

clear that the agency has been operating at an unacceptable level of resources.

The agency is understaffed at the agent and Uniform Division levels, resulting in shifts that are too long and which leave inadequate time for training.

The agency also needs to better use state-of-the-art technology and communications equipment.

All of these deficiencies contributed to the security breakdowns that allowed a man to climb over the White House fence, evade Secret Service officers while running across the White House lawn, and then run into the White House itself.

The goal of H.R. 1656 is to prevent future such incidents—and to protect against even more sophisticated threats that could result in far more harm.

This bill also would require that future directors of the Secret Service, after nomination by the President, be subject to Senate confirmation.

The current Director, Joseph Clancy, appears to be doing a good job in reinvigorating that agency, and we do not propose this as a criticism of him, or the President's selection of him, in any way.

However, this position—as is the case with the directors of the other law enforcement components of the Department of Homeland Security—should be Senate-confirmed, reinforcing the need to appoint the most highly-qualified candidates and elevating the position in stature.

With the consideration of this legislation today, we recognize that it is unfortunately the case that the Secret Service has recently failed to live up to its high standards with respect to the protection it provides our President and others.

By adopting the "Secret Service Improvements Act," we can help restore the agency so that it will be better prepared to achieve its mission.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1656, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

BORDER SECURITY TECHNOLOGY ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 2015

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1634) to strengthen accountability for deployment of border security technology at the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1634

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Border Security Technology Accountability Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. BORDER SECURITY TECHNOLOGY ACCOUNTABILITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle C of title IV of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 231 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 434. BORDER SECURITY TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM MANAGEMENT.

"(a) PLANNING DOCUMENTATION.—For each border security technology acquisition program of the Department that is determined to be a major acquisition program, the Secretary shall—

"(1) ensure that each such program has a written acquisition program baseline approved by the relevant acquisition decision authority;

"(2) document that each such program is meeting cost, schedule, and performance thresholds as specified in such baseline, in compliance with relevant departmental acquisition policies and the Federal Acquisition Regulation; and

"(3) have a plan for meeting program implementation objectives by managing contractor performance.

"(b) ADHERENCE TO STANDARDS.—The Secretary, acting through the Under Secretary for Management and the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, shall ensure border security technology acquisition program managers who are responsible for carrying out this section adhere to relevant internal control standards identified by the Comptroller General of the United States. The Commissioner shall provide information, as needed, to assist the Under Secretary in monitoring proper program management of border security technology acquisition programs under this section.

"(c) PLAN.—The Secretary, acting through the Under Secretary for Management, in coordination with the Under Secretary for Science and Technology and the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a plan for testing and evaluation, as well as the use of independent verification and validation resources, for border security technology so that new border security technologies are evaluated through a series of assessments, processes, and audits to ensure compliance with relevant departmental acquisition policies and the Federal Acquisition Regulation, as well as the effectiveness of taxpayer dollars.

"(d) MAJOR ACQUISITION PROGRAM DEFINED.—In this section, the term 'major acquisition program' means a Department acquisition program that is estimated by the Secretary to require an eventual total expenditure of at least \$300,000,000 (based on fiscal year 2015 constant dollars) over its life cycle cost."

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 433 the following new item:

"Sec. 434. Border security technology program management."

SEC. 3. PROHIBITION ON ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act and the amendments made by this Act. This Act and such amendments shall be carried out using amounts otherwise available for such purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VELA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Arizona.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

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

I rise today in support of H.R. 1634, the Border Security Technology Accountability Act, which I introduced earlier this year.

This bill seeks to provide the improved management of border security technology projects, safeguarding taxpayer dollars and increasing accountability for some of the Department of Homeland Security's largest acquisition programs.

The constituents I represent in southern Arizona are demanding better border security, and they expect us to do it through cost-effective and efficient means. They know that wasting taxpayer dollars on poorly managed border technology projects does little to actually secure the border or to improve our strategy. That is why this bill is so important.

The GAO has repeatedly included DHS acquisition management activities on its high-risk list, demonstrating that these programs are highly susceptible to waste, fraud, abuse, or mismanagement. The Secure Border Initiative, also known as SBInet, is a prime example of acquisition mismanagement at DHS. Initial plans developed in 2005 and 2006 called for the SBInet to extend across the entire U.S.-Mexico land border. However, SBInet deployment in my home State of Arizona was fraught with management problems, including a failure to adequately set requirements so the system would meet the needs of its users—our border patrol agents. After spending nearly \$1 billion of the taxpayers' money with minimal results, DHS canceled SBInet in 2011.

SBInet is not the only example, as DHS does not seem to be learning its lesson. The Government Accountability Office recently reported to the Committee on Homeland Security that Customs and Border Protection's Strategic Air and Marine Plan—or StAMP—initiated in 2006, with a cost of \$1.8 billion to date, still does not have an approved acquisition program baseline. This means that, despite CBP's plans to acquire boats and aircraft through 2035, they have not yet estimated how much it would cost to operate and maintain these systems.

How can we ensure programs like StAMP are on time, on budget, and are fiscally sound if DHS fails to follow sound management procedures?

We cannot afford to waste another minute or another dollar. We must put

in place strong, effective technology programs to secure our borders. This bill requires that border security technology programs at the Department have an acquisition program baseline—a critical document that lays out what a program will do, what it will cost, and when it will be completed.

□ 1615

The bill also requires programs to adhere to internal control standards and have a plan for testing and evaluation as well as the use of independent verification and validation resources.

My district includes over 80 miles of our U.S. border with Mexico, and I have spent countless hours at the border meeting with border residents and our Border Patrol.

I know firsthand that, when our border technology project lacks the proper oversight and accountability, it is bad for the taxpayers, those who defend our border and those who live along our border.

The Committee on Homeland Security approved my legislation by a unanimous voice vote last month. I urge all Members to join me in supporting robust, responsible secure technology along our border.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1634, the Border Security Technology Accountability Act of 2015.

Over the past several years, the Government Accountability Office has examined the various Department of Homeland Security programs and concluded that DHS has not followed standard best practices for acquisitions management.

Though DHS has taken steps to improve its performance, specific deficiencies in how the Department carries out major acquisitions remain.

When a DHS acquisition program falls short in terms of effectiveness or efficiency, it not only risks undermining that program, but also risks wasting limited Homeland Security dollars.

For example, DHS spent hundreds of millions of dollars on the SBInet border security program before it was ultimately canceled. No doubt, this funding could have been put to far better use along our Nation's border.

The Border Security Technology Accountability Act would require each of the Department's major acquisitions for border security technology to have written documentation reflecting a baseline approved by the relevant acquisition decision authority and demonstrate that the program is meeting agreed-upon cost, schedule, and performance thresholds before moving into the next phase of the acquisition cycle.

The bill also requires the Under Secretary for Management, in coordination with the Commissioner of Customs and Border Protection, to submit to Congress a plan for testing and evalua-

tion as well as the use of independent verification and validation resources for border security technology.

There is need for improving acquisitions management at the Department of Homeland Security as a whole, and addressing border security technology acquisitions is an important step. We owe it to the American taxpayers to make sure we are managing these investments wisely and preventing wasteful spending.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1634 aims to focus and improve the way we invest in and manage border security technology by providing a specific framework for accountability and oversight on behalf of the American taxpayer.

I thank Congresswoman MCSALLY for her leadership in bringing this bill forward, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I want to thank my colleague, Mr. VELA, for his support and all of my colleagues on our committee for support for this bill.

I once again urge my colleagues to support transparency, accountability, and efficiency of vital border security technology projects.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1634, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRECLEARANCE AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2015

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 998) to establish the conditions under which the Secretary of Homeland Security may establish preclearance facilities, conduct preclearance operations, and provide customs services outside the United States, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 998

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Preclearance Authorization Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. DEFINITION.

In this Act, the term "appropriate congressional committees" means the Committee on Homeland Security and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on Finance of the Senate.

SEC. 3. ESTABLISHMENT OF PRECLEARANCE OPERATIONS.

Pursuant to section 1629 of title 19, United States Code, and subject to section 5, the

Secretary of Homeland Security may establish U.S. Customs and Border Protection preclearance operations in a foreign country to—

(1) prevent terrorists, instruments of terrorism, and other security threats from entering the United States;

(2) prevent inadmissible persons from entering the United States;

(3) ensure merchandise destined for the United States complies with applicable laws;

(4) ensure the prompt processing of persons eligible to travel to the United States; and

(5) accomplish such other objectives as the Secretary determines necessary to protect the United States.

SEC. 4. NOTIFICATION AND CERTIFICATION TO CONGRESS.

(a) NOTIFICATION.—Not later than 180 days before entering into an agreement with the government of a foreign country to establish U.S. Customs and Border Protection preclearance operations in such foreign country, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall provide to the appropriate congressional committees the following:

(1) A copy of the proposed agreement to establish such preclearance operations, including an identification of the foreign country with which U.S. Customs and Border Protection intends to enter into a preclearance agreement, the location at which such preclearance operations will be conducted, and the terms and conditions for U.S. Customs and Border Protection personnel operating at the location.

(2) An estimate of the date on which U.S. Customs and Border Protection intends to establish preclearance operations under such agreement.

(3) The anticipated funding sources for preclearance operations under such agreement, and other funding sources considered.

(4) An assessment of the impact such preclearance operations will have on legitimate trade and travel, including potential impacts on passengers traveling to the United States.

(5) A homeland security threat assessment for the country in which such preclearance operations are to be established.

(6) An assessment of the impacts such preclearance operations will have on U.S. Customs and Border Protection domestic port of entry staffing.

(7) Information on potential economic, competitive, and job impacts on United States air carriers associated with establishing such preclearance operations.

(8) Information on the anticipated homeland security benefits associated with establishing such preclearance operations.

(9) Information on potential security vulnerabilities associated with commencing such preclearance operations, and mitigation plans to address such potential security vulnerabilities.

(10) A U.S. Customs and Border Protection staffing model for such preclearance operations, and plans for how such positions would be filled.

(11) Information on the anticipated costs over the next five fiscal years associated with commencing such preclearance operations.

(12) A copy of the agreement referred to in subsection (a) of section 5.

(13) Other factors that the Secretary of Homeland Security determines to be necessary for Congress to comprehensively assess the appropriateness of commencing such preclearance operations.

(b) CERTIFICATIONS RELATING TO PRECLEARANCE OPERATIONS ESTABLISHED AT AIRPORTS.—In the case of an airport, in addition to the notification requirements under subsection (a), not later than 90 days before