Ms. GRAHAM). This is a bipartisan amendment with respect to tunnels being used as a military tactic, technology, and strategy in asymmetric warfare.

Mr. Chairman, almost exactly a year ago, when war broke out in the Middle East and Hamas attacked Israel, I visited Israel and saw for myself the sophistication of the tunnels being dug

from Gaza to Israel through which terrorists traveled. They went to the other side of the tunnels, popped up, and tried to kill innocent civilians.

These tunnels are not the tunnels that many of us characterize in our own minds. These tunnels are sophisticated. These are expressways underground. It is like the Queens-Midtown Tunnel going from Gaza to Israel. They are ventilated. They are lit. They are massive. They are deep. They are huge. They are impenetrable, and they are very difficult to detect.

Mr. Chairman, the FY16 Intelligence Authorization bill properly says that the Director of National Intelligence will designate an official to manage the collection and analysis of intelligence regarding the tactical use of tunnels by state and nonstate actors.

□ 1430

This bipartisan amendment simply asks for accountability. It requires a report from this new lead intelligence officer for tunnels describing the trends in the use of tunnels by foreign state and nonstate actors and collaborative efforts between the United States and partner nations to address the use of tunnels by our adversaries.

Mr. Chairman, I talked about tunnels in the Middle East, but in fact, these tunnels are dynamic force multipliers for our enemies and enemies of our allies around the world. They are used for terrorist attacks, but they are also used to smuggle arms and contraband.

We have learned that these tunnels are being used well beyond Israel. Korea is another example. Tunnels have been found in North Korea. Here at home, more than 150 tunnels have been found since 2009.

Mr. Chairman, we have plenty of enemies today looking for ways to attack the United States and our interests around the globe. This bill recognizes these threats and, very wisely, creates a lead intelligence officer for tunnels.

This amendment simply encourages greater oversight by Congress. It allows Congress to make informed decisions on how and where to spend future funds in order to counter this threat and protect U.S. national security interests.

Most importantly, Mr. Chairman, these reports will help shape the efforts of the newly created position, making it clear that Congress expects accountability and transparency, and that is something that the American people require.

I ask my colleagues to support this bipartisan amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition, although I do not intend to oppose the amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. NUNES. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Congressman STEVE ISRAEL and Congresswoman GWEN GRAHAM for working together with me on this bipartisan effort in the defense bills, as well as now in the Intelligence Authorization Act. I would also like to thank Chairman NUNES and his staff for working together with me on this important issue.

Mr. Chairman, as Representative ISRAEL just described, there is a real and growing tunnel threat to American bases and embassies around the world, to our southern border, as well as to our ally Israel, both in Gaza, as well as Israel's northern border.

Language I offered in the base intelligence bill, combined with this amendment, will ensure that our intelligence community stays focused on this threat. There will be a dedicated person watching on this issue.

Going forward, partnership with Israel is the best way to address this growing threat. As we have seen with Iron Dome and other missile defense efforts, partnering with a vital ally like Israel enables both countries to learn quickly, while sharing costs and new technologies. It is a win-win situation for Israel and the U.S. and, hopefully, a loss situation for the bad guys.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I thank my very good friend from Colorado for his bipartisan support of this bill.

I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida. (Ms. GRAHAM).

Ms. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of Representative STEVE ISRAEL's amendment to the Intelligence Authorization Act to provide oversight for the joint U.S.-Israel antitunneling defense project.

The joint antitunneling project, which was added to the National Defense Authorization Act in an amendment sponsored by my good friend Representative LAMBORN and myself, will help our closest ally in the Middle East, Israel, protect its borders.

The terrorist group Hamas has spent years developing a complex network of tunnels under the Gaza Strip and Israel to smuggle weapons, kidnap Israelis, and launch mass murder attacks.

This project will develop new technology to detect and destroy these tunnels, and it will send a clear message to our allies and enemies alike. The United States is committed to protecting Israel and to rooting out and destroying the terrorists who wish to do her harm.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF), the distinguished ranking member of the committee.

Mr. SCHIFF. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. LAMBORN, and Ms. GRAHAM for this very important amendment and issue.

This will call for a report on our adversaries' use of tunnels and an update

on our collaboration with international partners in ways to detect and defeat tunnels.

All of us remember the fear that set in, in much of southern Israel last summer, as Hamas militants used a complex network of tunnels to attack Israeli soldiers from the Gaza Strip. This was not the first use of tunnels by Hamas. Cross-border tunnels were used in the capture of IDF soldier Gilad Shalit in 2006.

In addition to using them against military targets, Israel has uncovered evidence that the tunnels are being prepared for large-scale attacks against Israeli civilians.

Tunnels are not just a problem for Israel. For decades, the North Korean military has also been digging tunnels under the DMZ to facilitate infiltration of South Korea.

According to press reports, four tunnels from the north have been found in all, although none since 1990. The South Korean Defense Ministry believes there may be 20 in all, and they could pose a mortal threat to Koreans and American service personnel in the region.

I strongly support the amendment and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to support the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, all that I can say is thank you.

I yield back the balance of my time. The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. ISRAEL

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 114-155.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 16, after line 24, insert the following new subsection:

“(e) REPORTS.—Not later than 10 months after the date of the enactment of this subsection, and annually thereafter for three years, the Director of the Cyber Threat Intelligence Integration Center shall submit a report to Congress that includes the following:

“(1) With respect to the year covered by the report, a detailed description of cyber threat trends, as compiled by the Cyber Threat Intelligence Integration Center.

“(2) With respect to the year covered by the report, a detailed description of the coordination efforts by the Cyber Threat Intelligence Integration Center between departments and agencies of the Federal Government, including the Department of Defense, the Department of Justice, and the Department of Homeland Security.

“(3) Recommendations for better collaboration between such departments and agencies of the Federal Government.”

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 315, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I will attempt to continue my winning streak on the floor this morning.

I rise to offer an amendment with my distinguished friend and partner from New York (Mr. HANNA).

This bipartisan amendment addresses an issue that has concerned many of us for some time, and that is the fact that, when it comes to cyber defense and cyber war, many Federal agencies are doing something; it is just that they may not be aware of what each of them is doing. We need closer coordination and collaboration among all the Federal agencies and entities dealing with cyber war.

Mr. Chairman, we recently found out that the United States Office of Personnel Management suffered a cyber attack impacting millions of Federal workers. This attack, in my view, highlights a disconnect between agencies tasked to provide cyber defense, a foreign government hacking into a Federal government system, taking the records of millions of government employees, spanning the jurisdiction of several Federal agencies.

It is clear that there is an obvious need for greater collaboration between these agencies to create a credible defense and, if needed, a deterrent to those wishing to attack through the cyber domain.

That is why I was very pleased in February of this year when the President directed the DNI to establish the Cyber Threat Intelligence Integration Center, CTIIC. This bill very properly authorizes that position.

CTIIC will serve as the primary organization within the Federal Government for analyzing and integrating all intelligence possessed or acquired by the U.S. pertaining to cyber threats and coordinate cyber threat intelligence activities.

This bipartisan amendment, Mr. Chairman, simply ensures congressional oversight of CTIIC by requiring an annual report detailing three things: number one, cyber attack trends identified by the CTIIC; number two, an assessment of the collaborative efforts between the CTIIC and various Federal agencies tasked to defend this country against cyber attacks; and number three, recommendations for better collaboration between these agencies.

Mr. Chairman, we have entered a new era of warfare. Our networks are being attacked daily. We need to do a much better job of coordinating, collaborating, and cooperating at the Federal level. This amendment ensures oversight and accountability.

I want to thank my partner on this measure, Mr. HANNA, for his bipartisan assistance and support.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I do not intend to oppose the amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chair, over the last several years, cyber attacks have become a pressing concern for the United States. The recent breach of the Office of Personnel Management has put the personal information of millions of current and former Federal employees, including many of the men and women of our intelligence community, at risk.

Every day, cyber thieves attack private companies, stealing credit card numbers, accessing medical records, leaking proprietary information, and publishing confidential emails, affecting tens of millions of Americans.

The intelligence community has worked to improve our cyber defenses by improving information sharing between the private sector and the Federal Government through the support of H.R. 1560, the Protecting Cyber Networks Act.

While the Senate has yet to act on this bill, the legislation we consider today will help improve the Federal Government's ability to detect and defeat cyber attacks by creating the new Cyber Threat Intelligence Integration Center.

This thoughtful amendment by Mr. ISRAEL and Mr. HANNA will require that the Center produce a report on cyber threat trends and coordination on cyber threats between different government agencies.

I thank the gentlemen from New York for their work on this issue and urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF), the ranking member of the committee.

Mr. SCHIFF. I thank the gentleman, and I thank him for his excellent amendment and support in the intelligence process.

With each passing day, we are learning more about the cyber breach at the Office of Personnel Management. The volume of personal information lost during these events is of tremendous concern. Mr. ISRAEL's amendment will help us better inform Congress on the effectiveness of the government's collaborative efforts to defend against future cyber events.

I thank my colleagues for their work on it, and I urge support of Mr. ISRAEL's amendment.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the distinguished chairman for his bipartisan leadership and the distinguished ranking member. I appreciate their support for this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. CROWLEY

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 114-155.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 29, after line 17, insert the following:  
**SEC. 317. INCLUSION OF HISPANIC-SERVING INSTITUTIONS IN GRANT PROGRAM TO ENHANCE RECRUITING OF INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY WORKFORCE.**

Section 1024 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. ) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting “, Hispanic-serving institutions, and” after “universities”; and

(B) in the subsection heading for such subsection, by striking “HISTORICALLY BLACK” and inserting “CERTAIN MINORITY-SERVING”; and

(2) in subsection (g)—

(A) by redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (6); and

(B) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following new paragraph (5):

“(5) HISPANIC-SERVING INSTITUTION.—The term ‘Hispanic-serving institution’ has the meaning given that term in section 502(a)(5) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1101a(a)(5)).”

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 315, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, like many of my colleagues, I am focused on growing educational opportunities for young Hispanic Americans, particularly in the areas that will be so critical to our Nation's success in the years ahead.

Last month, the House approved a bipartisan amendment to the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act designed to increase opportunities for Latinos in the STEM fields.

The amendment I am offering today with my colleagues, Mr. SERRANO and Mr. CURBELO, builds upon that effort and would further expand opportunities for Hispanic students.

Our proposal would allow the Director of National Intelligence to offer grants to Hispanic-Serving Institutions of higher education for advanced foreign language education programs that are in the immediate interest of the intelligence community.

It would also promote study abroad and cultural immersion programs in those areas, which we all know are crucial to truly understanding the intricacies of other languages and other cultures. This is a time when we need to be encouraging more of our young people to enter careers aimed at making our Nation safer.

Of the nearly 2 million Latino students enrolled in college today, the majority attend Hispanic-Serving Institutions. With these targeted grants, HSIs would be able to help increase the ranks of Latinos going into the intelligence community, where they are underrepresented today.

This amendment would not only promote diversity in national security and

intelligence communities, but it would also strengthen our youngest and fastest growing minority, Hispanic Americans.

We must ensure that these young people are prepared with the knowledge and skills that will contribute to our Nation's future strength, security, and global leadership because, when education is available to everyone, our entire Nation is a stronger nation.

I want to thank my colleagues who have worked with me on this issue, Mr. SERRANO and Mr. CURBELO, who have cosponsored this amendment.

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

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition, although I do not intend to oppose the amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chair, I thank Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. CURBELO for offering this amendment to include Hispanic-Serving Institutions in the grant program to improve recruitment efforts for the intelligence community.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CURBELO).

□ 1445

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of this amendment and thank my colleague from New York for allowing me to join in leading on this important issue.

This amendment would allow the Director of National Intelligence to provide grants to Hispanic-Serving Institutions of higher education to offer advanced foreign language programs that are important to our intelligence community. These students, in addition to the traditional classroom setting, would also be able to travel and study abroad so they can gain a firsthand perspective of the culture in which they are immersing themselves.

Mr. Chairman, the study of Farsi, Middle Eastern, and South Asian dialects is of the utmost importance in developing our country's continued relationships abroad. I am proud to advocate for Hispanic-Serving Institutions, like Florida International University and Miami Dade College in my district, and will strive to provide them the opportunity to train their students so that they can go on to serve our country.

I am proud to be working with the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO) to provide more opportunities for these young Hispanic students who want to serve their country and to provide our intelligence community this special tool to recruit those who could be useful in advancing the cause of building the relationships that are so critical to our intelligence services operating throughout the world.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from Florida's comments on this bill and his support.

At this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

Mr. SCHIFF. I thank my colleague from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) for yielding and for his work on this amendment. I am very happy to support it.

Diversity and language skills are critical to national security. Together, they allow the intelligence community to reach its potential and expand its reach, its access, as well as its understanding.

This amendment would further both goals by providing better language-learning opportunities to students of Hispanic-Serving Institutions. I am very proud to support this amendment and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Again, I thank my friend from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) as well as my other colleagues who worked with him on this amendment. I urge passage.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for his support of this amendment as well as the ranking member, Mr. SCHIFF, for his support of this amendment, and all the Members who have worked on this amendment.

I think the amendment speaks for itself. It is providing a great opportunity for a growing minority community within our country who want to serve our country in this capacity.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. KEATING

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 114-155.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 35, after line 17, insert the following new subsection (and redesignate the subsequent subsections accordingly):

(C) ADDITIONAL REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to the congressional intelligence committees a report that includes—

(1) with respect to the travel of foreign fighters to and from Iraq and Syria, a description of the intelligence sharing relationships between the United States and member states of the European Union and member states of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; and

(2) an analysis of the challenges impeding such intelligence sharing relationships.

Page 35, line 19, insert "and (c)" after "(a)".

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 315, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I offer this bipartisan amendment with the support of Homeland Security Chairman MICHAEL MCCAUL and Representatives KATKO and LOUDERMILK to help Congress identify ways to improve intelligence sharing on the flow of foreign fighters around the world—with particular attention to their travel to and from Iraq and Syria.

Already, this legislation that we are considering today makes substantial strides in ensuring that intelligence surrounding the flow of foreign fighters is shared with Congress. These continuous reports will shed light on the total number of attempted and successful fighters since the beginning of 2011.

My amendment would require the Director of National Intelligence to report to Congress on the intelligence community's progress in forging information-sharing agreements with foreign partners and help Congress identify the challenges impeding coordinated intelligence efforts.

Over 20,000 foreign fighters have traveled to join rebel and terrorist groups in Iraq and Syria, including ISIS and al Qaeda affiliates like al-Nusrah. Their movements are proving increasingly difficult to track in our globalized world, particularly given the uneven or nonexistent tracking efforts from some of our foreign partners.

As the ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade and as a member of the Homeland Security Subcommittee on Counterterrorism and Intelligence, I have engaged on the issue of intelligence sharing from two perspectives—from our efforts to improve the intelligence community's coordination with State, local, and other Federal agencies and from our work to better improve our information-sharing practices with our overseas allies to prevent terrorist attacks and the flow of foreign fighters here at home.

While the intelligence community has made improvements to the processes of sharing pertinent information with the relevant Federal, State, and local agencies, there still exists a blind spot in our intelligence-gathering efforts on foreign fighters. That blind spot stems from the failure of some foreign governments to take common-sense information-sharing steps, and it has made the task of tracking foreign fighters even more challenging.

The inability or unwillingness of some foreign governments to pass along even the most basic information about these individuals represents a major risk to the safety of the American people.

An additional threat looms when some of these individuals return to their homelands from Iraq and Syria, battle-hardened and radicalized. Once back home, some can travel between international borders with relative ease, which makes tracking them a truly difficult feat.

This amendment will also provide insight into our current intelligence-sharing relationships and will give Congress the opportunity to highlight best practices while also revealing areas for improvement.

I thank Chairman NUNES and Ranking Member SCHIFF for their cooperation.

I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL).

Mr. MCCAUL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of the Keating-McCaul amendment in the Intelligence Authorization Act. If adopted, our amendment would require the Director of National Intelligence to report to Congress on the state of intelligence information sharing with overseas partners to help us identify security gaps so that we can improve international monitoring of foreign fighter travel both in and out of Syria and Iraq.

Islamist fanatics from more than 100 countries have traveled overseas to fight with groups like ISIS and al Qaeda. Thousands of the jihadists carry Western passports and can exploit security gaps in places like Europe to return to the West, where they can plot attacks against America and our allies.

Last month, I led a congressional delegation to the Middle East to investigate the flow of these foreign fighters. And while progress is being made, I am still troubled by intelligence and screening gaps, especially with our foreign partners. We need to make sure our allies not only share the identities of terrorists and foreign fighters with us but also with each other so that these extremists can be stopped before they cross our borders into the United States.

This amendment will provide Congress critical information needed to close these security gaps and improve intelligence information sharing to defend our homeland.

I applaud the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING) for his hard work on the amendment and for his strong participation in our delegation overseas, where we learned quite a bit. It is not very often you can pass something you think can save American lives, and I think this is one of them. I thank the gentleman again.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of Homeland Security for his leadership on this issue. We really have established a very strong bipartisan effort, putting our national security first and realizing what holes there are in our system, in our security for our country.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

Mr. SCHIFF. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the work of my colleagues from Massachusetts and from Texas. This is a superb amendment that will help us track foreign fighters, and I am proud to support it.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. KEATING

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 114-155.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I have another amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 41, line 8, strike “paragraphs (3) and (4)” and insert “paragraph (3) and redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (3)”.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 315, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, the recent events involving the plan of radicalized individuals in Massachusetts to target law enforcement officials—police, in particular—underscore the truth that protecting America will require the efforts of local, State, and Federal law enforcement.

Since the Boston Marathon bombings, the FBI has made great efforts to improve their information-sharing efforts with the Joint Terrorism Task Force and other Federal agencies.

With my work and the work of my colleagues on the congressional investigation of the Boston Marathon bombings through the Homeland Security Committee, I can attest to the seriousness in which the Federal Bureau of Investigation has set out to improve their information-sharing practices.

However, the FBI’s efforts to institutionalize sharing across law enforcement and intelligence are still a work in progress.

The current version of this bill eliminates the requirement for the FBI to report to Congress on their progress to implement information-sharing principles. This is a reporting requirement that has kept Congress aware of the FBI’s information-sharing practices since 2004, and it has been vital to understand what works and what can be improved.

This amendment will reinstate that requirement, with the recognition that the FBI has more work to do on information sharing to better protect the American public.

These necessary reforms include re-executing FBI current memorandums of understanding with local partners, improving training and accessibility for the eGuardian platform, and formalizing methods for disseminating intelligence to relevant consumers up- and downstream.

Without information on the progress the FBI is making in these reforms, Congress is hindered in taking the critical steps needed to protect the American public.

I would like to again thank Chairman NUNES and Ranking Member SCHIFF.

I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

Mr. SCHIFF. I thank my colleague from Massachusetts, who has been an active and important voice on national security since he joined the Congress several years ago. In particular, he has worked to ensure that we maintain a strong focus on information sharing across agencies.

One of the key lessons we learned from 9/11 is the need to tear down stovepipes and to ensure that inappropriate barriers to information sharing across agencies never reappear.

The gentleman from Massachusetts’ amendment seeks to maintain our vigilance on this issue and would require the FBI to report to Congress on its information-sharing progress.

As a fellow native Bostonian, I am very pleased to see my colleague do such great work. I want to thank him for his commitment to the issue. And I am very happy to support the amendment.

Mr. KEATING. I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. SCHIFF

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 114-155.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike sections 321, 322, 323, and 331.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 315, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would strike the sections of the bill which would undermine the administration’s ability to close the prison at Guantanamo by transferring the remaining detainees to the United States for further disposition of their cases or to third countries that agree to accept them, secure them, and monitor them.

I am grateful that my colleague from Washington, ADAM SMITH, ranking member of the Armed Services Committee, has joined me in urging the House to make this important change to the bill.

Every day that it remains open, the prison at Guantanamo Bay damages the United States. Because there are other, better options for the prosecution and detention of these inmates, we are not safer for Guantanamo’s existence. In fact, it makes us more vulnerable by drawing new recruits to the jihad.

The Congress, the administration, and the military can work together to find a solution that protects our people even as we maintain our principles and devotion to the rule of law.

Under the provisions included in this bill, the administration would be barred from transferring Guantanamo detainees to a “war zone.”

While I agree that it would be foolhardy to seek to send a detainee to Yemen while that country is immersed in civil war, the definition of “war zone” used here is derived from the U.S. Tax Code and is extremely broad, ruling out countries like Jordan, for example, that have either successfully resettled and monitored former detainees or demonstrated a genuine commitment to doing so.

These provisions also prevent the administration from transferring Guantanamo detainees to the United States for further proceedings under the military commissions process or for trial in an article III court.

□ 1500

The Department of Justice and our courts have proven themselves time and time again to be more than capable of handling the toughest terrorism cases and doing so in a way that ennobles us and sets an example to the world that a great nation can both safeguard its people and the rule of law.

As a practical matter, our civilian courts have proven much more adept at handling these cases than the military commissions process has. In fact, this past Friday, a three-judge panel of the Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit, one of the most important appellate courts in the Nation, further struck down the legality of commission charges, so narrowing the jurisdiction of the military commissions themselves that any utility as an alternative to article III courts has been called into further question.

And while Khalid Sheikh Mohammed and his fellow Guantanamo terrorists still await their date with justice, a host of others—including Richard Reid, the shoe bomber; and Umar Farouk Abdulmutallab, the underwear bomber; and Faisal Shahzad, the Times Square bomber—have been tried, convicted, and sent to ADX Florence, the toughest prison in America. They are gone, and they are not coming back.

The inclusion of these provisions is the first time that restrictions related to Guantanamo have been included in the Intelligence Authorization Act, and I believe that alone sets an unfortunate precedent that could undermine what has been a largely bipartisan effort. These provisions are unnecessary and unwise, and they do not belong in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the House to reconsider these provisions, to trust in American justice, diplomacy, and the best military advice, and to give the administration a means to shutter a prison that both shames us and perpetuates the threat to the Nation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, although I appreciate the ranking member's concerns about these provisions, I do remain concerned that further releases from Guantanamo will threaten our national security.

Press reports now indicate that the administration intends to transfer up to 10 additional detainees this month. As the committee learned through its many briefings and hearings, the five detainees released to Qatar last May have participated in activities that threaten the United States and its allies and are counter to U.S. national security interests, not unlike their activities before they were detained. No intelligence community element should enable any future transfers that endanger national security.

Furthermore, I would note that these provisions are substantively identical to the provisions passed by the House Armed Services Committee as part of the National Defense Authorization Act. Mr. Chairman, 26 of the 27 Democrats on that committee voted to advance an NDAA that contained similar restrictions. The provisions in our bill will complement those restrictions, as well as the restrictions put forward in the defense appropriations bills for several years running and this committee's previous intelligence authorization bills. The ranking member may have forgotten, but in 2012, there were provisions similar to this one that were included in the legislation.

In sum, these provisions represent a strong and enduring consensus in Congress that Guantanamo should remain open and that detainees should not be transferred to the U.S. for any reason. As everyone here is aware, several detainees who have been released from Guantanamo have gone back to the fight and killed and wounded Americans. Putting detainees in U.S. prisons, as the administration originally proposed, would be disruptive and potentially disastrous. The threat is real, and Guantanamo is already equipped to handle the detention and military trial of these individuals, as appropriate.

For those reasons, I would urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHIFF. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to urge support for this amendment. This is one of the few areas of disagreement between the chairman and myself. When we look at how we are progressing or the lack of more progress in our struggle against ISIS and al Qaeda in places like Syria and Iraq, we are often tempted to consider those that we take off the battlefield as a metric of our success—we have eliminated so many combatants from the battlefield. But of course that number in isolation means very little.

And the challenge is that with every one we take off the battlefield, there are new foreign fighters coming onto the battlefield.

The recruitment of those additional fighters uses a variety of images and issues to attract people to join the jihad. One of the issues that is continually used as recruiting propaganda is the presence of the detention center at Guantanamo Bay. This is a recruitment vehicle for the jihadis. It is a rallying cry for the jihadis.

The closure of this prison will not end the threat from ISIS or al Qaeda. There will be other efforts to recruit. But why give them this recruitment tool when there are other, better ways that these people can be incarcerated? Why give them this recruitment vehicle when there are ways that we can secure the people at Guantanamo Bay, prosecute the people at Guantanamo Bay, uphold our highest standards and the rule of law, and remove at least one part the jihadi social media and other propaganda campaign?

Mr. Chairman, I think it is in our national security interest to do so. I would urge support for the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I know that the gentleman believes every word that he is saying. We have had robust debate in the Intelligence Committee behind closed doors, and we have had robust debate out in open session, and it is a debate I think that will always continue.

However, the concern remains from the majority Members of Congress that they would prefer to keep Guantanamo open because no one wants to bring those terrorists to the United States, to their backyard, to try them in their State or their county or their community.

So I respect the gentleman's concerns, and we will continue to debate those, but I will continue to oppose closing Guantanamo or having our intelligence community participate in the removal of detainees from Guantanamo.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. ROONEY OF FLORIDA

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 114-155.

Mr. ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title III, add the following new section:

**SEC. 3. REPORT ON HIRING OF GRADUATES OF CYBER CORPS SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM BY INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence, in coordination with the Director of the National Science Foundation, shall submit to the congressional intelligence committees a report on the employment by the intelligence community of graduates of the Cyber Corps Scholarship Program. The report shall include the following:

(1) The number of graduates of the Cyber Corps Scholarship Program hired by each element of the intelligence community.

(2) A description of how each element of the intelligence community recruits graduates of the Cyber Corps Scholar Program.

(3) A description of any processes available to the intelligence community to expedite the hiring or processing of security clearances for graduates of the Cyber Corps Scholar Program.

(4) Recommendations by the Director to improve the hiring by the intelligence community of graduates of the Cyber Corps Scholarship Program, including any recommendations for legislative action to carry out such improvements.

(b) CYBER CORPS SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM DEFINED.—In this section, the term "Cyber Corps Scholarship Program" means the Federal Cyber Scholarship-for-Service Program under section 302 of the Cybersecurity Enhancement Act of 2014 (15 U.S.C. 7442).

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 315, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROONEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, as we debate this bill today, hackers across the world are trying furiously to break into our cyber networks, as we all know. And as we have seen in recent weeks, they are occasionally successful, and the consequences are grave. These cracks in our cyber defense put our security at risk. They also threaten American businesses and the privacy and credit of individuals across this country.

For the sake of our national security and our economy, we must work together to improve our cyber capabilities. This requires a stronger, more capable cyber workforce, which our bipartisan amendment will help facilitate.

The Federal CyberCorps Scholarship for Service program gives scholarships to students who study in the cybersecurity field. In exchange, those students commit to serving in government cybersecurity positions after graduation. Leaders within the intelligence community and DOD have told us that they need to expand their workforce and want to hire graduates from this program. Unfortunately, outdated personnel rules and insufficient direct hire authority make it extremely difficult for them to do so. As a result, these

students aren't able to fulfill their work commitment and we are unable to meet our workforce needs, and our cybersecurity suffers.

We believe Congress should help remove those obstacles and make it easier to bring those graduates into the cyber workforce. Our amendment starts that process by requiring a report back to us on how many CyberCorps graduates go to work for the intelligence community and how these agencies recruit them. This information will help us determine how to streamline the hiring process so we are capitalizing on the best cybersecurity talent available.

Mr. Chairman, this is a simple, bipartisan amendment, but it will pay dividends to improve and expand our cyber workforce and strengthen our national security.

I would like to thank Congresswoman SEWELL from Alabama for her assistance in this amendment.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition, even though I am not opposed.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from California is recognized.

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank the gentleman from Florida and the gentlewoman from Alabama, both HPSCI colleagues, for their amendment, and I am happy to support it.

This amendment furthers two important goals: first, to ensure that academic programs that should serve as a resource to the government—in this case, the National Science Foundation's CyberCorps Scholarship for Service—actually do result in a good number of students choosing employment within the intelligence community; and second, to deepen the bench of our cyber defenders.

As a recent series of serious cyber breaches has demonstrated, it is an imperative for the protection of this Nation's workforce, privacy, and sensitive intelligence that we strengthen the IC's cyber cadre with our best and brightest. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a fine addition to the gentleman's and the gentlewoman's other initiatives already represented in the bill, particularly those that advance diversity in the intelligence community.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleagues for their work. I urge support for this bipartisan amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of this bipartisan, common sense amendment that seeks to streamline and strengthen our Intelligence Community's (IC) cyber workforce. I am pleased to join my fellow colleague, Rep. ROONEY, who shares

my deeply held desire to help meet the incredible need to raise the number of professionals in the critically important field of cybersecurity.

The recent breach of OPM which compromised the personal information of nearly 4 million federal employees further illustrates our urgent and immediate need to make substantial improvements to our cyber databases and overall cyber infrastructure. Cyberattacks have become increasingly common, and state sponsored bad actors pose a serious threat to our national security. These types of attacks are one of the most urgent modern challenges to our nation. Our government must be poised to do more to prevent future attacks. We must position ourselves to curtail any threat, no matter how great or small.

In December 2011, the National Science and Technology Council, in cooperation with the National Science Foundation (NSF), advanced a broad, coordinated federal strategic plan to enhance cybersecurity research and education. As part of this plan, the NSF launched the CyberCorps Scholarship for Service (SFS) program. In an effort to bolster our federal workforce's capacity and advance the nation's economic prosperity and national security, this program provides funding for undergraduate and graduate level scholarships to students interested in cybersecurity. In return, scholarship recipients are required to work for a Federal, State, Local, or Tribal Government organization in a position related to cybersecurity for a period equal to the length of the scholarship. In essence, students receive a scholarship in exchange for their commitment to federal civil service. This program seeks to cultivate pipelines for applicants from undergraduate and graduate programs into federal careers focusing on combatting emerging cyber security threats.

Leaders within the Intelligence Community tell me, however, that outdated policies and onerous clearance procedures are inhibiting their ability to fill industry vacancies with young and diverse cybersecurity professionals.

Our amendment simply requires the Intelligence Community to report to Congress on how many CyberCorps graduates actually go to work for the IC and how IC agencies recruit these CyberCorps graduates. This information will help Congress determine how we can best improve the hiring process.

I strongly believe that Congress should be facilitating ways to help the Intelligence Community hire these critically important CyberCorps graduates and create a pipeline directly into our cyber workforce.

I encourage my colleagues to vote yes on this amendment.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROONEY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. MOULTON

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 114-155.

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title III, add the following new section:

**SEC. 3 —. REPORT ON EFFECTS OF DATA BREACH OF OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT.**

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall transmit to the congressional intelligence committees a report on the data breach of the Office of Personnel Management disclosed in June 2015.

(b) MATTERS INCLUDED.—The report under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) The effects, if any, of the data breach on the operations of the intelligence community abroad, including the types of operations, if any, that have been negatively affected or entirely suspended or terminated as a result of the data breach.

(2) An assessment of the effects of the data breach to each element of the intelligence community.

(3) An assessment of how foreign persons, groups, or countries may use the data collected by the data breach (particularly regarding information included in background investigations for security clearances), including with respect to—

(A) recruiting intelligence assets;

(B) influencing decision-making processes within the Federal Government, including regarding foreign policy decisions; and

(C) compromising employees of the Federal Government and friends and families of such employees for the purpose of gaining access to sensitive national security and economic information.

(4) An assessment of which departments or agencies of the Federal Government use the best practices to protect sensitive data, including a summary of any such best practices that were not used by the Office of Personnel Management.

(5) An assessment of the best practices used by the departments or agencies identified under paragraph (4) to identify and fix potential vulnerabilities in the systems of the department or agency.

(c) BRIEFING.—The Director of National Intelligence shall provide to the congressional intelligence committees an interim briefing on the report under subsection (a), including a discussion of proposals and options for responding to cyber attacks.

(d) FORM.—The report under subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 315, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOULTON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, recently, the Office of Personnel Management disclosed a massive security breach that may have exposed personal information of millions of current and former Federal employees, including those who work in sensitive national security positions. Simply put, this cyber breach is unacceptable and breaks faith with those dedicated military and civilian personnel who commit their lives to keeping our country safe.

Although responsibility has not yet been officially confirmed, many observers believe that individuals in China, who may have been acting on orders of the Chinese Government, were responsible for hacking into OPM databases.

Two things are clear, Mr. Chairman. First, we must ensure this does not

happen again; we must protect our Federal employees—our foreign service officers, State Department staff, members of the intelligence community, and many others. Second, we must make clear to the rest of the world that these attacks will not be tolerated and that there will be consequences.

Mr. Chairman, that is why my amendment takes the first of many critical steps to respond to this breach. My amendment starts the process of holding OPM accountable. It makes sure we leverage the best data security practices that our intelligence agencies use to protect sensitive personal information about our military and civilian personnel who work day in and day out to keep our country safe.

Finally, my amendment ensures that the United States Congress can play a constructive role in developing a meaningful, forceful response to cyber attacks—especially attacks aimed at our Nation's security. We must stop these attacks and protect those who commit their lives to our safety. This amendment is an important first step in doing just that.

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

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chair, we are prepared to accept the amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chairman, the Intelligence Committee, I think, in a bipartisan manner, has the same concerns as the gentleman.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

Mr. SCHIFF. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

We expect timely briefs on all major cyber attacks, but in this case, I agree, we need to require specific reporting and briefing on the impacts of the recent OPM breach. We need to learn far more about how hackers accessed the systems, what they obtained, and how we can prevent this from happening again. In addition, this will help us understand the impact to the intelligence community.

Mr. Chairman, as I have said before, our public and private networks are not sufficiently secure, and they are a regular target for cyber attacks. We must do everything we can to shore them up, and we must do so now.

I want to thank my colleague for his work, and I urge support of his amendment.

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOULTON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. TURNER

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in House Report 114-155.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3. ASSESSMENT ON FUNDING OF POLITICAL PARTIES AND NONGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS BY THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees an intelligence community assessment on the funding of political parties and nongovernmental organizations in former Soviet states and countries in Europe by the Russian Federation and the security and intelligence services of the Russian Federation since January 1, 2006. Such assessment shall include the following:

(1) The country involved, the entity funded, the security service involved, and the intended effect of the funding.

(2) An evaluation of such intended effects, including with respect to—

(A) undermining the political cohesion of the country involved;

(B) undermining the missile defense of the United States and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; and

(C) undermining energy projects that could provide an alternative to Russian energy.

(b) FORM.—The report under subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(c) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means the following:

(1) The congressional intelligence communities.

(2) The Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

(3) The Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 315, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

□ 1515

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Chairman, my bipartisan amendment requires the Director of National Intelligence to submit a report to Congress on the funding of political parties and NGOs in former Soviet states by the Russian Federation and its associated security and intelligence services.

As Congress well knows, a resurgent Russia, led by President Vladimir Putin, is once again determined to destabilize the West and various Euro-Atlantic institutions such as NATO.

While we have seen the blatant use of military force both in Georgia and Ukraine, Russia has employed a variety of nontraditional methods to disrupt the West. These methods include the use of propaganda through state-owned media outlets such as Russia Today, manipulation of European natural gas markets, and the use of money to influence political parties and nongovernmental organizations throughout Europe.

In a recent New York Times article, authors Peter Baker and Steven Er-

langer highlight a series of instances in which the Russian Federation covertly funneled money to political organizations in Europe in order to influence various decisionmakers and parties.

While their ultimate goal remains the fragmentation of institutions such as the EU and NATO, Russia hopes to achieve incremental victories like influencing the EU's upcoming decision on whether or not to renew sanctions against them.

As president of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly and chair of the Assembly's U.S. delegation, I have had the opportunity to meet frequently with my European counterparts to discuss this issue. In all instances, Assembly members continue to validate and echo the concerns discussed here today. Only through an increased understanding can we begin to effectively plan and combat President Putin and a resurging Russia.

I ask all of my colleagues to rise in support of this bipartisan amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition, even though I am not opposed.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentlemen from Ohio, Alabama, and New York for their amendment, which I am proud to support.

This amendment requires the Director of National Intelligence to provide an assessment on funding of political parties and NGOs in the former Soviet states and countries in Europe by the Russian Federation and its security and intelligence services.

Over the past few years, we have witnessed a number of highly visible, aggressive actions by Russia, particularly in Ukraine; but Moscow's efforts to destabilize its neighbors are also subtler and more nefarious. Russia is sponsoring and funding political parties to groom the next generation of puppets which they can control from Moscow.

We must better understand what they are doing, even if what they are doing is very deep behind the scenes; so long as sources and methods are properly protected, I support this effort.

Again, I want to thank my colleagues for their work, and I urge support of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Chairman, as the chairman well remembers, with the cold war, there was a time when the conflict between the United States and Russia was very tense. This amendment will help us bring to bear light on the actions of Russia so that we can make certain our policies reflect the new aggressiveness of the Russian Federation.

Mr. NUNES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TURNER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. NUNES. I really appreciate the gentleman. He is one of the most involved Members of Congress with NATO, so I know that his concerns are valid. I, too, share those concerns and would urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. FARR

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in House Report 114-155.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title III, add the following new section:

**SEC. 3. REPORT ON CONTINUOUS EVALUATION OF SECURITY CLEARANCES.**

Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to the congressional intelligence committees and the congressional defense committees (as defined in section 101(a)(16) of title 10, United States Code) a report on the continuous evaluation of security clearances of employees, officers, and contractors of the intelligence community. The report shall include the following:

(1) The status of the continuous evaluation program of the intelligence community, including a timeline for the implementation of such program.

(2) A comparison of such program to the automated continuous evaluation system of the Department of Defense.

(3) Identification of any possible efficiencies that could be achieved by the intelligence community leveraging the automated continuous evaluation system of the Department of Defense.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 315, the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, today, I rise to offer an amendment which strengthens the process for granting security clearances to those working in the intelligence community through a continuous evaluation process.

This amendment directs the National Intelligence Director to provide the intelligence and defense committees a report on the status of its current efforts for continuous evaluation of security clearance holders, including a timeline for its rollout. The report will also provide a cost-benefit analysis of DNI's efforts to similar efforts that are being carried on in the Department of Defense.

We learned, after the tragic shooting in the Navy Yard in September 2013, the DOD should continuously evaluate these personnel, rather than do it every once every 5 years.

Clearance starts by an initial vetting that determines a person's suitability

and eligibility to have access to classified material by examining the person's past and making a judgment on future reliability. Now, once cleared, a continuous evaluation process is designed to examine a person's behavior to ensure its continued reliability.

Congress directed the DOD to create a process that would be a government-wide solution for continuous personnel security evaluations. This solution is called ACES, Automated Continuous Evaluation System.

Now, the Director of National Intelligence is also seeking its own capability for continuous evaluation. While I support the intelligence community's requirement, their efforts may be redundant.

DOD's system already has measurable successes. Their system is also flexible enough to be tailored to meet any specific requirements that the intelligence community may need.

My amendment simply assures that the DNI does not work towards a continuous evaluation system in a vacuum. By working together to share lessons learned or build a common evaluation system, the DNI and the DOD can build a better program that ensures our national security and uses taxpayer dollars effectively.

As we have all seen recently, the insider threat to our national security is real. We must continue to ensure that we remain secure by only granting security clearances to those who are suitable and reliable.

I ask for an "aye" vote on the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to accept the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF), my colleague, the ranking member of the Intelligence Committee.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman and my good friend from California for his amendment, which I am very happy to support.

An important role of Congress and of this bill is to ensure that our intelligence agencies protect sensitive information and protect taxpayer dollars.

This amendment supports both of these goals by requiring that the Office of the Director of National Intelligence report to Congress on its continuous evaluation process for security clearances and to compare those processes to those the Department of Defense uses. This comparative study will help identify places where we may be able to make improvements and save money.

I want to thank Mr. FARR for his amendment and his diligence.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MS. SINEMA

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 11 printed in House Report 114-155.

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk, and I offer that amendment at this time.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 42, after line 12, insert the following:

**SEC. 336. REPORT ON STRATEGY, EFFORTS, AND RESOURCES TO DETECT, DETER, AND DEGRADE ISLAMIC STATE REVENUE MECHANISMS.**

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the intelligence community should dedicate necessary resources to defeating the revenue mechanisms of the Islamic State.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to the intelligence committees a report on the strategy, efforts, and resources of the intelligence community that are necessary to detect, deter, and degrade the revenue mechanisms of the Islamic State.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 315, the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Arizona.

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to say thank you to Mr. FITZPATRICK for cosponsoring this amendment and for his leadership as the chairman of the Task Force to Investigate Terrorism Financing. Thank you also to Chairman NUNES and Ranking Member SCHIFF for supporting this important amendment.

The purpose of the bipartisan Sinema-Fitzpatrick amendment is to choke off the Islamic State's revenue stream. Our amendment directs the intelligence community to detect, deter, and degrade Islamic State's revenue sources and to report on the strategy and resources needed for success.

The Islamic State is one of the world's most violent and dangerous terrorist groups. Its goals to build a caliphate in the Middle East and encourage attacks in Europe and the United States represent a new threat to our country and to global stability.

ISIL is also believed to be the richest terrorist organization in history, controlling a huge territory in Iraq and Syria containing significant oil resources. In 2014, the Islamic State generated approximately \$1 million per day through the sale of smuggled oil, extortion, and kidnapping for ransom.

U.S. strikes have reportedly diminished ISIL's oil revenues, but the breadth of this terrorist organization's

funding sources represents a serious challenge to our national security.

A February report by the Financial Action Task Force estimated that ISIL now largely finances itself through extortion in the territory it controls, and another study places this extortion revenue at \$360 million per year. In Iraq, ISIL levies a 5 percent tax on all withdrawals from banks, and the organization also gains tens of millions of dollars from kidnapping on an annual basis.

To defeat ISIL and protect our country, we must cut off the Islamic State's diverse and substantial sources of revenue.

I encourage my colleagues to support this commonsense bipartisan amendment.

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

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I do not intend to oppose the amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK).

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman, and I thank my colleague Ms. SINEMA for her work on this important amendment and for her work as well on the task force established to investigate terrorism financing.

Today, the terror threat faced by our Nation and our intelligence community is more diverse and sophisticated than it has ever been before. Organizations like Hezbollah, ISIS, and Boko Haram can no longer simply be considered terrorist groups.

They have grown into much more dangerous entities, ones with the abilities to self-finance their actions through means far beyond traditional methods, from illicit oil sales and human trafficking to regional taxation and antiquity dealing.

In order to effectively combat such evolved threats, U.S. policy must also evolve. As chair of the bipartisan Task Force to Investigate Terrorism Financing, established by the Committee on Financial Services, I have worked with lawmakers and policy experts to guarantee the U.S. response to terror's new revenue streams are quickly and effectively choked out.

This amendment is important to ensure each level of our government, from Congress to the intelligence community, has identified the problem, as well as potential weaknesses, and is ready to address the threats that we face.

By both expressing the sense of Congress that our intelligence agencies must dedicate resources to eradicate terror revenue mechanisms, as well as report to relevant committees on their strategies, this amendment strengthens the underlying bill and Congress'

understanding of our global response to terrorism.

The threat to freedom and democracy posed by the Islamic State and groups like it circles the globe, and the United States can ill afford to combat these enemies on the battlefield alone. Any strategy against terror groups worldwide must attack not only militarily, but at their funding source. Organizations, no matter how complex, cannot effectively function without requisite resources.

Mr. Chairman, our intelligence community is second to none, and I am certain that, together, we can formulate and carry out long-term solutions to combat terror financing.

I thank the chairman for his leadership on this issue and Ms. SINEMA for offering this amendment.

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California, Ranking Member SCHIFF, and thank him for his leadership on national security issues.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Arizona for her amendment, as well as the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I am proud to support it.

Behind ISIL's rapid and dangerous rise are its many sources of illicit funding. This amendment expresses the conviction of Congress that the intelligence community should dedicate resources to finding and eliminating those revenue sources and that the IC must report on its effort to do so.

Again, I want to thank both of my colleagues for their leadership on this issue, and I urge strong support of their amendment.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PITTENGER).

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment and congratulate Ms. SINEMA and Mr. FITZPATRICK, the chairman of the committee. This will help our terrorism task force efforts undermine the funding of ISIS.

Terrorism experts concur that ISIS is the most well-funded terrorist threat that we have ever faced. Through the illicit sale of stolen oil and antiquities, kidnapping for ransom, extortion, bank robberies, and usurious taxation, ISIS continues to amass tens of millions of dollars.

Stopping this flow of money to terrorists must be a top priority if we are to defeat ISIS. Unfortunately, earlier this month, the President admitted he does not have a comprehensive strategy to defeat ISIS.

This amendment will require the Director of National Intelligence to submit to Congress the current efforts they use to undermine the funding of ISIS, increasing our ability to ensure these efforts are a priority.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. I will look forward to the continued bipartisan support of the Financial Services Task Force to Investigate Terrorism Financing.

□ 1530

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Chair, as a member of the Task Force to Investigate Terrorism Financing, I am working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to keep money out of the hands of terrorists and to find solutions like this amendment, which strengthens America's security.

Again, I would like to thank Mr. FITZPATRICK for his partnership and leadership on this issue. I also thank Chairman NUNES, Ranking Member SCHIFF, and Mr. PITTENGER for their work on this important legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chair, we are prepared to support the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. CROWLEY

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 12 printed in House Report 114-155.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 42, after line 12, insert the following:  
**SEC. 336. REPORT ON NATIONAL SECURITY COOPERATION BETWEEN UNITED STATES, INDIA, AND ISRAEL.**

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to the congressional intelligence committees a report on possibilities for growing national security cooperation between the United States, India, and Israel.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 315, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today to urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan amendment.

I appreciate the support of my colleagues from California, Ohio, North Carolina, Arizona, and New York, who are coleaders on this effort. They are Mr. BERA, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Mr. HOLDING. I also thank the chairman and ranking member of the Intelligence Committee for their support of this amendment.

This amendment is about expanding the cooperation between the world's oldest democracy, the world's largest democracy, and a true democracy within the Middle East. That is the United States, India, and Israel. In recent years, the United States has expanded relations with Israel, as well as with India, in a number of areas.

We have also seen India and Israel work more and more together on a bilateral basis. Of course, that is because a lot of their interests overlap, but it is

also because many of our values overlap.

There is so much that our three countries can be doing together in the realm of scientific cooperation, research, best practices, national security implementation, defense, and much, much more.

There is also a lot that we can learn from each other, whether it is about drip irrigation to build food supplies, desalinization to address water shortages, or refrigeration practices to prevent the kind of food spoilage that leads to hunger, not to mention how much potential there is in technological research and economic development.

This amendment, of course, just deals with a narrow portion of these areas because the underlying bill is limited to security issues, but it is a needed start.

I truly believe that the United States-India relationship has the potential to be the world's most important "big country" relationship in the 21st century. As our ties with India grow, it is important to see the India-Israel ties increasing as well.

Here in the United States, as a former co-chair of the Congressional Caucus on India and Indian Americans, I have met with many members of the Indian American community, and I have consistently heard from visiting members of India's Government that there is a genuine desire to expand relations between India and Israel now and in the future.

In fact, it has already been reported that, in the coming months, India's Prime Minister will become the first-ever Indian Prime Minister to travel to Israel. We are going to see the leader of what will be the world's most populous nation visiting and engaging with one of the smallest nations.

The sky is really the limit on this effort going forward, and that is why the amendment asks the Director of National Intelligence to submit to Congress a plan on how to grow the U.S.-India-Israel national security relationship. This is a real possibility, and I hope the DNI can identify a solid number of ways to work together even more in the future.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition, although I do not intend to oppose the amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chair, Mr. HOLDING was just here, but unfortunately, he got called away to another meeting because I know he worked closely with Mr. CROWLEY and others as chair of the India Caucus, and he wanted me to express his strong support for this amendment. I also urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

Mr. SCHIFF. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chair, working with international partners is an essential element of the IC's mission to understand the global threat environment, as well as the political, social, and economic trends around the world.

For nearly 70 years, Israel has been a close friend and ally, as well as a vital source of intelligence about the world's most volatile region. In recent years, India, the world's largest democracy, has upgraded its bilateral relationships with both the United States and Israel. Given India's complex relationship with both Pakistan and China, exploring the potential for enhanced trilateral intelligence cooperation is very much in our interest.

Mr. CROWLEY's amendment to direct the DNI to report to Congress on the potential for intelligence sharing is timely, and I urge the House to support it.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, again, let me thank Mr. NUNES, the chair of the committee, as well as the ranking member, Mr. SCHIFF, for their support of this valuable amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. WILSON OF SOUTH CAROLINA

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 13 printed in House Report 114-155.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 42, after line 12, insert the following:  
**SEC. 336. CYBER ATTACK STANDARDS OF MEASUREMENT STUDY.**

(a) **STUDY REQUIRED.**—The Director of National Intelligence, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the Secretary of Defense, shall carry out a study to determine appropriate standards that—

(1) can be used to measure the damage of cyber incidents for the purposes of determining the response to such incidents; and

(2) include a method for quantifying the damage caused to affected computers, systems, and devices.

(b) **REPORTS TO CONGRESS.**—

(1) **PRELIMINARY FINDINGS.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall provide to the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Homeland Security, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives the initial findings of the study required under subsection (a).

(2) **REPORT.**—Not later than 360 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services,

the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Homeland Security, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives a report containing the complete findings of such study.

(3) **FORM OF REPORT.**—The report required by paragraph (2) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 315, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I am grateful for Chairman NUNES and the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence for their leadership on this important legislation.

I am particularly grateful that I was here to hear the presentation by Congressman JOE CROWLEY relative to promoting a better relationship with the world's largest democracy, India, by the world's oldest democracy, the United States.

He and I have served as the past co-chairs of the Caucus of India and Indian Americans, and I know of his commitment to promoting a better relationship between India and the United States.

Last week, the Office of Personnel Management revealed they were the targets of an extended cyber attack on Federal employee personnel records. These attacks stole personal data, such as Social Security numbers, financial information, and security clearance documents, putting the personal and financial security of our citizens at risk.

This cyber attack was not a novelty. Recently, we have seen a growing number of cyber attacks on government Web sites, national retailers, and small businesses. Indeed, according to Symantec, most businesses reported a completed or an attempted cyber attack in the last year, and 60 percent of those facing an attack were small- or medium-sized businesses. These cyber attacks are a sober reminder to Congress that all government agencies need to work together to better protect their public and private networks.

After each of these attacks, we have had a number of questions: Who is behind it? Is it an agent of a foreign government or a nonstate actor? How many records were affected? What kind of information was accessed?

As of now, we gather this information through various government agencies, and each uses a different measure to assess and quantify the damage of the attack, so we waste valuable time and resources when trying to piece together a response.

We need a clear, unified system of measurement for cyber attacks that can be used across all government agencies and military branches. By putting government agencies and branches of the military on the same

page, we can have an effective and rapid response.

This amendment directs the Director of National Intelligence, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Director of the FBI, and the Secretary of Defense, to conduct a study to define a method of measuring a cyber incident so we can determine an appropriate response.

As chairman of the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities, it is apparent that cyber is a new domain of warfare. This amendment is a critical first step in building a more comprehensive cyber defense system.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition even though I am not opposed.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentleman from South Carolina for his important amendment.

There is a limit to how effective a defensive cyber strategy can be because, while we have to defend everything at all times, our adversaries get to attack everywhere and need to be successful only once, so we need to create a more effective deterrent, which this amendment will help further.

It would require that the Office of the Director of National Intelligence report to Congress on how we measure cyber attacks so that we can know how best to respond once we are attacked or to communicate in advance how we would respond if we were attacked. Measuring the scale and effects of cyber attacks is no easy task, especially as we must factor in second and third order effects.

I want to thank Mr. WILSON for his amendment. I am proud to support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MR. POE OF TEXAS

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 14 printed in House Report 114-155.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 42, after line 12, insert the following:  
**SEC. 336. REPORT ON WILDLIFE TRAFFICKING.**

(a) REPORTS REQUIRED.—Not later than 365 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to the congressional committees specified in subsection (b) a report on wildlife trafficking.

(b) SPECIFIED MEMBERS AND COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—The congressional committees specified in this subsection are the following:

(1) Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

(2) Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

(3) Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate.

(4) Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

(5) Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(6) Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives.

(c) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—The report submitted under subsection (a) shall include each of the following:

(1) An assessment of the major source, transit, and destination countries for wildlife trafficking products or their derivatives and how such products or derivatives are trafficked.

(2) An assessment of the efforts of those countries identified as major source, transit, and destination countries to counter wildlife trafficking and to adhere to their international treaty obligations relating to endangered or threatened species.

(3) An assessment of critical vulnerabilities that can be used to counter wildlife trafficking.

(4) An assessment of the extent of involvement of designated foreign terrorist organizations and transnational criminal organizations in wildlife trafficking.

(5) An assessment of key actors and facilitators, including government officials, that are supporting wildlife trafficking.

(6) An assessment of the annual net worth of wildlife trafficking globally and the financial flows that enables wildlife trafficking.

(7) An assessment of the impact of wildlife trafficking on key wildlife populations.

(8) An assessment of the effectiveness of efforts taken to date to counter wildlife trafficking.

(9) An assessment of the effectiveness of capacity-building efforts by the United States Government.

(10) An assessment of the impact of wildlife trafficking on the national security of the United States.

(11) An assessment of the level of coordination between United States intelligence and law enforcement agencies on intelligence related to wildlife trafficking, the capacity of those agencies to process and act on that intelligence effectively, existing barriers to effective coordination, and the degree to which relevant intelligence is shared with and acted upon by bilateral and multilateral law enforcement partners.

(12) An assessment of the gaps in intelligence capabilities to assess transnational wildlife trafficking networks and steps currently being taken, in line with the Implementation Plan to the National Strategy for Combating Wildlife Trafficking, to remedy such information gaps.

(d) FORM.—The report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 315, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This amendment, cosponsored by the ranking member on the Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade Subcommittee, Mr. KEATING from Massachusetts, requires the Director of National Intelligence to produce a report on wildlife trafficking, how terrorist organizations are involved, how they

are making money off of wildlife trafficking, and the impact it has on U.S. national security.

During our Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade Subcommittee hearing on this very issue in February, we learned that rhinos and elephants are on the path to extinction.

For example, back in the seventies, there were approximately 65,000 rhinos in Africa. Since then, about 1,000 a year have been killed, and now, there are only 5,000 left in Africa. That is a 94 percent drop in those rhinos. There are only five white rhinos in the whole world.

Elephants are not faring much better. From 2002 to 2010, the elephant population across Africa dropped 66 percent. Back in the thirties and forties, Mr. Chairman, there were approximately 5 million African elephants. Now there are about a half a million African elephants.

One of the most famous was Satao in this photograph that was taken last year. He was, presumably, the oldest elephant that was in existence in Africa. He was killed last year for his tusks, which almost touched the ground. In fact, National Geographic, a year ago today, did an article on him and how he was killed for his tusks and how other elephants are being killed for their tusks. He was about 46 years old when he was killed for those tusks.

The reason that poaching seems to be on the increase over the last few years is that there is a low risk of apprehension, and it is easy to commit these crimes. Also, even when someone is captured, penalties for wildlife trafficking are far less than for drug trafficking.

Who uses these tusks? Who uses these rhino horns? The number one country in the world that is the consumer of the illegal ivory trade is China. Vietnam is the number one country in the world that uses the illegal trade of rhino horns. This is where these tusks and these rhino horns go, and it brings in a lot of money.

For example, a kilogram of rhino horns—if I remember my math correctly, that is 2.2 pounds—sells for \$60,000. So there is a lot more money involved in the sale of rhino horns and of elephant tusks than even of gold and platinum.

Overall, the illegal wildlife trade is about \$10 billion to \$20 billion a year. It should come as no surprise that terrorist organizations are also involved in this criminal enterprise, like al Qaeda's affiliate al Shabaab and like Joseph Kony's Lord's Resistance Army. They are cashing in on the illegal wildlife trafficking.

It is getting so bad that the poachers have become very sophisticated in the sense that they no longer just shoot elephants, for example, because that makes a noise, that warns them. They are even being poisoned. An elephant is poisoned, and the elephant dies.

Then, when people approach the elephant, they not only see the dead elephant, but they see other animals that

were feeding on the carcass of the elephant, and they are all dead, too, so that the poachers can get those tusks. They have become very innovative.

□ 1545

Local park rangers are under-resourced; they are ill-equipped; and some of them are corrupt as well. So we can't fight what we don't know.

There is a lot about this issue—and terrorist involvement in wildlife trafficking—that is murky, so we need to find out, for example: How much money do terrorists get from wildlife trafficking? Who are the key facilitators of the trade? What government officials are complicit? What impact does this have on the U.S. national security?

This amendment requires the Director of National Intelligence to report to Congress on these and other questions. The better we understand the threat, the better we understand what is happening and how terrorists are involved in the illegal killing of rhinos and elephants, the more effective we can be against fighting those terrorists. And that is just the way it is.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, even though I am not opposed.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentlemen from Texas and Massachusetts for their amendment, which I am proud to support.

The trafficking of wildlife by terrorist organizations is an important issue, not only because it threatens to wipe out elephants, rhinos, and tigers, but also because it could threaten our national security. The World Wildlife Fund estimates that the amount of money generated by wildlife trafficking trade reaches into the hundreds of millions of dollars, and much of this goes to fund terrorists, including The Lord's Resistance Army, al-Shabaab, and Boko Haram. That is money going into the coffers of those who every day seek to harm us and others.

We must put our intelligence professionals to the task. We must understand from beginning to end how terrorists acquire, transfer, and profit from wildlife trafficking. This is the first step to putting an end to it.

Again, I want to thank my colleagues for offering this amendment. I urge support.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POE of Texas. I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MR. POE OF TEXAS

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 15 printed in House Report 114-155.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 42, after line 12, insert the following:  
**SEC. 336. REPORT ON TERRORIST USE OF SOCIAL MEDIA.**

(a) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to the congressional committees specified in subsection (b) a report that represents the coordinated assessment of the intelligence community on terrorist use of social media.

(b) **SPECIFIED MEMBERS AND COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.**—The congressional committees specified in this subsection are the following:

(1) Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

(2) Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

(3) Committee on Judiciary of the Senate.

(4) Committee on Homeland and Government Affairs of the Senate.

(5) Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

(6) Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(7) Committee on Judiciary of the House of Representatives.

(8) Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives.

(c) **MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.**—The report submitted under subsection (a) shall include each of the following:

(1) An assessment of what role social media plays in radicalization in the United States and elsewhere.

(2) An assessment of how terrorists and terrorist organizations are using social media, including trends.

(3) An assessment of the intelligence value of social media posts by terrorists and terrorist organizations.

(4) An assessment of the impact on the national security of the United States of the public availability of terrorist content on social media for fundraising, radicalization, and recruitment.

(d) **FORM.**—The report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 315, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, terrorists' use of social media has exploded over the past several years. A recent study by The Brookings Institution found that ISIS had over 40,000 Twitter accounts. Terrorist groups from ISIS to the Taliban use social media platforms to recruit, to radicalize, to spread propaganda, and to raise money. I have seen fan pages for the Khorasan Group, an online press conference held on Twitter by the al Qaeda branch in Yemen, and we all remember al-Shabaab live tweeting the murder of 72 people in Kenya. All terrorist groups.

The benefits of social media are clear. Social media is easy to use, it is free, and it reaches huge audiences across the world. We need to better un-

derstand why terrorists' use of social media is effective and what impact it is having on the world.

This bipartisan amendment is co-sponsored by the ranking member on our Subcommittee on Terrorism, Non-proliferation, and Trade, Mr. KEATING from Massachusetts. This amendment requires the Director of National Intelligence to assess four parts of the social media problem: First, what role does social media play in radicalizing people in the United States and abroad?

The rise of the lone wolf terrorism in recent years has been fueled, in part, by terrorists' use of social media. Just recently, in Garland, Texas, two individuals claiming ISIS connections were killed while they were attacking an assembly on free speech and peaceable assembly of religion. Evidence shows that they had some social connection, social media connection with ISIS. The Boston bombers made two pressure cooker bombs. The recipes for those bombs were published before the attack in al Qaeda's Inspire magazine. That magazine was released and promoted on social media.

Second, how exactly are terrorists using social media? Social media is constantly evolving, just like terrorists' use of social media platforms. Following online trends is an essential element in putting resources where they have the most impact. We need to make fast-paced improvements in this area as new trends and platforms emerge.

Third, what is the real intelligence value of terrorists' posts? In 2012, a number of my colleagues and I sent a letter to the FBI asking, What intelligence value is terrorists' use of social media? The FBI has not come up with an answer. We need a detailed understanding from the whole intelligence community on just how valuable the intelligence is that we are getting from terrorists' use of social media.

Finally, how does online fundraising, radicalization, and recruitment by terrorists impact U.S. national security? We know social media is a valuable tool to the terrorists just by how often they use it. Unfortunately, the United States is way behind on countering terrorists' use of social media, so we should do more. Terrorists like ISIS are out to destroy us. We have to fight to defeat them on every battlefield, and that includes in social media.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, even though I am not opposed.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, social media, like any other form of communication, can be exploited by bad actors for nefarious purposes. While we are lucky to live in a time of remarkable innovation that brings us closer to

one another no matter what our geographical distance may be, our adversaries use the same tools to spread hateful and dangerous messages across the globe.

I, therefore, support this amendment that calls on the intelligence community to provide Congress with greater information about how terrorist organizations use social media for fundraising, radicalization, and recruitment. Armed with that knowledge, we are more capable of stopping them.

I yield back the balance of my time.  
Mr. POE of Texas. I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR. POE OF TEXAS

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 16 printed in House Report 114-155.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 42, after line 12, insert the following:  
**SEC. 336. REPORT ON UNITED STATES COUNTER-TERRORISM STRATEGY TO DISRUPT, DISMANTLE, AND DEFEAT ISIL, AL-QAEDA, AND THEIR AFFILIATED GROUPS, ASSOCIATED GROUPS, AND ADHERENTS.**

(a) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a comprehensive report on the United States counterterrorism strategy to disrupt, dismantle, and defeat the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), al-Qaeda, and their affiliated groups, associated groups, and adherents.

(2) COORDINATION.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall be prepared in coordination with the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Attorney General, and the Secretary of Defense, and the head of any other department or agency of the United States Government that has responsibility for activities directed at combating ISIL, al-Qaeda, and their affiliated groups, associated groups, and adherents.

(3) ELEMENTS.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include each of the following:

(A) A definition of—

(i) al-Qaeda core, including a list of which known individuals constitute al-Qaeda core;

(ii) ISIL, including a list of which known individuals constitute ISIL leadership;

(iii) an affiliated group of ISIL or al-Qaeda, including a list of which known groups constitute an affiliate group of ISIL or al-Qaeda;

(iv) an associated group of ISIL or al-Qaeda, including a list of which known groups constitute an associated group of ISIL or al-Qaeda;

(v) an adherent of ISIL or al-Qaeda, including a list of which known groups constitute an adherent of ISIL or al-Qaeda; and

(vi) a group aligned with ISIL or al-Qaeda, including a description of what actions a group takes or statements it makes that qualify it as a group aligned with ISIL or al-Qaeda.

(B) An assessment of the relationship between all identified ISIL or al-Qaeda affili-

ated groups, associated groups, and adherents with ISIL leadership or al-Qaeda core.

(C) An assessment of the strengthening or weakening of ISIL or al-Qaeda, its affiliated groups, associated groups, and adherents, from January 1, 2010, to the present, including a description of the metrics that are used to assess strengthening or weakening and an assessment of the relative increase or decrease in violent attacks attributed to such entities.

(D) An assessment of whether or not an individual can be a member of al-Qaeda core if such individual is not located in Afghanistan or Pakistan.

(E) An assessment of whether or not an individual can be a member of al-Qaeda core as well as a member of an al-Qaeda affiliated group, associated group, or adherent.

(F) A definition of defeat of ISIL or core al-Qaeda.

(G) An assessment of the extent or coordination, command, and control between ISIL or core al-Qaeda and their affiliated groups, associated groups, and adherents, specifically addressing each such entity.

(H) An assessment of the effectiveness of counterterrorism operations against ISIL or core al-Qaeda, their affiliated groups, associated groups, and adherents, and whether such operations have had a sustained impact on the capabilities and effectiveness of ISIL or core al-Qaeda, their affiliated groups, associated groups, and adherents.

(4) FORM.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(b) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(1) the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Select Committee on Intelligence, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 315, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment requires a strategy to defeat ISIS and other like-minded groups. It is incredible that after 4 years of the rise of ISIS, we still have to talk about needing a strategy, but here we are.

Four years, Mr. Chairman, what is that? Well, in 4 years the United States mobilized the whole country and had to fight two wars—one in the Pacific and one in Europe—during World War II, and we were successful in protecting the United States, but here after 4 years of the rise of ISIS, we are not sure even what our strategy is.

One thing we do know: controlling land is a top priority for ISIS. Its own credibility is wrapped up in the idea of establishing a caliphate. Without land, ISIS has no caliphate. Without a caliphate, ISIS loses its legitimacy among its hardcore fighters. Controlling land is also how ISIS makes a lot of its money. See, ISIS extorts the people that it controls. It also taxes them. ISIS is still bringing in millions of dollars a day by other illegal activities.

The only way to stop that source of money is by taking back land that ISIS controls. Because ISIS is embedded in civilian populations, U.S. airstrikes are not enough to take the land back. The Iraqi Army is still too unprofessional to show that they are up to the job, and we have all seen ourselves how the Iraqis have dropped American weapons and run. We have yet to give the Kurds the weapons they need to fight for themselves, and we don't expect the dictator Assad to get the job done.

The problem of ISIS is only getting bigger. Thousands of foreign fighters are still streaming into Iraq and Syria from other countries. Outside of Iraq and Syria, ISIS still has 10 networks, not including Iraq and Syria. There are three in Libya, two in Saudi Arabia, and one each in the Sinai, Nigeria, Yemen, Algeria, and one in Pakistan and Afghanistan.

Saudi Arabia is known for its strong government control, but the ISIS affiliate in Saudi Arabia recently pulled off two successful suicide attack bombings in 2 weeks. Its affiliate in Yemen has taken advantage of the fall of the government to take over more land. The ISIS affiliate in Libya is running free in a lawless area throughout the same country that killed our Ambassador and three other Americans. All of ISIS' 10 networks are growing stronger, not weaker, by the day.

The President said last year that the United States would defeat and dismantle ISIS. Well, here we are a year later; we still do not have that strategy. That is at least according to the President himself last week when he was meeting with the world leaders at the G7 summit. He said: We do not yet have a complete strategy against ISIS.

This amendment requires the Director of National Intelligence to report to Congress within 6 months a complete strategy to defeat ISIS and other groups like it. The same amendment did pass unanimously last year with this committee's support. So I ask Members to support it once again this year and make it become the law of the land. Today's terrorists control more land than they have at anytime since World War II. We need a strategy; we need a plan; and we need it soon.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, it is critical that the United States continue to refine and implement a comprehensive and aggressive strategy to counter ISIL, al Qaeda, and their affiliates, but that responsibility does not lie with the Director of National Intelligence. The DNI's job is to ensure that our national leadership, who do generate our counterterrorism strategy, have the timeliest, most germane, and detailed information to be sure our strategy will be successful.

Mr. POE's amendment misclassifies that responsibility and misconstrues

the important role of the Director of National Intelligence. Our intelligence community must be free to collect and assess intelligence outside of the scope of political decisions to be sure their analysis remains impartial and objective.

So, reluctantly, I must oppose this amendment and urge my colleagues to do the same.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POE of Texas. The amendment does state that the Director of National Intelligence will work with other appropriate agencies.

Mr. Chairman, it is hard to fathom that this Nation does not have a plan to deal with ISIS. This amendment says Congress will move forward and expect and put into law that we will have a plan; we will have a strategy; and if the Director of National Intelligence is not an individual who is supposed to help form that plan, then I don't know who would be.

I would ask that this amendment be adopted.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, with respect to my colleague, we have a strategy with respect to defeating al Qaeda and ISIL, with respect to the war in Syria and Iraq. It is a comprehensive strategy and, frankly, it is a difficult strategy to implement. It is a strategy that involves cutting off terrorism financing. It is a strategy that involves cutting off the flow of foreign fighters into Syria and Iraq. It is a strategy that involves drying up the resources, the propaganda, the attacking of the recruitment mechanism of ISIS. It is a strategy that involves enlisting the support of our partners in the region and within the Islamic world to combat the perversion of their faith that is used to recruit people to this jihad. It is a strategy that is also military in character, that employs our air assets, that seeks to train and assist Iraqi forces. So we have a strategy. It is comprehensive, and it is tough.

While I recognize that there is frustration that many of my colleagues have that our strategy has thus far not borne more success—and I share that frustration—I have yet to hear any of my colleagues offer an alternative. It is one thing to bash the administration because you don't like the strategy; it is another to ignore the fact that we have a strategy or to propose improvements to it.

But the subject matter of this amendment is whether the top intelligence official in the country should be charged with the responsibility of developing the policy to defeat ISIS, and I think it is rather his responsibility to make sure that the policymakers in Congress and the administration have the very best intelligence to inform those decisions.

We see, frankly, this misunderstanding of the role of the intelligence community many times even in our committee when committee members will ask witnesses from the intel-

ligence community to state policy positions on how they think certain policies should be implemented when that is really not their responsibility.

Here, much as I concur with the need to perfect our strategy, improve our strategy, and the execution of that strategy, I don't believe that this is something that we should lay at the feet of the Director of National Intelligence.

I urge a "no" vote on the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1600

Mr. POE of Texas. I don't have anything to say, believe it or not, Mr. Chairman, so I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas) having assumed the chair, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2596) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### 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 4 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1700

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WESTMORELAND) at 5 p.m.

#### INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 315 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2596.

Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) kindly take the chair.

□ 1701

#### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the

further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2596) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes, with Mr. POE of Texas (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 16 printed in House Report 114-155 offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) had been disposed of.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. SCHIFF

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, the unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

#### RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 176, noes 246, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 367]

AYES—176

Adams	Doyle, Michael	Levin
Amash	F.	Lewis
Ashford	Duckworth	Lieu, Ted
Bass	Duncan (TN)	Loebsack
Beatty	Edwards	Lofgren
Becerra	Ellison	Lowenthal
Bera	Engel	Lowe
Beyer	Eshoo	Lujan Grisham
Bishop (GA)	Esty	(NM)
Blumenauer	Farr	Lujan, Ben Ray
Bonamici	Foster	(NM)
Brady (PA)	Frankel (FL)	Lynch
Brown (FL)	Fudge	Maloney,
Bustos	Gabbard	Carolyn
Butterfield	Gallego	Massie
Capps	Garamendi	Matsui
Capuano	Grayson	McCollum
Cárdenas	Green, Al	McDermott
Carney	Grijalva	McGovern
Carson (IN)	Gutiérrez	McNerney
Cartwright	Hahn	Meeks
Castor (FL)	Hastings	Meng
Castro (TX)	Heck (WA)	Moore
Chu, Judy	Higgins	Moulton
Cicilline	Himes	Murphy (FL)
Clark (MA)	Hinojosa	Nadler
Clarke (NY)	Honda	Napolitano
Clay	Hoyer	Neal
Cleaver	Huffman	Nolan
Clyburn	Israel	Norcross
Cohen	Jackson Lee	O'Rourke
Connolly	Jeffries	Pallone
Conyers	Johnson (GA)	Pascarell
Cooper	Johnson, E. B.	Payne
Costa	Jones	Pelosi
Courtney	Kaptur	Perlmutter
Crowley	Keating	Peters
Cummings	Kelly (IL)	Peterson
Davis (CA)	Kennedy	Pingree
Davis, Danny	Kildee	Pocan
DeFazio	Kilmer	Polis
DeGette	Kind	Price (NC)
Delaney	Kuster	Quigley
DeLauro	Langevin	Rangel
DelBene	Larsen (WA)	Rice (NY)
Deutch	Larson (CT)	Richmond
Dingell	Lawrence	Roybal-Allard
Doggett	Lee	Rush

Ryan (OH)  
 Sánchez, Linda  
 T.  
 Sanford  
 Sarbanes  
 Schakowsky  
 Schiff  
 Schrader  
 Scott (VA)  
 Scott, David  
 Serrano  
 Sherman  
 Sires

NOES—246

Abraham  
 Aderholt  
 Aguilar  
 Allen  
 Amodei  
 Babin  
 Barletta  
 Barr  
 Barton  
 Benishek  
 Bilirakis  
 Bishop (MI)  
 Bishop (UT)  
 Black  
 Blackburn  
 Blum  
 Bost  
 Boustany  
 Brady (TX)  
 Brat  
 Bridenstine  
 Brooks (AL)  
 Brooks (IN)  
 Brownley (CA)  
 Buchanan  
 Buck  
 Bucshon  
 Burgess  
 Calvert  
 Carter (GA)  
 Carter (TX)  
 Chabot  
 Chaffetz  
 Clawson (FL)  
 Coffman  
 Cole  
 Collins (GA)  
 Collins (NY)  
 Comstock  
 Conaway  
 Cook  
 Costello (PA)  
 Cramer  
 Crawford  
 Crenshaw  
 Cuellar  
 Culberson  
 Curbelo (FL)  
 Davis, Rodney  
 Denham  
 Dent  
 DeSantis  
 DesJarlais  
 Diaz-Balart  
 Dold  
 Donovan  
 Duffy  
 Duncan (SC)  
 Ellmers (NC)  
 Emmer (MN)  
 Farenthold  
 Fincher  
 Fitzpatrick  
 Fleischmann  
 Fleming  
 Flores  
 Forbes  
 Fortenberry  
 Foxx  
 Franks (AZ)  
 Frelinghuysen  
 Garrett  
 Gibbs  
 Gibson  
 Gohmert  
 Goodlatte  
 Gosar  
 Gowdy  
 Graham  
 Granger  
 Graves (GA)  
 Graves (LA)  
 Graves (MO)

Green, Gene  
 Grothman  
 Guinta  
 Guthrie  
 Hanna  
 Hardy  
 Harper  
 Harris  
 Hartzler  
 Heck (NV)  
 Hensarling  
 Herrera Beutler  
 Hice, Jody B.  
 Holding  
 Hudson  
 Huelskamp  
 Huizenga (MI)  
 Hultgren  
 Hunter  
 Hurd (TX)  
 Hurt (VA)  
 Issa  
 Jenkins (KS)  
 Jenkins (WV)  
 Johnson (OH)  
 Johnson, Sam  
 Jolly  
 Jordan  
 Joyce  
 Katko  
 Kelly (PA)  
 King (IA)  
 King (NY)  
 Kinzinger (IL)  
 Kline  
 Knight  
 Labrador  
 LaMalfa  
 Lamborn  
 Lance  
 Latta  
 Lipinski  
 LoBiondo  
 Long  
 Loudermilk  
 Love  
 Lucas  
 Luetkemeyer  
 Lummis  
 MacArthur  
 Maloney, Sean  
 Marchant  
 Marino  
 McCarthy  
 McCaul  
 McClintock  
 McKinley  
 McMorris  
 Rodgers  
 McSally  
 Meadows  
 Meehan  
 Messer  
 Mica  
 Miller (FL)  
 Miller (MI)  
 Moolenaar  
 Mooney (WV)  
 Mullin  
 Mulvaney  
 Murphy (PA)  
 Neugebauer  
 Newhouse  
 Noem  
 Nugent  
 Nunes  
 Olson  
 Palazzo  
 Palmer  
 Paulsen  
 Pearce

Vargas  
 Veasey  
 Vela  
 Velázquez  
 Vislosky  
 Walz  
 Wasserman  
 Schultz  
 Waters, Maxine  
 Watson Coleman  
 Wilson (FL)  
 Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—11

Boyle, Brendan  
 F.  
 Byrne  
 DeSaulnier  
 Fattah  
 Griffith  
 Kelly (MS)  
 McHenry  
 Sanchez, Loretta  
 Sessions  
 Sewell (AL)  
 Welch

□ 1730

Mrs. NOEM, Messrs. POMPEO, WITTMAN, JOYCE, and DESANTIS changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. BEYER, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Messrs. COHEN and MASSIE changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia) having assumed the chair, Mr. POE of Texas, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2596) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 315, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Mrs. DINGELL. I am opposed to it in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. Dingell moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2596 to the Select Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select) with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Page 29, after line 11, insert the following:

**SEC. 317. PROTECTING UNITED STATES PERSONS WHO TRAVEL.**

To maximize the security of United States civilian aviation, the Director of National

Intelligence shall identify and share with all appropriate Federal departments and agencies, including the Transportation Security Administration—

(1) all information on new and constantly changing threats used by terrorists to evade airport screening operations; and

(2) updated terrorist watch list information for the purpose of properly vetting employees at commercial airports.

**SEC. 318. PROTECTING PRIVATE PERSONAL INFORMATION FROM CYBER ATTACKS BY CHINA, RUSSIA, AND OTHER STATE-SPONSORED COMPUTER HACKERS.**

The Director of National Intelligence, in coordination with the heads of each element of the intelligence community, shall prioritize efforts and dedicate sufficient resources to uncover and to foil attempts to steal the private personal information of United States persons, including Social Security numbers, dates of birth, employment information, and health records, insofar as—

(1) up to 4,000,000 records of Federal employees under the control of the Office of Personnel Management were stolen;

(2) the information of 80,000,000 Americans was compromised by the attacks on Anthem Health Insurance and CareFirst BlueCross BlueShield;

(3) the health records of more than 29,000,000 Americans were compromised in data breaches between 2010 and 2013; and

(4) the personnel records of millions of Federal employees were compromised by a series of recently discovered attacks against the Office of Personnel Management, including records related to the background investigations of current, former, and prospective Federal employees.

Mrs. DINGELL (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, it is very timely that we are considering the intelligence authorization bill today, as there have been several troubling incidents in the last few weeks that require an immediate response by the Congress.

I know that Members on both sides of the aisle care deeply about airport security and cybersecurity, and we agree that Congress must do everything possible to keep the American people safe.

Last week, we learned that there were 73 people employed at airports across the country that should have been disqualified for employment because they are on a terrorist watch list. The American people deserve the highest level of security at our airports, and, quite frankly, I believe for all of us the status quo is unacceptable.

While it is easy for us to blame the TSA for this lapse in security, it is shocking that the TSA does not have access and that the current policy does not authorize them to have access to the information that they need so that



Walden Westmoreland Yoho  
Walker Whitfield Young (AK)  
Walorski Williams Young (IA)  
Walters, Mimi Wilson (SC)  
Weber (TX) Wittman Young (IN)  
Webster (FL) Womack Zeldin  
Wenstrup Woodall Zinke  
Westerman Yoder

NOT VOTING—10

Byrne Kelly (MS) Sanchez, Loretta  
Cicilline McGovern Sewell (AL)  
Fattah McHenry  
Gibson Reed

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1746

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 247, noes 178, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 369]

AYES—247

Abraham Cuellar Hultgren  
Aguiar Culberson Hunter  
Allen Curbelo (FL) Hurd (TX)  
Amodei Davis, Rodney Hurt (VA)  
Ashford Delaney Jenkins (KS)  
Babin Denham Jenkins (WV)  
Barletta Dent Johnson (OH)  
Barr DeSantis Johnson, Sam  
Barton Diaz-Balart Jolly  
Benishek Dold Joyce  
Bera Donovan Katko  
Billirakis Duckworth Keating  
Bishop (GA) Duffy Kelly (PA)  
Bishop (MI) Ellmers (NC) King (IA)  
Bishop (UT) Emmer (MN) King (NY)  
Black Farenthold Kinzinger (IL)  
Blackburn Fincher Kirkpatrick  
Blum Fitzpatrick Kline  
Bost Fleischmann Knight  
Boustany Fleming Kuster  
Brady (TX) Flores LaMalfa  
Brat Forbes Lamborn  
Bridenstine Fortenberry Lance  
Brooks (AL) Foxx Langevin  
Brooks (IN) Franks (AZ) Latta  
Brownley (CA) Frelinghuysen Lipinski  
Buchanan Gibbs LoBiondo  
Buck Goodlatte Long  
Bucshon Gowdy Loudermilk  
Burgess Graham Love  
Bustos Granger Lucas  
Calvert Graves (GA) Luetkemeyer  
Carter (GA) Graves (LA) Lujan Grisham  
Carter (TX) Graves (MO) (NM)  
Chabot Grothman MacArthur  
Chaffetz Guinta Maloney, Sean  
Clay Guthrie Marchant  
Coffman Hanna Marino  
Cole Harly McCarthy  
Collins (GA) Harper McCaul  
Collins (NY) Hartzler McClintock  
Comstock Heck (NV) McKinley  
Conaway Heck (WA) McMorris  
Cook Hensarling Rodgers  
Cooper Herrera Beutler McSally  
Costa Hice, Jody B. Meadows  
Costello (PA) Hill Meehan  
Cramer Holding Messer  
Crawford Hudson Mica  
Crenshaw Huizenga (MI) Miller (FL)

Miller (MI) Roe (TN)  
Moolenaar Rogers (AL)  
Mullin Rogers (KY)  
Murphy (FL) Rohrabacher  
Murphy (PA) Rokita  
Neugebauer Rooney (FL)  
Newhouse Ros-Lehtinen  
Noem Roskam  
Norcross Ross  
Nunes Rothfus  
Olson Rouzer  
Palazzo Royce  
Palmer Ruiz  
Paulsen Ruppertsberger  
Pearce Russell  
Peters Ryan (WI)  
Peterson Scalise  
Pittenger Schweikert  
Pitts Scott, Austin  
Poe (TX) Sensenbrenner  
Poliquin Sessions  
Pompeo Shimkus  
Posey Shuster  
Price, Tom Simpson  
Ratcliffe Sinema  
Reed Smith (MO)  
Reichert Smith (NE)  
Renacci Smith (NJ)  
Ribble Smith (TX)  
Rice (NY) Stefanik  
Rice (SC) Stewart  
Rigell Stivers  
Roby Stutzman

NOES—178

Adams Gibson Nadler  
Amash Gohmert Napolitano  
Bass Gosar Neal  
Beatty Grayson Nolan  
Becerra Green, Al Nugent  
Beyer Green, Gene O'Rourke  
Blumenauer Griffith Pallone  
Bonamici Grijalva Pascrell  
Boyle, Brendan Gutiérrez Payne  
F. Hahn  
Brady (PA) Harris Perlmutter  
Brown (FL) Hastings Perry  
Butterfield Higgins Pingree  
Capps Himes Pocan  
Capuano Hinojosa Polis  
Cárdenas Honda Price (NC)  
Carney Hoyer Quigley  
Carson (IN) Huelskamp Rangel  
Cartwright Huffman Richmond  
Castor (FL) Israel Roybal-Allard  
Castro (TX) Issa Rush  
Chu, Judy Jackson Lee Ryan (OH)  
Cicilline Jeffries Salmon  
Clark (MA) Johnson (GA) Sánchez, Linda  
Clarke (NY) Johnson, E. B. T.  
Clawson (FL) Jones Sanford  
Cleaver Jordan Sarbanes  
Clyburn Kaptur Schakowsky  
Cocher Kelly (IL) Schiff  
Connolly Kennedy Schrader  
Conyers Conyers Scott (VA)  
Courtney Kilmer Scott, David  
Crowley Kind Serrano  
Cummings Labrador Larsen (WA)  
Davis (CA) Larsen (CT)  
Davis, Danny Larson (CT)  
DeFazio Lawrence  
DeGette Lee  
DeLauro Levin  
DeBene Lewis  
DeSaulnier Lieu, Ted  
DesJarlais Loebsack  
Deutch Lofgren  
Dingell Lowenthal  
Doggett Lowey  
Doyle, Michael Lujan, Ben Ray  
F. (NM)  
Duncan (SC) Lummis  
Duncan (TN) Lynch  
Edwards Maloney,  
Ellison Carolyn  
Engel Massie  
Eshoo Matsui  
Esty McCollum  
Farr McDermott  
Foster McNeerney  
Frankel (FL) Meeks  
Fudge Meng  
Gabbard Mooney (WV)  
Gallego Moore  
Garamendi Moulton  
Garrett Mulvaney

Thompson (PA) NOT VOTING—8  
Thornberry  
Tiberi Kelly (MS) Sanchez, Loretta  
Tipton McGovern Sewell (AL)  
Trott McHenry  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Veasey  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walker  
Walorski  
Walters, Mimi  
Walz  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Young (AK)  
Young (IA)  
Young (IN)  
Zeldin  
Zinke

□ 1753

So the bill was passed.  
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Madam Speaker, during the votes today I was inescapably detained and away handling important matters related to my District and the State of Alabama.

If I had been present, I would have voted: “no” on H. Res. 315; “no” on the Schiff/Smith (WA) Amendment to H.R. 2596; “yes” on the Democratic Motion to Recommit H.R. 2596; and “no” on final passage of H.R. 2596.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 2596, INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016

Mr. NUNES. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to make technical corrections in the engrossment of H.R. 2596, to correct section numbers, punctuation, and cross-references, and to make such other technical and conforming changes as may be necessary to accurately reflect the actions of the House, including changing “line 17” to “line 11” in the instruction in amendment No. 3 by the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1942

Mr. GUINTA. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HARRIS) be removed as a cosponsor from H.R. 1942.

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

There was no objection.

HONORING TUCSON FIRE DEPARTMENT CAPTAIN DIANA BENSON

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

Ms. MCSALLY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Tucson Fire Department Captain Diana Benson for her many years of service to the community upon her upcoming retirement.

Captain Benson was one of the first women in the Tucson Fire Department, the first career female firefighter, and the first female lead training officer. During her 25 years in the department, she has been a pioneer and role model.

Captain Benson served on the technical rescue team, a highly specialized crew responsible for conducting swift water, extrication, and rope rescues. She has been a reliable leader in the department who initiated numerous peer fitness programs and also served as a member of the Tucson Fire Honor Guard. She has been highly involved in Camp Fury and the cadet program, serving as a mentor to Tucson youth and opening doors to nontraditional careers, such as firefighting, for girls.

No doubt, Captain Benson's positive impact on the department and legacy of excellence lasting over two decades will be lasting. I wish her all the best in her upcoming retirement.

---

OFFICE OF PERSONNEL  
MANAGEMENT DATA BREACH

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Speaker, in the past 2 weeks, we have learned that the data millions of Americans entrusted to the Office of Personnel Management have been taken as a result of a cybersecurity breach.

It did not have to happen this way. Since 2007, OPM's inspector general has documented repeated deficiencies in information security practices. Yet OPM's response has been glacial, and its systems remain antiquated. It was only after a security breach last year that OPM finally, in its 2016 budget request, asked for additional funds for the Office of Chief Information Officer. Well, it is about time.

The question we need to ask, though, is: Why did OPM underinvest in cybersecurity before that breach happened? While I would hope that we find a definitive answer during oversight hearings, there is one thing that certainly contributed to the problem. There was no one in charge of cybersecurity with both policy and budgetary authorities to compel action.

Even as we rely on agencies to be primarily responsible for protecting their networks, we lack a Federal cyber coordinator with budgetary authority to review agency spending and security plans. My Executive Cyberspace Coordination Act would remedy this by providing for a Senate-confirmed independent officer with the power to compel agency action.

Let's get this done.

---

CONGRATS TO CHANHASSEN HIGH  
SCHOOL BASEBALL

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Chanhassen High School baseball team on winning the Minnesota State title last week with a 2-0 championship game victory.

The Storm rode the arm of Jack Schnettler in the finals as the senior tossed a complete game shutout to clinch the second State athletic title in the school's short history.

Chanhassen's two runs came courtesy of a Ty Denzer single in the third inning. In addition, fine work with the glove behind the Storm ace helped hold their opponents from Lakeville North at bay.

Madam Speaker, baseball is a game of skill and mental toughness, and it is clear that the players from Chanhassen have both. In addition to the time spent on the practice field, student athletes have to balance their work in the classroom and any family responsibilities they have as well. Their dedication and commitment is commendable.

Congratulations to the Chanhassen baseball team on their State title.

---

□ 1800

WORLD WAR II HONOR FLIGHT

(Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Madam Speaker, I rise to acknowledge and honor a group of World War II veterans from New Mexico who visited Washington, D.C., last week. They came to visit the memorials, their memorials, that are dedicated to honor their service and sacrifices.

We have about 5,000 World War II veterans in New Mexico, and I appreciate the efforts of the Williamson Foundation in supporting the veterans by organizing this week's Honor Flight.

While I am sure each veteran appreciated the opportunity to visit the memorials, I know many of them were just as impressed with the gratitude expressed by their fellow New Mexicans for their service. Huge crowds greeted them at the airport in Albuquerque. One veteran said he had never received a thank you before this trip.

New Mexicans played pivotal roles and sacrificed a lot during the war in Europe, north Africa, and the Pacific.

We must never forget what these and all veterans have done for our great Nation. I thank them for their service.

---

ACKNOWLEDGING THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF 2012 DEFERRED ACTION FOR CHILDHOOD ARRIVALS PROGRAM

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

Mr. VEASEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the third anniversary of President Obama's 2012 Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program, commonly known as DACA.

While the Nation desperately waits for House Republicans to move forward

on immigration reform, the DACA program has provided temporary relief for hundreds of thousands of families to continue their studies and contribute to our economy. Since its enactment, more than 750,000 young people, including 88,000 Texans, have successfully applied for DACA.

Although I am disappointed with the recent court actions delaying President Obama's expansion of the DACA program, I remain hopeful that millions more immigrant families will one day be able to fully contribute to the prosperity of our country.

That is why, in my home district in the Dallas-Fort Worth metroplex, I will host a DACA-DAPA informational forum with Congressman LUIS GUTIÉRREZ on July 18 to help TX-33 residents prepare for immigration relief.

While President Obama's efforts to expand DACA and initiate DAPA programs are temporarily stalled in the courts, I am committed to fighting for immigrant families nationwide, so they can come out of the shadows and live the American Dream.

---

BETTER FUNDING AND SUPPORT FOR ALZHEIMER'S RESEARCH

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

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Madam Speaker, I stand here today to join my colleagues in a bipartisan call for action for better funding and support for Alzheimer's research. The Alzheimer's Association of Greater Michigan, which is headquartered in my district, the 14th Congressional District of Michigan, supports more than 140,000 people and their families.

According to the Banner Alzheimer Institute, those numbers are going to increase unless treatments or cures are developed. The institute estimates the number of people 65 and older with Alzheimer's will nearly triple to 13.8 million, and the U.S. healthcare costs for Alzheimer's will skyrocket to \$1.1 trillion per year, with more than \$700 million coming out of Medicare and Medicaid.

It is time to treat Alzheimer's as the healthcare disaster that it has become. It is time to take this epidemic seriously. It is time to guard against the threat it poses to our families, our districts, healthcare system, and our Nation.

---

CHICAGO BLACKHAWKS STANLEY CUP DYNASTY

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

Mr. LIPINSKI. Madam Speaker, last night, I wore my number 35 Tony Esposito Chicago Blackhawks jersey from the 1970s, and I watched what I could never have imagined in those days, a Chicago Blackhawks Stanley

Cup dynasty; but thanks to the leadership of owner, Rocky Wirtz, and an amazing team put together by Stan Bowman and led by Coach Q, the Hawks won their third Stanley Cup in 6 years.

The core of Toews, Keith, Kane, Hossa, Seabrook, Hjalmarsson, and Sharp have been there for all three. This year, Duncan Keith was awarded the Conn Smythe MVP trophy, but this was truly a team effort.

Chicagoland thanks everyone in the organization for once again making us proud and bringing the Stanley Cup back to Chicago.

I can't wait for the parade. I can't wait to see the Stanley Cup again.

#### CONGRESS AND AMERICA OPPOSE FAST TRACK

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, this afternoon, House Republican leaders used a trick to pass a new rule to revoke the job-outsourcing, unfair, fast-track Trans-Pacific Partnership trade deal. They buried the revoke in the intelligence authorization.

Well, the Republican leadership wants to buy itself another month to make deals, trading favors and funding pet projects in this district or that district, in exchange for a vote against the best interests of the American people, jobs in America with good wages.

Imagine Congress fast-tracking a bill to repair our roads, bridges, and harbors all across this country. Imagine a bill to be fast-tracked to renew the powers of the Export-Import Bank that actually increases exports and jobs in this country.

Instead, fast track is being rammed through Congress with House Republican leaders bending the rules and breaking regular order. Intelligence authorization bills should not be another name for secret fast-track life support.

No more delays. It is overtime for Congress to move on from fast track to a real fair trade deal that creates jobs and good wages in America for a change.

#### A TALE OF TWO ECONOMIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. TIPTON. Madam Speaker, across our country, we are seeing a tale of two economies, to where there are pockets of prosperity, but unfortunately, through many of our rural communities, we continue to see challenges.

For the first time since we have been keeping records, we are seeing more small businesses shut down than there are now business startups. Businesses across this country are suffering under

the burden of \$2 trillion—\$2 trillion—in regulatory costs.

Why is this important? It is because we are seeing now the cost of a loaf of bread, the clothes that we buy for our children to be able to go back to school, and that gallon of milk costs more via taxation by regulation that is impacting our ability to create jobs.

When we move into my district in Colorado, composed of rural communities, 29 counties of Colorado's 64, 54,000 miles of the State of Colorado, many of our counties are still suffering in double-digit unemployment when it comes down to the real number.

Two counties that I would like to be able to address specifically this evening are being specifically challenged, Moffat County and Rio Blanco County, on the west slope of Colorado, one of the most beautiful places that anyone can visit.

Residing there and creating jobs is something called the Colowyo Mine, a coal mine. We encourage people to be able to come and see a coal mine with good technology, providing affordable electricity, providing jobs, and providing also clear blue skies with that technology. Those are currently being challenged.

There was a court ruling recently that came out, one that was in response to a suit that was brought by an extreme environmental group that challenged the 2007 issuance of the Office of Surface Mining permit for the Colowyo Mine to be able to operate.

That is challenging now 200 jobs because the court has ruled that a new NEPA process, a supplemental process, must be performed within 120 days, an extremely short period of time.

Those 200 families, 200 families that are relying on that job to be able to provide for their children, to be able to support that community, are now feeling threatened by policies not only in terms of the NEPA process, but now by the ruling of the Court as well in response to a suit filed by this extreme environmental group.

Here is the real challenge that we face. We need the Secretary of the Interior to respond. These families' jobs cannot wait. Being able to put food on the table for their children cannot wait for this process to be able to play out.

We encourage the Secretary to deploy all necessary resources to be able to respond to that emergency NEPA process, to be able to get it done in that 120-day period of time, or to be able to also look at the propriety of challenging that ruling by going in and filing an appeal.

Are jobs and the economy important? They certainly are in my district. Those families that are relying on good-paying coal jobs, families that love where they live, love their environment, and support their community are now seeing their livelihoods, their future being challenged.

We encourage the Secretary, on behalf of American families, families in my district that are struggling to be

able to succeed or to just be able to provide for themselves, to be able to respond in a timely manner, to be able to address this so that we can secure those jobs and secure affordable electricity as well.

Coal is often maligned, but we see that it can be done right—Craig, Colorado, blue skies and a coal-fired power plant. There is an opportunity for us to be able to create a win-win.

If you care about senior citizens that are on fixed incomes, if you care about young families right now that are struggling to be able to pay the bills and to be able to provide for their young children, we are seeing that taxation via regulation coming out of policy.

I think it is very important that we preserve the jobs. Let's work with all of the above. That has been embraced in my district. We have seen the opportunity to be able to create hydroelectric power, wind, solar, geothermal, also to responsibly develop oil, gas, oil shale, and coal.

Right now, the problem for the people in the Third District, specifically in Rio Blanco and Moffat Counties, is urgent. They are families that I have talked to. I have looked in their eyes. They will do it responsibly. They want to be able to do it well, not only for the community, but for their families as well.

It is very important that we are also mindful that those jobs impact others. These are the families that support the local grocery store, the local hardware store; these are the families that provide for the health of that community.

Madam Speaker, we would call upon the Secretary of the Interior to respond to American families whose jobs are currently being threatened, deploy the necessary resources to be able to carry out that supplemental NEPA, get the job done in time to protect those jobs.

If that isn't possible, then go ahead and explore that proprietary notion of filing an appeal, to make sure that we get a stay and keep those jobs moving, because the message that my folks out of Craig, out of Rio Blanco County want to be able to communicate is their bills won't stop. Their children's needs will not be met unless we see a response out of the Department of the Interior to be able to stand up for good-paying coal jobs in western Colorado.

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

#### ALZHEIMER'S AND BRAIN AWARENESS MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Speaker, for the next hour, we will be talking about an issue that really confronts every American family, an issue that

has brought devastation, fear, and sadness to virtually every family in this Nation.

We are going to talk about dementia and Alzheimer's. We are going to talk about the way in which it literally tears families apart as their loved one's mind, recollections, and ability to handle their own affairs seems to dissipate.

□ 1815

This is an issue that currently confronts around 5 million Americans and their families. This is an issue that will grow exponentially over the next 25 to 30 years to the point where maybe 16 million American families are going to be affected by it.

It is also an issue that we can deal with. It is an issue that we can see the cost. Let me put up this chart here, and we will talk about the cost of Alzheimer's quickly.

It is a crisis that is growing rapidly, and it is resulting in extraordinary cost increases. If you look at 2015, on Medicare and Medicaid programs, the Federal Government will spend \$153 billion on Alzheimer's. In 2020, it will grow to \$182 billion. And then it is anticipated—as one of our colleagues spoke during a 1-minute speech—that by 2050, it will grow to over \$1 trillion. This is an issue for the Federal Government. It is an issue for every family.

Let me put up another little chart here that really displays what an investment by the American people can do. If you take a look at the reasons why people die most commonly in the United States—breast cancer, prostate cancer, heart disease, stroke, HIV—you will notice that in every one of these, we have seen a decline in the mortality from these illnesses.

Breast cancer declining just marginally. Prostate cancer, a significant decline of around 11 percent. Heart disease declined by 14 percent; stroke by 21; and HIV, while still prevalent and still common, the death rate is down by more than 50 percent.

This one over here is Alzheimer's disease; a 71 percent increase in the number of deaths due to Alzheimer's.

My mother-in-law is in this statistic. She spent the last 2 years of her life living with my wife, Patty, and I in our home. We cared for her at night. We, fortunately, were able to have someone come in to help us during the day. And that is really the story of most Alzheimer's now. You are either in a nursing home or you are cared for in the home.

So among those 5 million out there, there are families, like mine, that are caring as best they can in a very difficult situation. Ours, fortunately, was not so difficult. But, nonetheless, after two-plus years, my mother-in-law did die.

So what can we do about it?

I want to put up one more chart here, and then I want to turn to my colleagues. If you will remember on that chart I just put up, death rates are declining for cancer. There is a reason.

And the reason is the annual expenditure for cancer research has been just under \$5.5 billion for the last few years. For HIV/AIDS, nearly \$3 billion of research annually. Cardiovascular, heart disease, over \$2 billion.

Alzheimer's, while the death rate climbs, we are spending just over \$566 million—not billion, million. So we shouldn't be surprised when we see this: declines in the cancer rates, deaths from cancer, stroke, heart disease, HIV. And then Alzheimer's.

Mr. Speaker, \$1 trillion will be spent in just 25 years on dealing with Alzheimer's, and some 16 million Americans will have that illness.

Now there is good news. The good news just happened today, and I want to commend my Republican colleague TOM COLE from Oklahoma, chairman of the Appropriations Health and Human Services Subcommittee, who moved to increase Alzheimer's research from \$566 million to almost \$900 million.

Go for it, TOM. You are the chairman of that subcommittee, and you are doing the right thing. You are doing the right thing by 5 million Americans who suffer from Alzheimer's today, and you are doing the right thing for their families.

And I think House has the opportunity also to stand with TOM COLE and to do the right thing by Americans, and that is, increase this research funding.

There are breakthroughs that are coming. If you read the articles, if you read the scientific journals, we are coming to an understanding of this very, very difficult disease for which there is no early detection, for which there is no cure, and for which there is only one exit, and that is death. So we can deal with this.

The 535 of us, the Representatives of those 5 million Americans with Alzheimer's and their families, we can do something. We can increase the funding for research.

Tonight I am joined by several of my colleagues.

I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS) who carried legislation on this for years. She has been the co-chair of the Alzheimer's Caucus. If she will join us and share with us her work and what is happening from her perspective.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Thank you so very much.

Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my friend and colleague from California, Congressman JOHN GARAMENDI, for yielding, and I commend him for organizing this Special Order on Alzheimer's disease in honor of the month of June, which is Alzheimer's and Brain Awareness Month.

As the co-chair of the Congressional Task Force on Alzheimer's Disease, I know how devastating this disease can be for our patients, families, and caregivers. I am proud to lead the task force along with my co-chairs, Congressman CHRIS SMITH, Congressman MICHAEL BURGESS, and Congressman CHAKA FATTAH.

Alzheimer's is a tragic disease which has no effective treatment, no means of prevention, and no method for slowing progression of the disease. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 5 million Americans were living with Alzheimer's disease in 2013. This number is expected to almost triple to 14 million by the year 2050.

The bipartisan supported National Plan to Address Alzheimer's Disease calls for a cure or an effective treatment for Alzheimer's by the year 2025. Reaching this goal will require a significant increase in Federal funding for Alzheimer's research.

I, therefore, introduced H.R. 237, a bipartisan resolution which calls for a significant increase in Alzheimer's research funding and declares that achieving the primary goal of the national plan—to prevent and effectively treat Alzheimer's by 2025—is an urgent national priority. A similar resolution was introduced in the Senate by Senator SUSAN COLLINS of Maine.

I also circulated a letter to the House Appropriations Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee requesting robust funding for Alzheimer's research at the National Institutes of Health in the coming fiscal year. The letter was signed by a bipartisan group of 63 Members of Congress. I was pleased to learn that the subcommittee recently proposed a \$300 million increase for Alzheimer's research.

As we pursue the goals of a cure for Alzheimer's, we must also do everything we can to assist the patients, families, and caregivers who are living with Alzheimer's every day. That is why I am introducing Alzheimer's Action Now, a set of bills that together will help Alzheimer's patients and their families; promote public awareness; and encourage voluntary contributions to research efforts. The various bills in the Alzheimer's Action Now address different challenges presented by Alzheimer's disease.

The Alzheimer's Caregiver Support Act authorizes grants to public and nonprofit organizations to expand training and support services for families and caregivers of Alzheimer's patients. With the majority of Alzheimer's patients living at home, under the care of family and friends, it is important that we ensure these caregivers have access to the training and resources they need to provide effective, compassionate care.

The Missing Alzheimer's Disease Patient Alert Program Reauthorization Act reauthorizes a Department of Justice program. It helps local communities and law enforcement officials quickly identify persons with Alzheimer's disease who wander away from their homes and reunite them with their families. This program saves law enforcement officials valuable time and allows them to focus on other security concerns. It also reduces injuries and deaths among Alzheimer's patients, and it brings peace of mind to their families.

Finally, the Alzheimer's Disease Semipostal Stamp Act requires the U.S. Postal Service to issue and sell a semipostal stamp, with the proceeds helping to fund Alzheimer's research at NIH. This bill will raise public awareness and encourage concerned individuals to get involved and to make voluntary contributions to Alzheimer's research efforts. The bill is modeled on the popular and successful Breast Cancer Research semipostal stamp.

Our Nation is at a crucial and critical crossroads. The situation requires decisive action to search for a cure and protect the millions of Americans currently living with Alzheimer's disease. Together, we must take every possible action to improve treatments for Alzheimer's patients, support caregivers, raise public awareness, and invest in research to find a cure for this dreadful disease.

Once again, I can't say enough to thank JOHN GARAMENDI, my colleague from California, with whom I have worked for many, many years, for, again, organizing yet another night's Special Order to bring attention to Alzheimer's disease.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I thank the gentlewoman from California who has been a leader in this disease and dealing with the problems of it for many, many years. And your work Ms. WATERS is paying off. The work that you have done organizing us, Members of Congress, to petition the subcommittee paid off—a 50 percent increase, a 50 percent increase, and I think it has got a good chance of staying in. This is really really good news and the rest of the legislation piece by piece we are going to get at this.

I would like now to turn the time over to our colleague from New York BRIAN HIGGINS. We have spoken on this issue before. Mr. HIGGINS, thank you so very much. If you will share your thoughts with us on this disease and what we might do to deal with it.

Mr. HIGGINS. I thank the gentleman from California and thank you for your leadership on this and so many issues that are of critical importance to our Nation and our future.

June is Alzheimer's Brain and Awareness month. It is the sixth-leading cause of death in this country. Over 5.3 million Americans are afflicted with Alzheimer's. By 2050, this number is expected to increase to 16 million. In my western New York community alone, 55,000 people have Alzheimer's or related dementia, and 165,000 people in our community are impacted directly or indirectly. Alzheimer's will cost the Nation \$226 billion this year. By the year 2050, these costs will rise to as high as \$1.1 trillion. Last year, Congress passed a law, the Alzheimer's Accountability Act, which created a bypass budget for Alzheimer's research. This will allow the National Institutes of Health to prepare a budget that will reach the estimated goal of funding effective prevention and treatment for Alzheimer's by 2025.

This year, I introduced with my colleagues ROSA DELAURO and PETER KING the Accelerating Biomedical Research Act. Over the next 6 years, our legislation would provide an additional \$50 billion in funding to the National Institutes of Health above what is currently budgeted. We also established the House NIH Caucus to rally Members to develop a plan to increase the purchasing power of NIH.

□ 1830

Mr. Speaker, Congress should also pass the HOPE for Alzheimer's Act, the Advancing Research for Neurological Diseases Act.

Mr. GARAMENDI, again, thank you for your leadership. We obviously, as a Congress, have a long way to go. The origins of Alzheimer's disease are unknown, but its ends are absolutely certain, and it ends in losing your cognitive ability, your dignity, and then it takes your life. It is time that Congress, in a bipartisan effort, provide robust funding to Alzheimer's research to end this terrible, terrible disease for future generations.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. HIGGINS, thank you so very much. Your points are absolutely on target.

This little chart here points out much of what you and Ms. WATERS were talking about, and that is the extraordinary expense. This is 2015. And we expect to spend \$153 billion of Federal tax money, Medicare and Medicaid, on treating Alzheimer's. Way over, that little tiny purple spot, is the \$566 million of research. It would be a little bigger if we were able to get that 300, but it is still going to pale in comparison to this. This is 261 times more money spent on treatment, which ultimately just enables the passage of time and leads to death because there is no effective treatment today. That is what we are spending on caring for people.

That number down there, and the efforts and the bills that have been introduced and the Alzheimer's Foundation and others that are working on this have an opportunity to change this entire dynamic around because we can find the solution to this.

I would like now to turn to my colleague, as part of what we often do here, we call it the "East-West Show," my colleague from the great State of New York, PAUL TONKO.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative GARAMENDI, for bringing us together in this very Special Order as we discuss the impact of Alzheimer's upon the quality of life not only of the individual living with the disease, but on family members and loved ones that surround that individual. So much of the work that we do in this House, so much of the work done on the Hill here in Washington, needs to be guided by the moral compass.

Our budget priorities should reflect who we are as a people and the compassion that is required as we see these numbers continually grow—balloon—in

terms of an impact on the budget. And that should challenge us to do all that we can to be not only compassionate, but to be effective when it comes to the fiscal impact of what is happening to far too many families across this country.

It is a known fact now that Alzheimer's is the most expensive disease in America. That should strike home. That should call upon our hearts and our minds to respond with dignity and with effectiveness to the given issue at hand. Our efforts for Alzheimer's need to be enhanced. There is no mistaking it. This is the most expensive disease in America. It is impacting the budget here in Washington. Our national numbers are a challenge, and we need to address the budget not only in sound strategy for the present moment, but with preventative elements brought to bear.

So when we look at the most recent data—and those data are very telling—for 2014, the calendar year of 2014, the numbers are there, and it will remind us that \$214 billion was the need, the drawdown, for speaking to Alzheimer's, responding to the Alzheimer's situation. That is a large number that is only projected to grow exponentially. As more and more baby boomers ascend the age ladder, climb that ladder, we should only anticipate that doing what we are doing is not going to be enough, that research needs to take hold here.

We have the intellectual capacity as a nation. We have resources at our fingertips, and the priority here for providing the preventative elements of research are important. The President has offered an initiative with the study of the mind, the brain, that can provide several opportunities. It can release the information, the documentation, that is required to move forward to find a cure for this ever-growing disease.

Look at the stats. Representative GARAMENDI, when we look at the research moneys, for every \$100 invested in those individuals and families that are impacted by Alzheimer's, 25 cents is spent on research—for every \$100, 25 cents. That is a very minute amount of investment, investment that has an anticipated lucrative return, paying dividends for all of us to address a cure, a hope for individuals. This country requires our government to respond in full fashion so that public-private partnerships in research institutes like the NIH, the National Institutes of Health, are funded appropriately. Accordingly, with the data that have been assembled, knowing what needs to be done, we should go forward with those efforts.

Now, I am reminded, Representative GARAMENDI, routinely by families—and many women will draw that perspective for me, that of those who are living with Alzheimer's in this country, two-thirds—two-thirds—of the individuals living with Alzheimer's, or 3.2 million people, are women. This disease is

impacting women in a disproportionate measure.

It is extracting from us all sorts of voluntary efforts that are required. Volunteers are responding as unpaid caregivers. We know the stats. The data are compelling: 15.5 million volunteers, caregivers, providing unpaid services, unpaid care, equaling 17.7 billion hours. These are staggering numbers, 15.5 million providing 17.7 billion. That amasses to \$220.2 billion in terms of services provided, unpaid services provided.

So it is not only costing the Federal Government money, projected to balloon heavily, but it is also extracting \$220 billion worth of unpaid services that are provided to individuals by loved ones, by those concerned in their community, for the struggles that these individuals and their family members are facing. So this behooves us to do much better than we are doing.

We are a compassionate society. We are unique. We have opportunities galore. I know what can happen. I have talked to our team in my district. Beth and the team from Alzheimer's Association of Northeast New York, they have done a tremendous job. I see what they do for respite care and what they are doing for services with the Alzheimer's Cafe, where people gather and cluster. They are given music therapy. There is an enhanced quality of life. It is with dignity that we respond. But more needs to be done, and there has to be that element that is provided out there that is speaking to prevention, that is speaking to a cure.

So, Representative GARAMENDI, there is much to be done.

I was lead Democrat on the Alzheimer's Accountability Act, which responded to the planning requirements that were earlier set up statutorily in this country. That act, the Alzheimer's Accountability Act, that passed successfully in both Houses and was signed into law by the President, requires that a professional judgment budget be put together. As was stated earlier on the floor, until 2025, there needs to be this commitment made for research for Alzheimer's and related diseases.

But we furthered the quality of that legislation, of that statute, by requiring professionals to project the numbers that are needed. That is a very important element. Clinicians and professionals in the medical community will tell us, they will advise what that number ought to be. That is speaking with integrity, with the veracity that is required, with the dignity, and with the compassion that is so much required for the Alzheimer's community.

So again, I thank you, Representative GARAMENDI, for having that heart, for leading us in this Special Order so as to comprehend what we need to do here, to move that moral compass, to be there for those individuals, to be there for those unpaid caregivers, and to be there for the research community, but most importantly, to be there

for the soul that is struggling with Alzheimer's or dementia-related diseases. We are at our best when we connect emotionally so that we can put together the programmatic response and the intellectual response that enable us to provide that light at the end of the tunnel which is so important and so meaningful to the families that endure.

I thank you, Representative GARAMENDI.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. TONKO, for more than 4 years now, you and I have stood on the floor on Special Order hour to talk about Make It In America, about the manufacturing system and about the jobs that we need to build, transportation infrastructure, and your passion for those subjects was so obvious. Your passion and your determination to deal with Alzheimer's and to find a cure, to find an understanding of what it is and how it affects the brain, and then also to reach out to the families that are caring for their loved ones really exceeds and mirrors the passion that you have for the working men and women of this Nation. I thank you.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to thank the Alzheimer's Association. They organized a lobbying group through here very recently. They were wearing their purple ribbons, and they brought to us the stories, the individual stories that were of their families. I know that as I talked to my colleagues here on the floor and over in the Senate, I get the same thing from them: Yes, my mother, my aunt, my sister, my brother, they too have suffered from Alzheimer's, and they recently died, or they are in very serious condition.

So we find this illness touching every family. I have yet to find a family that I have talked to about Alzheimer's that didn't nod their head in understanding: Yes, we know what it is.

What Americans don't know is the information that you and my colleagues, MAXINE WATERS and BRIAN HIGGINS, brought to the floor today, and that is the facts, not only the impact that Alzheimer's has on the Federal budget—Medicare and Medicaid—the impact that it has on family budgets, on insurance, private insurance, but the impact that it has on families. You have made that clear.

I think that the work that has been done by Alzheimer's Association and related organizations—Medicare, Social Security, and support groups all across this Nation—is having an impact. When a budget for any specific program is increased by 50 percent in this era of sequestration, something has had an impact. Mr. COLE, as chairman of that, and Ms. WATERS, as the chairperson or the vice chair, co-chair of the Working Group on Alzheimer's, are having an impact.

We can find a solution here. We can understand. We can do the early diagnosis. It is pretty clear there are some breakthroughs that are occurring.

□ 1845

There are certain drugs out there that seem to work if you can intervene

early in the process. What a change that would be. What a change that would be for all families.

This is not just an issue of Alzheimer's, this is an issue of the brain. We have got the U.S. military, the Department of Defense, doing significant research on brain injuries, brain trauma, and illnesses resulting from the wars—from traumatic brain syndrome and related.

So if we pool together and we actually put into the Defense Authorization Act a paragraph that said: Research done by the Department of Defense on the brain, brain injuries, a way in which the brain works or doesn't work, they need to take that research and couple it with research that is taking place on dementia, on other kinds of neurological diseases, including Alzheimer's, and if we can pool all of these various research programs together and get them to share the information to fertilize each other's research, I think we are going to succeed.

That 2025 goal I think is too far out there. I see we are on the cusp of a breakthrough. And if we can push all of the research and focus it and, like a dart, hit the center of the target, I think we are going to be successful.

Mr. TONKO, would you like to join in here?

Mr. TONKO. Absolutely.

Representative GARAMENDI, it only takes one visit, but there have been many visits that I have made to the centers, the day care center operations that are conducted for individuals and families who are living with Alzheimer's, and to witness and hear the hurt, the confusion, the pain that surrounds the individual. It is enough challenge to try and get this done in as quick a fashion as possible.

But if that doesn't move us, the economics on this. You know, we earlier talked about the \$214 billion impact in 1 year—some of our most recent data. Well, that is 1 in every 5 Medicare dollars. How much are we willing to have that take over the Medicare expenditures before we come to our senses to say, let's do more in research, let's do a preventive response? Does it need to grow that much more? Does the drain on Medicare, does the reflection of Alzheimer's-related Medicare expenditures need to be that much greater to bring us to a response? The challenges are there, the data are there. We need to move accordingly.

Now, earlier, I had expressed that two-thirds of the people living with Alzheimer's, the 3.2 million people, happen to be women. Well, 60 percent of the unpaid caregivers happen to be women. So there needs to be a response here to enable people to be addressed with a sense of compassion, with dignity brought into the equation. It is absolutely essential.

And when we talk about those caregivers and the \$220.2 billion that is the calculation for the volunteerism they offer as caregivers, of that community of caregivers, they have been worn

down physically. So the price tag for them is an additional \$9.3 billion in terms of response to their physical health care needs. This is a drain on families, on loved ones. It is an undignified outcome for far too many Alzheimer's patients who require our support, who have earned the respect of this body and Congress moving to provide for research opportunities.

Now, one other effort that I am making now in the aftermath of the Alzheimer's Accountability Act, that victory being behind us now, I have now served as the lead Democrat on the HOPE for Alzheimer's Act, which would authorize Medicare investment in sound planning upon diagnosis of Alzheimer's so that individuals and their families who are so diagnosed can sit down and plan accordingly for their care, for their treatment, for their needs.

That is an important bit of quality that can be introduced for the individual and her or his family so that their life, already severely impacted by this outcome, can be as manageable as possible. And we are hopeful with some 183 cosponsors of a bipartisan nature who have come forward to say, Sign me up for the HOPE for Alzheimer's Act.

So isn't that what we are supposed to be? Aren't we those agents of hope? Do we walk away from this dilemma? Do we walk away from this need? Do we walk away from the struggle, the pain, the hurt, the confusion that people live with every waking hour of every day? Or do we respond in that all-American fashion and say, yeah, we have the intellectual capacity as a Nation; yes, we have the resources.

It is an order of prioritization. And that priority here needs to be a response, a full-fledged response, a compassionate response, a loving response coming from us as individuals and collectively as Congress to say, yes, we support these efforts that are required, that are possible. Do not deny the possibilities. Let us go forward and be those sound decisionmakers who understand that this issue, when addressed accordingly, with human compassion offered, with the humanization of this process, we are then offering a cost-effective outcome. A study of the brain initiative that the President has advanced should be supported.

These resources that are required for planning, for research, for services, for respite need to be funded accordingly. It is within our grasp, and it makes sense to do so.

So, Representative GARAMENDI, I thank you for leading us in this Special Order, which is absolutely key to public information exchange.

For those who may be viewing, I would suggest that you contact those of us who serve you in Washington and let us know that you want this to be a priority. Tell us you believe in the research capacity of this country. Tell us you want to humanize that response, more deeply respond to the individuals and families that are so impacted.

When we hit so many people, when we see the millions who are living with this disease, we can't escape that impact falling upon us. Neighbors, family members, friends who we know are living with this disease require our attention, require our responsiveness.

So I thank you for leading us in what is a very valuable discussion.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. TONKO, thank you for your leadership. Thank you for rounding up 180-plus Members of this House. On any issue that is tough, but then having them sign on to a piece of legislation that would advance the care that individuals receive and the support that families need.

The cure for Alzheimer's, all of those pieces of legislation, which Ms. WATERS talked about, those are all pieces of the puzzle. And they deal with—I am going to end with just two charts, so it is really where I started. This is a different version of one of the charts that deals with the costs that we are talking about. These are the total cost in the system. If you take a look at it, 2015, you are talking about a quarter of a billion dollars, just under \$226 billion, of which the great majority is Medicare and Medicaid, and then out-of-pocket and other payers, or the other insurance companies. It will rise each year until we get to 2050, which is not that far away. Thirty-five years out we will be well over \$1 trillion, of which we will bust the bank, the Medicare.

There is a lot of discussion around here about the deficit. The real factors in the deficit are this health care issue. That is where we are going to find the budget deficit.

But we have already seen through the Affordable Care Act that the projected increases for Medicare have substantially reduced over the last 4 years as the Affordable Care Act is providing early diagnosis of heart disease, diabetes, other kinds of long-term illnesses that are really where most of the expense in Medicare and Medicaid occur. And if we can get a grip on Alzheimer's, if we can find a way of delaying the onset of it, we are going to save tens and, indeed, hundreds of billions of dollars over the passage of time.

And the next step is the cure. So they think, the researchers, think they can find a way of delaying the onset. As they do that, they will also find a way of dealing with the disease itself. Then this awesome and horrific expense will be reduced.

There is one other chart.

Mr. TONKO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARAMENDI. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TONKO. That chart is very powerful. The trillions—with a T—will really balloon our budget, and really it is undoable. It gets to a level where it will exhaust, it will overwhelm other areas of investment that are required.

But translate that from dollars into human suffering, pain, confusion, reduced quality of life. That is a calculus that needs to be made. If it is going to

save us money and at the same time respond with that moral compass, why are we not doing that, why are we not responding?

So, to me, that is where we are at. When you see the unleashing of technology, of research, of the potential for progress to be made, it is there. It is documented from so many perspectives in work that is done by the National Institutes of Health and others. For many, they will say, well, leave it to the private sector. No, there is a track record up there for this country to have stepped up to the plate and made a difference, for vaccines and other sought-for outcomes that affected people in a positive way. They gave them hope.

Our government has a track record of having stepped up and invested in research where perhaps the private sector wouldn't go or where we have shaved some of the risk off of that demand for research in a public-private partnership. So it is there within our potential. We should not deny our loved ones, our constituents, our country the opportunity to advance the cause of research and to respond again with a sense of hope for those who are living with this within this darkness. We can and we must do better.

I am happy to work with individuals like Representative GARAMENDI to push to make a difference and to be there in a responsive manner, and I thank you.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. TONKO, you continually come back to the compassion and caregiving that I think each human being has somewhere in them. For us here in Congress, it is to express that in a meaningful way. That meaningful way is to make sure there is support for those families and individuals who have Alzheimer's, those who are caring for them, to make sure that the medical treatment, such as it is for this illness, is available, and to pursue vigorously the research that could and, I believe, will lead to a complete understanding of the illness. That is our task.

Mr. TONKO.

Mr. TONKO. And as we are concluding here, I was just bringing to mind one of the Alzheimer's town halls that we are required to conduct, and it told me a few things: that this disease is percolating lower and lower into the age demographics.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Yes, it is.

□ 1900

Mr. TONKO. So it may be—I am just guessing here—that it is more than just genetics. It may be environmental in its impact or cause. Whatever it is, let's go for that cause.

At one of these townhalls, a contemporary of mine whom I have known for a long time, as I have known her husband for a long time, said: "My husband knows my voice, but he doesn't know my name."

How do we not say "yes" to research? How do we not say we want to do all that we can to make a difference?

When we do so, we are going to save our budget. We are going to save our budget a great number of consequences by being that powerful force that will do things academically, soundly, wisely, effectively, efficiently.

That is what this business is about, a thoughtful response, a heartfelt response that, by the way, is the budgetwise thing to do.

Let us respond as a government, as a nation.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. TONKO, thank you so very much.

Mr. Speaker, I think we will end there and simply say that this is not the last time that we will be speaking on this issue on the floor.

I would hope the next time that we speak on this issue that the House of Representatives will have increased the research budget by 50 percent, from \$566 million to close to \$900 million. That is a big leap. It is not sufficient. It is not what is necessary to really get at this disease, but this is one we can tackle. This is one we have to tackle for the strength of the American Government budget. It is one we have to tackle.

This is where you have been with this entire discussion, Mr. TONKO. This is about families. It is about individuals. It is about the suffering, the angst, and the fear that exists out there with this devastating disease. We can do this. We really can.

My message to the American people is one that you put out a few moments ago, Mr. TONKO. That is, for anybody who is watching out there, for anybody who is interested in the Federal deficit, for anybody who is interested in the quality of life of their families as they age and even before they age, talk to us.

Tell us that you want us to spend your tax money on solving this problem, on the research that will lead to the solution for what is now an unsolvable mystery.

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

**REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 160, PROTECT MEDICAL INNOVATION ACT OF 2015, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1190, PROTECTING SENIORS' ACCESS TO MEDICARE ACT OF 2015**

Mr. BURGESS (during the Special Order of Mr. GARAMENDI) from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114-157) on the resolution (H. Res. 319) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 160) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on medical devices, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1190) to repeal the provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act providing for the Independent Payment Advisory Board, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

**OVERRULING THE HOUSE OF GOD**

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WESTERMAN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, this week, there will be important decisions made here on the House of Representatives' floor.

We are told, this month, the Supreme Court may well play God and overrule what has been considered to be the house of God, as given by Moses, for the dramatic amount of history, including up through the President's own statement that he believed marriage was just between a man and a woman.

When he was running for office, apparently, according to his campaign manager or whatever he is—whatever he was—he felt he wouldn't get elected if he said what he really believed.

Nonetheless, in 6½ years, we are told things have changed to the point we are now in a position to overrule what Moses said, which is that a man will leave his father and mother and a woman leave her home and the two will come together. That would be marriage—Moses, who is the only full-faced profile above us in the gallery, with the side profiles of all of the great lawgivers, the greatest lawgivers as they were thought to be years ago.

I will also note that, as I sat and listened to the Supreme Court's entertaining arguments on whether or not Texas could keep our monument dedicated to the Ten Commandments on our State campgrounds—and it was joined with a case from Kentucky on whether they could keep their Ten Commandments that were posted inside the door—and as they were arguing about whether or not the Ten Commandments could be attributed in that manner, I looked up on the marble wall to my right in the Supreme Court's chambers, and there was Moses, looking down with both tablets of the Ten Commandments, looking down—interesting, very interesting. It is the kind of mental gymnastics that have been played in the Supreme Court throughout its history.

We know Dred Scott was a dreadful decision, and there have been others that were poor. Sometimes, in being human, they get them right, and sometimes, they get them wrong; but there is one thing that is very, very, very clear, and it is in the United States Code. It is United States law.

It is volume 28 of the United States Code, section 455, and section (a) is very clear: "Any justice, judge, or magistrate judge of the United States shall"—no room for question—"disqualify himself"—that is generic, meaning mankind; it could be male or female—"in any proceeding in which his impartiality might reasonably be questioned."

That is the law, and the only way that we can remain a nation that believes in the rule of law is if the courts that decide whether a law can stand or

must fall abide by the laws that apply to them. If the highest court in the United States blatantly violates the law and especially blatantly violates the law in deciding a case, then is it really law that they have made if they have violated the law to create it?

In knowing that the law is very clear, a United States Supreme Court Justice "shall disqualify him or herself in any proceeding in which his impartiality might reasonably be questioned." Then we must look next to see if there are any indications of partiality on the part of any of the Supreme Court Justices.

Here is an article that was published by foxnews.com back on September 1, 2013, and it reads the following: "Two months after the Supreme Court's landmark ruling to expand Federal recognition of same-sex marriages, striking down part of an anti-gay marriage law, Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg officiated at a same-sex wedding.

"The officiating is believed to be a first for a member of the Nation's highest court.

"Ginsburg officiated Saturday at the marriage of Kennedy Center President Michael Kaiser and John Roberts, a government economist."

I was just out at the Kennedy Center this weekend—it may be the only weekend; I am here in Washington all year—and was delighted to be there. Apparently, if Michael Kaiser is still the president, he is doing what appears to be an excellent job there.

Further down in the article, it is quoting Justice Ginsburg, and it reads: "I think it will be one more statement that people who love each other and want to live together should be able to enjoy the blessings and the strife in the marriage relationship," Ginsburg told The Washington Post in an interview.

"It won't be long before there will be another" performed by a Justice. She has another ceremony planned for September."

The last line—it is not the last of the article—but it reads: "Justices generally avoid taking stands on political issues."

The rest of the article goes on: "While hearing arguments in the case in March, Ginsburg argued for treating marriages equally. The rights associated with marriage are pervasive, she said."

Anyway, it reads further down: "Before the Court heard arguments on the Defense of Marriage Act, Ginsburg told The New Yorker magazine in March that she had not performed a same-sex marriage and had not been asked. Justices do officiate at other weddings, though.

"I don't think anybody's asking us, because of these cases," she told the magazine. "No one in the gay rights movement wants to risk having any member of the Court be criticized or asked to recuse. So I think that's the reason no one has asked me."

"Asked whether she would perform such a wedding in the future, she said, 'Why not?'"

Apparently, the Associated Press also contributed to that report.

It doesn't sound as if it could be any more clear that Justice Ginsburg has a very solid opinion that gay marriage, same-sex marriage, same-sex weddings are constitutional, despite its being something that is reserved to the States and to the people under the 10th Amendment for decisions.

On September 22 of 2014, in *The Hill*, written by Peter Sullivan, an article reads: "Supreme Court Justice Elena Kagan officiated a same-sex wedding on Sunday, a court spokeswoman told the Associated Press.

"The ceremony in Maryland for a former law clerk is the first same-sex wedding that Kagan has performed. Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg and retired Justice Sandra Day O'Connor have both performed same-sex weddings in the past.

"Gay marriage has been a divisive topic at the Supreme Court as it has been elsewhere in the country."

Further down, the article reads: "The Court could decide as early as this month whether to take up the issue again in the coming session, this time to consider a more sweeping ruling declaring a right to same-sex marriage across the country.

"Ginsburg said last week that, unless an appeals court allows a gay marriage ban to stand, 'there is no need for us to rush' on a Supreme Court ruling."

Clearly, Justice Kagan has made her feelings clear on same-sex marriage. There could not be a more clear, unequivocal statement that any just judge or Justice could ever make on the issue of same-sex marriage than to actually perform, officiate, in a same-sex wedding.

Here is a Newsmax article from May 18, 2015, by Greg Richter: "Supreme Court Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg sparked speculation on Sunday when she mentioned the Constitution while officiating a same-sex wedding."

Further down is a quote from Maureen Dowd, a columnist for *The New York Times*: "With a sly look and special emphasis on the word 'Constitution,' Justice Ginsburg said that she was pronouncing the two men married by the powers vested in her by the Constitution of the United States, Dowd wrote."

□ 1915

Then it also says in the article, "Nevertheless, guests applauded loudly, Dowd said, and Ginsburg 'seemed delighted.'"

For Justice Ginsburg to state publicly that the Constitution of the United States gives her the power to officiate and unite a same-sex couple in marriage is an unequivocal, clear statement as to what she believes the Supreme Court should do in their decision. If there was ever any doubt—and there wasn't. Once she performed a same-sex wedding, there was no question about her feelings on the matter.

An article from *National Review* by Edward Whelan, February 19 of this

year, the article, just a small part of it here: "At her Supreme Court confirmation hearing in 1993, Ruth Bader Ginsburg repeatedly explained that the judicial obligation of impartiality required that she give 'no hints, no forecasts, no previews' about how she might 'vote on questions the Supreme Court may be called upon to decide.'"

As she declared in her opening statement: "A judge sworn to decide impartially can offer no forecasts, no hints, for that would show not only disregard for the specifics of the particular case, it would display disdain for the entire judicial process." That was Ruth Bader Ginsburg in 1993. Apparently, she sees things a great deal differently now.

Further down in the article, Edward Whelan writes: "Human nature being what it is, it's not easy for a Justice to recuse in a closely divided case that she obviously cares passionately about. This is exactly the situation Justice Scalia faced a dozen years ago in the wake of his public comments criticizing a Ninth Circuit ruling against the Pledge of Allegiance. As *Slate's* Dahlia Lithwick wrote at the time, Scalia was 'intellectually honest enough to know that he slipped,' and he thus, 'recused himself from what would have been one of the most important church-state cases of his career.' His recusal meant that 'the Court may well split 4-4 on the case, in which case the Ninth Circuit's decision will stand for all the States in its jurisdiction.'"

We also have a quote from Justice Sonia Sotomayor: "I suspect even with us giving gay rights to marry, that there's some gay people who will choose not to, just as there's some heterosexual couples who choose not to marry. So we are not taking anybody's liberty away."

Justice Sotomayor has obviously stated her position very clearly on the issue of same-sex marriage.

This is an article from May 27, 2009, Lisa Keen from the Keen News Service. She says in an article: "Long-time gay legal activist Paula Ettelbrick said she met Sotomayor in about 1991 when they both served on then-New York Governor Mario Cuomo's Advisory Committee on Fighting Bias. 'Nobody wanted to talk to . . .'" and uses a slur for a homosexual "'person at that time,' said Ettelbrick, who represented Lambda Legal Defense and Education Fund. 'She was the only one on the advisory committee who made a point to come over and introduce herself. She was totally interested in gay civil rights issues and supportive.'"

Evan Wolfson, head of the national Freedom to Marry organization said: "From everything I know, Judge Sotomayor is an outstanding choice, fair and aware, open, and judicious. I believe she has demonstrated the commitment to principles of equal protection and inclusion that defines a good nominee to the Supreme Court." Wolfson said the President "has made a strong and appealing nomination that

should and will receive the support of those committed to equality for lesbians and gay men." The National LGBT Bar Association issued a statement saying it was pleased with the choice, noting that it represents "more diversity on the bench."

In view, actually, of her quote, it seems that she has clearly stated her position with regard to same-sex marriage. Anyway, the article further down said Kevin Cathcart, executive director of Lambda Legal Defense and Education Fund, said the organization was pleased that the nominee is a woman of color. "While women, people of color, and self-identified gay people continue to be woefully underrepresented in the Federal judiciary, Judge Sotomayor's nomination represents a step in the right direction," Cathcart said.

So, anyway, if those quotes are accurate, then certainly they would be supporting evidence of her quote that "I suspect even with us giving gay rights to marry . . ." she is already stating in this quote that she, not the Creator, not God, not almighty God, not the Constitution—"us giving," obviously the Supreme Court.

So, as Jefferson pointed out, you know, he trembles for the country when he realizes that God is just and his justice will not sleep forever. It is not the Supreme Court that gives rights. We get our rights, according to the Declaration of Independence, from our Creator, and they are embodied or supposed to have been embodied in the Constitution. And yes, it took a Civil War to ensure that the Constitution meant what it said, and it took an ordained Christian minister named King to push peacefully until such time as the Constitution was more thoroughly forced to mean what it said.

We are talking about marriage here. For anyone who is a Christian, that means they believe in Jesus Christ, they believe His teachings, they believe He is Savior, and they would have to believe when He quoted Moses, who said he was giving the law from God, and Jesus said: A man shall leave his father and mother, and a woman leave her home, and the two will become one flesh, and what God joined together, let no one put asunder. He put His stamp: this is marriage. It approved what Moses said was marriage, and in this Nation, throughout the Nation, until some said we have become smarter than we have ever been, once again defying Solomon's statement: There is nothing new under the Sun. This is not new. We are not more enlightened than other civilizations have been.

But if the Supreme Court in a majority decision destroys the constitutions of numerous States across this Nation, and the majority opinion has Justices who are violating Federal statute regarding what a judge shall do, then it would appear that their law would be no more valid than if someone here cast the deciding vote on legislation that becomes law, and it is determined

that the deciding vote was cast by someone who was not legally a Member of Congress. There would be reason to say that is not a valid law. It did not pass the House of Representatives. And especially, if it turned out that, say, 20, 30, 40 percent of those casting the majority votes on a bill were disqualified at the time of the vote from casting a vote, that would not be a legitimate law.

I hope, and since I believe in prayer, I pray that those Justices who have made clear by their statements and their actions that they are disqualified, will do the lawful thing and recuse themselves. If they do not do that, they will be casting a ballot, casting a vote, and if that vote is the majority decision, and if that decision overturns massive law on marriage across the country, and by its statement says: We know more than Moses, we know more than Jesus, we are the U.S. Supreme Court, it certainly sounds like they will have produced an unlawful decision of the Supreme Court. I hope they will not put this Nation to such a constitutional crisis by violating the law to push through their legislative agenda, but we will see. Will they start a constitutional crisis by violating the law to push their legislative agenda through the Court? We will see. I hope and pray that they will follow the law and disqualify themselves.

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

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. FATTAH (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today after 5 p.m.

#### SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 565. An act to reduce the operations and maintenance costs associated with the Federal fleet by encouraging the use of remanufactured parts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

#### ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 17, 2015, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1842. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and

Human Services, transmitting Fiscal Years 2011-2012 Report to Congress on the Family Violence Prevention and Services Program, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 10404; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1843. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Summary of Benefits and Coverage and Uniform Glossary (RIN: 1210-AB69) received June 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1844. A letter from the Deputy Director, ODRM, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Summary of Benefits and Coverage and Uniform Glossary [CMS-9938-F] (RIN: 0938-AS54) received June 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1845. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Update of the Motor Vehicle Emissions Budgets and General Conformity Budgets for the Scranton/Wilkes-Barre 1997 8-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard Maintenance Area [EPA-R03-OAR-2014-0652; FRL-9929-07-Region 3] received June 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1846. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Di-n-butyl carbonate; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2014-0176; FRL-9928-63-OCSPP] received June 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1847. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Revision to the New York State Implementation Plan for Carbon Monoxide [EPA-R02-OAR-2013-0192; FRL-9929-11-Region 2] received June 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1848. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; South Carolina; Charlotte-Rock Hill; Base Year Emissions Inventory and Emissions Statements Requirements for the 2008 8-Hour Ozone Standard [EPA-R04-OAR-2014-0915; FRL-9928-88-Region 4] received June 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1849. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Sethoxydim; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2014-0161; FRL-9928-20] received June 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1850. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction that was declared in Executive Order 12938 of November 14, 1994, and continued by the President each year, most recently on November 7, 2014, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1703(c) and 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1851. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the annual report pursuant to

Sec. 2(9) of the Senate's Resolution of Advice and Consent to the Treaty with the United Kingdom Concerning Defense Trade Cooperation (Treaty Doc. 110-07); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

#### 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. RYAN of Wisconsin: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 2580. A bill to provide for a technical change to the Medicare long-term care hospital moratorium exception, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114-156). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BURGESS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 319. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 160) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on medical devices, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1190) to repeal the provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act providing for the Independent Payment Advisory Board (Rept. 114-157). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 2506. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to delay the authority to terminate Medicare Advantage contracts for MA plans failing to achieve minimum quality ratings with an amendment (Rept. 114-158, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 2507. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to establish an annual rulemaking schedule for payment rates under Medicare Advantage; with an amendment (Rept. 114-159, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 2579. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve the risk adjustment under the Medicare Advantage program, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114-160, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 2581. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to establish a 3-year demonstration program to test the use of value-based insurance design methodologies under eligible Medicare Advantage plans, to preserve Medicare beneficiary choice under Medicare Advantage, to revise the treatment under the Medicare program of infusion drugs furnished through durable medical equipment, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114-161, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Energy and Commerce discharged from further consideration. H.R. 2506 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Energy and Commerce discharged from further consideration. H.R. 2507 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Energy and Commerce

discharged from further consideration. H.R. 2579 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Energy and Commerce discharged from further consideration. H.R. 2581 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### 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. REICHERT (for himself and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 2788. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for S corporation reform, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARCHANT (for himself, Mr. BLACK, and Mr. SMITH of Texas):

H.R. 2789. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify S corporation shareholder and preferred stock rules with respect to banks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 2790. A bill to provide for pay parity for civilian employees serving at joint military installations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself and Mr. WALDEN):

H.R. 2791. A bill to require that certain Federal lands be held in trust by the United States for the benefit of certain Indian tribes in Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GROTHMAN:

H.R. 2792. A bill to require that any revision to, or establishment of, a national primary or secondary ambient air quality standard be made by statute, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia:

H.R. 2793. A bill to amend the Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to take appropriate actions to ensure that an alien who is unlawfully present in the United States, is in removal proceedings or has been ordered removed, and is required to register under the Act, is so registered, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HONDA (for himself, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. LEE, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. TAKAI, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. TAKANO):

H.R. 2794. A bill to strengthen and unite communities through English literacy and civics education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE (for herself, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. CASTRO

of Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. BASS, Ms. LEE, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mr. PALLONE):

H.R. 2795. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to submit a study on the circumstances which may impact the effectiveness and availability of first responders before, during, or after a terrorist threat or event; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. RICHMOND:

H.R. 2796. A bill to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to provide grants to States for summer employment programs for youth; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. RICHMOND:

H.R. 2797. A bill to amend the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 to establish the Office of School Discipline Policy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. AMASH:

H.J. Res. 57. A joint resolution directing the President to remove United States Armed Forces deployed to Iraq or Syria on or after August 7, 2014, other than Armed Forces required to protect United States diplomatic facilities and personnel, from Iraq and Syria; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. SIRES, Mr. LANCE, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. YARMUTH):

H. Res. 317. A resolution congratulating American Pharoah and owner Ahmed Zayat of Teaneck, New Jersey, for winning horse racing's Triple Crown; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CURBELO of Florida (for himself, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. STEFANK, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mr. HIGGINS):

H. Res. 318. A resolution condemning resolutions or policies calling for or instituting a boycott of Israeli academic institutions or scholars by institutions of higher learning and scholarly associations; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. HAHN (for herself, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. ESTY, and Mr. JONES):

H. Res. 320. A resolution expressing the sense of Congress that a grateful Nation honors and salutes Sons and Daughters in Touch on its 25th anniversary that is being celebrated on Father's Day, 2015, at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial in Washington, the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, 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.

#### MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

55. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 68, urging the Congress of the United States to restore trade relations between the United States and Cuba in order to open the market to Louisiana rice; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

56. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 66, urging the Congress of the United States to take action

against illegal, unreported, and unregulated fishing in Louisiana's sovereign waters by passing H.R. 774, the Illegal, Unreported, and Unregulated Fishing Enforcement Act of 2015; jointly to the Committees on Natural Resources and Transportation and Infrastructure.

#### 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. REICHERT:

H.R. 2788.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MARCHANT:

H.R. 2789.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Constitution Art. I Sec. 8 cl. 1, under the "Power To lay and collect Taxes";

Amd. 16, under the "power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration"; and

Art. I Sec. 8 cl. 18, under the power "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 2790.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 2791.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 1 of Article I of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. GROTHMAN:

H.R. 2792.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia:

H.R. 2793.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4, which states that Congress has the power "to establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States."

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, which states that Congress has the power to "make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof . . ."

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 2794.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 2795.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. RICHMOND:

H.R. 2796.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is introduced pursuant to the powers granted to Congress under the General Welfare Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 1), the Commerce Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 3), and the Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 18).

Further, this statement of constitutional authority is made for the sole purpose of compliance with clause 7 of Rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives and shall have no bearing on judicial review of the accompanying bill.

By Mr. RICHMOND:

H.R. 2797.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is introduced pursuant to the powers granted to Congress under the General Welfare Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 1), the Commerce Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 3), and the Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 18).

Further, this statement of constitutional authority is made for the sole purpose of compliance with clause 7 of Rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives and shall have no bearing on judicial review of the accompanying bill.

By Mr. AMASH:

H.J. Res. 57.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the Constitution (authorizing Congress to "make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces"). Article I, Section 8, Clause 11 of the Constitution authorizes Congress to "declare War." Congress did not declare war or authorize the use of military force for the current conflict in Iraq and Syria, and this resolution takes corrective action.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 6: Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. ZELDIN, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. BOST, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.

H.R. 24: Mr. HURD of Texas.

H.R. 136: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California and Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California.

H.R. 197: Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 244: Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS.

H.R. 511: Mr. SALMON.

H.R. 532: Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 540: Ms. JUDY CHU of California and Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 592: Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 616: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H.R. 653: Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 662: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 699: Mr. CARSON of Indiana and Mr. PERRY.

H.R. 700: Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 702: Mr. MILLER of Florida and Mr. GIBBS.

H.R. 727: Ms. GRAHAM.

H.R. 753: Ms. NORTON and Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 766: Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 775: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SIRES, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 828: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 845: Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. FORTENBERRY, and Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.

H.R. 846: Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mrs. DINGELL.

H.R. 868: Mr. POE of Texas and Mr. MULVANEY.

H.R. 885: Mr. GALLEGO.

H.R. 915: Mrs. DINGELL.

H.R. 916: Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 928: Mr. SANFORD and Mr. HURD of Texas.

H.R. 985: Mr. BARR, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. YODER, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 986: Mr. HARRIS, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. MICA, and Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.

H.R. 1054: Mr. DESANTIS.

H.R. 1057: Mrs. NOEM.

H.R. 1062: Mr. JOLLY.

H.R. 1095: Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 1132: Mr. ISSA.

H.R. 1141: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.

H.R. 1211: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 1218: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 1233: Mr. CARTER of Georgia and Mr. BABIN.

H.R. 1283: Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 1288: Mr. ZELDIN.

H.R. 1300: Ms. STEFANIK.

H.R. 1301: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. YODER.

H.R. 1309: Mr. CHAFFETZ and Mr. CARTER of Texas.

H.R. 1310: Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 1331: Mr. KNIGHT.

H.R. 1338: Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. COHEN, Mr. GOSAR, and Mrs. DINGELL.

H.R. 1387: Mr. MICA.

H.R. 1424: Mr. DOLD.

H.R. 1462: Mr. JOLLY.

H.R. 1478: Mr. POLIQUIN.

H.R. 1516: Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS.

H.R. 1519: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 1523: Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 1559: Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1571: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. COHEN, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 1591: Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 1607: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 1610: Mr. GIBBS.

H.R. 1613: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1624: Mr. JOYCE, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, and Mr. BOST.

H.R. 1669: Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 1686: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 1692: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 1726: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. RUSH, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. GUTHRIE.

H.R. 1736: Mr. MARINO.

H.R. 1737: Mr. BABIN, Ms. GRAHAM, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. KILMER, Mr. LAMBORN, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. JOLLY, and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 1769: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. COHEN, Mr. RUSH, and Miss RICE of New York.

H.R. 1785: Mr. MULVANEY.

H.R. 1804: Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 1854: Mr. ALLEN and Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H.R. 1945: Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 1948: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1953: Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 1956: Mr. TAKAI.

H.R. 1957: Mr. TAKAI.

H.R. 1994: Mr. GOSAR and Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 2042: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. LAMBORN, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. LOUDERMILK, and Ms. MCSALLY.

H.R. 2046: Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin.

H.R. 2061: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 2102: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 2123: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 2141: Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 2142: Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 2147: Mr. LEWIS, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 2150: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

H.R. 2156: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 2191: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 2215: Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 2217: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. MEEKS.

H.R. 2259: Mr. KING of Iowa and Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 2272: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 2300: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 2302: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H.R. 2315: Mr. PEARCE and Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California.

H.R. 2342: Mr. TAKAI.

H.R. 2371: Mrs. DINGELL.

H.R. 2400: Mr. BRAT and Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 2403: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

H.R. 2404: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.

H.R. 2405: Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. RICHMOND, and Mr. NEAL.

H.R. 2406: Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, and Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.

H.R. 2460: Ms. PINGREE, Mr. JONES, and Mr. GIBSON.

H.R. 2466: Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. CRENSHAW, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 2493: Mr. TAKANO, Mr. POLIS, Mr. ZELDIN, and Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H.R. 2508: Mr. MOOLENAAR.

H.R. 2513: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 2514: Mr. CLAWSON of Florida and Mr. PERRY.

H.R. 2517: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.

H.R. 2520: Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 2521: Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 2530: Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 2531: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 2551: Mrs. NOEM.

H.R. 2576: Mr. MOOLENAAR and Mr. DESJARLAIS.

H.R. 2582: Mr. JOLLY, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

H.R. 2594: Mr. DONOVAN.

H.R. 2607: Mr. DONOVAN and Mr. GIBSON.

H.R. 2610: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 2615: Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. PIERLUISI.

H.R. 2630: Mr. CLAWSON of Florida.

H.R. 2646: Mr. LANCE, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. WENSTRUP.

H.R. 2647: Mr. TIPTON and Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

H.R. 2650: Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 2658: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania,

Mr. HARPER, Mr. LANCE, Mr. DENT, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. JONES.

H.R. 2663: Mr. POCAN and Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 2689: Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 2694: Mr. NEAL, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. HONDA, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BEYER, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 2710: Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. TIPTON, and Mr. ABRAHAM.

H.R. 2714: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 2732: Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 2737: Mr. McDERMOTT and Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 2752: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 2753: Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 2760: Mr. COLE.

H.R. 2762: Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 2763: Mr. SABLAN.

H.R. 2767: Ms. NORTON, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 2770: Mr. KEATING.  
H.R. 2773: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.  
H.R. 2776: Mr. RANGEL and Ms. BORDALLO.  
H.J. Res. 22: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of  
New York and Mr. RUIZ.  
H.J. Res. 42: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.  
H.J. Res. 45: Ms. MCSALLY.  
H.J. Res. 51: Mrs. DINGELL.  
H. Con. Res. 18: Mr. KILDEE.  
H. Res. 28: Mr. WITTMAN.

H. Res. 54: Mr. WITTMAN.  
H. Res. 210: Mr. HECK of Washington.  
H. Res. 262: Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. HASTINGS,  
and Ms. BORDALLO.  
H. Res. 263: Mr. COHEN.  
H. Res. 294: Mr. TONKO.  
H. Res. 307: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. WEBER of  
Texas.  
H. Res. 310: Mr. COHEN, Mr. DONOVAN, and  
Mr. BLUMENAUER.

DELETION OF SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors  
were deleted from public bills and reso-  
lutions, as follows:

H.R. 1942: Mr. HARRIS.