

with a symbolic seal from the Philippines, and an elephant piggy bank from Indonesia. We couldn't buy everything they displayed, but let me tell you, there was no consciousness that Congress should be supporting goods made in America, here at the highest lawmaking branch of our country.

How can Congress expect to strengthen American industry and create American jobs if it itself is not buying American-made goods? If there is one place in our country that should showcase items made in the U.S.A., it is right here in the Congress. How can the American people trust Congress to be responsible if it is selling goods that create jobs in other places, not here in America?

That is why H.R. 2039 was introduced in the first place, because we must employ at this time of high unemployment every opportunity to help turn our economic ship of state in a positive direction. This bill creates a clear standard. It says we must change our practices. It says we must restore manufacturing in America.

It begins to do this by raising the consciousness of our Nation that the legislative branch of our Federal Government steps forward to say it is time to make goods in America again. That is where new jobs will come from.

Under the Buy America Act, current law states that the Federal Government, but not the legislative branch, must buy American-made products. But when this bill passes, the Congressional Made in America Promise Act will apply the Buy America Act to Congress.

In addition, when dealing with any product bearing an official insignia of the House, the Senate and the Congress, H.R. 2039 will prohibit the exceptions of not purchasing American goods if they are inconsistent with the public interest, not made in sufficiently available commercial quantities, or under the price of \$2,500. This means the only exceptions will be if the goods produced here are unreasonable in cost or not used in the United States.

This Congress has taken steps to close tax loopholes that reward large corporations that outsource business and jobs overseas. We are providing tax credits to help small businesses hire new employees and sell their products and innovation overseas, but we need to do more. Congress must lead by example.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 2039, help create jobs in America, help rebuild American industry by building in America once again. Vote for the Made in America Promise Act.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my colleague on the Committee of House Administration, the gentlewoman from California, SUSAN DAVIS.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. I want to thank my colleague from Pennsylvania for bringing H.R. 2039 forward today.

Mr. Speaker, the forefathers and mothers of our Nation included Con-

gress in section 1 of the Constitution for a reason. Congress is for the people by the people.

But for too long, Congress has encouraged Buy America throughout this country without setting a strong enough example here in the Halls of Congress. My colleague has just referenced a number of the pieces of goods that people purchased that were certainly not made in America.

I suspect that our forefathers would be pleased with this piece of legislation before us. As our Nation works to bolster our manufacturing sector for the 21st century and beyond, we can start with making sure that goods sold in the Capitol and Congress are made right here in the U.S.

The congressional Made in America Promise Act does just that by requiring that the rules of the Buy America Act apply to the legislative branch. By passing it, Congress is setting an example for our Nation. Goods sold in Congress should say "Made in the U.S.A."

For the people, by the people. Right now, we are seeing that getting back to the basics of making it in America is what works for our economy. In fact, in August, U.S. manufacturing expanded for the 13th straight month. Our manufacturing sector has always been a source of pride for our country, and it is still the best in the world. Now more than ever, we need to encourage the production of goods that are made in America because the more we make at home the more Americans will be able to go back to work.

I strongly support the congressional Made in America Promise Act.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2039, the Congressional Made in America Promise Act. I commend Representative MARCY KAPTUR for her leadership on this issue and working to get the bill passed.

Today, we are considering legislation that will help improve the Buy American Act, which requires the United States government to purchase goods produced and manufactured in the United States, when it is in the best interest of the United States to do so. Specifically, H.R. 2039 would amend the Buy American Act so that "Buy American" statutory requirements are applied to articles, materials and supplies used by Congressional offices. Further, the Made in America Promise Act requires that any article containing the Congressional seal be purchased from American vendors, without exception.

Mr. Speaker, this Act is an important part of the Democratic plan to assist Main Street Americans—hard-working, talented, dedicated workers. Citizens of Michigan's 15th Congressional District, unfortunately, have long been victims of outsourcing and unfair trade agreements, even before the Great Recession began. They have seen their jobs shipped overseas in large part because of corporate tax breaks encouraging outsourcing and trade policies that lower labor standards and do nothing to open up new markets for U.S. goods.

This legislation is part of an ongoing effort to save and create American jobs and continue our country on the path to economic recovery. What we have here is a choice be-

tween protecting the wealth of some versus creating opportunity for all. I ask my colleagues to join me in voting for opportunity.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 2039.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I stand in support of H.R. 2039, the Congressional Made in America Promise Act of 2009.

This bipartisan legislation ensures that the rules of the Buy American Act that apply to all states and federal agencies also apply to Congress. Under current law, states and the federal government must buy only American made products. Though exemptions exist for cases where public interest, cost or unavailability make purchasing the good prohibitive, all goods purchased by state and federal governments must be produced in the United States. Congress, however, is not subjected to this requirement.

Promoting American job growth is a priority for this Congress. This common sense legislation is example of our commitment. If passed, this legislation will apply a standard for procurement that exceeds that enforced by states and federal agencies. Any product bearing the official congressional insignias, including goods bearing a mark resembling the official seals of the U.S. Senate, U.S. House of Representatives, and the U.S. Congress, will have to be made in America.

Mr. Speaker, the president has set an ambitious goal to significantly increase this country's exports over the next two years. This legislation contributes to that effort by ensuring that goods procured by states, federal agencies and Congress are made in the U.S.A. I encourage my colleagues to join me in support of the bill.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I urge an "aye" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRADY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2039, 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. BRADY of Pennsylvania. 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 and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### BERRY AMENDMENT EXTENSION ACT

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3116) to prohibit the Department of Homeland Security from procuring certain items directly related to the national security unless the items are grown, reprocessed, reused, or produced in 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. 3116

*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 “Berry Amendment Extension Act”.

**SEC. 2. BUY AMERICAN REQUIREMENT IMPOSED ON DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY; EXCEPTIONS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subtitle H of title VIII of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 451 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

**“SEC. 890. BUY AMERICAN REQUIREMENT; EXCEPTIONS.**

“(a) **REQUIREMENT.**—Except as provided in subsections (c) through (e), the Secretary may not procure an item described in subsection (b) if the item is not grown, reprocessed, reused, or produced in the United States.

**“(b) COVERED ITEMS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—An item referred to in subsection (a) is any item described in paragraph (2), if the item is directly related to the national security interests of the United States.

“(2) **ITEMS DESCRIBED.**—An item described in this paragraph is any article or item of—

“(A) clothing and the materials and components thereof, other than sensors, electronics, or other items added to, and not normally associated with, clothing (and the materials and components thereof);

“(B) tents, tarpaulins, or covers;

“(C) cotton and other natural fiber products, woven silk or woven silk blends, spun silk yarn for cartridge cloth, synthetic fabric or coated synthetic fabric (including all textile fibers and yarns that are for use in such fabrics), canvas products, or wool (whether in the form of fiber or yarn or contained in fabrics, materials, or manufactured articles); or

“(D) any item of individual equipment manufactured from or containing such fibers, yarns, fabrics, or materials.

“(c) **AVAILABILITY EXCEPTION.**—Subsection (a) does not apply to the extent that the Secretary determines that satisfactory quality and sufficient quantity of any such article or item described in subsection (b)(2) grown, reprocessed, reused, or produced in the United States cannot be procured as and when needed.

“(d) **EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN PROCUREMENTS OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.**—Subsection (a) does not apply to the following:

“(1) Procurements by vessels in foreign waters.

“(2) Emergency procurements.

“(e) **EXCEPTION FOR SMALL PURCHASES.**—Subsection (a) does not apply to purchases for amounts not greater than the simplified acquisition threshold referred to in section 2304(g) of title 10, United States Code.

“(f) **APPLICABILITY TO CONTRACTS AND SUBCONTRACTS FOR PROCUREMENT OF COMMERCIAL ITEMS.**—This section is applicable to contracts and subcontracts for the procurement of commercial items notwithstanding section 34 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 430).

“(g) **GEOGRAPHIC COVERAGE.**—In this section, the term ‘United States’ includes the possessions of the United States.

“(h) **NOTIFICATION REQUIRED WITHIN 7 DAYS AFTER CONTRACT AWARD IF CERTAIN EXCEPTIONS APPLIED.**—In the case of any contract for the procurement of an item described in subsection (b)(2), if the Secretary applies an exception set forth in subsection (c) with respect to that contract, the Secretary shall, not later than 7 days after the award of the contract, post a notification that the exception has been applied.

**“(i) TRAINING.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall ensure that each member of the acquisition workforce who participates personally and substantially in the acquisition of textiles

on a regular basis receives training on the requirements of this section and the regulations implementing this section.

“(2) **INCLUSION OF INFORMATION IN NEW TRAINING PROGRAMS.**—The Secretary shall ensure that any training program for the acquisition workforce developed or implemented after the date of the enactment of this section includes comprehensive information on the requirements described in paragraph (1).

“(j) **CONSISTENCY WITH INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS.**—This section shall be applied in a manner consistent with United States obligations under international agreements.”

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—Section 890 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by subsection (a), shall apply with respect to contracts entered into by the Department of Homeland Security on and after the date occurring 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. RICHARDSON) and the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

□ 1040

**GENERAL LEAVE**

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Berry Amendment Extension Act, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 3116, the Berry Amendment Extension Act, was introduced by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. KISSELL). This legislation would apply procurement requirements that have been in place since 1941 at the Department of Defense to the Department of Homeland Security.

As approved in 1941, the purpose of the Berry Amendment was to protect the United States from our enemies by requiring that the military maintain rules and regulations regarding the uniforms worn by our soldiers.

Extension of the Berry Amendment to the Department of Homeland Security is the necessary thing to do from a security standpoint. Currently, there are not any requirements on where uniforms worn by enforcing agencies such as the Transportation Security Administration and Customs and Border Protection are manufactured.

In light of ongoing threats which require the utmost protection of our safety resources and personnel, the extension of the Berry Amendment is appropriate. Further, the failure to utilize American invested workers to produce military resources is not only detrimental to American manufacturing jobs, but it is also detrimental to our Nation's security.

A beneficial side effect of the Berry Amendment is its impact on jobs. Data shows that the Berry Amendment has allowed for the sustainment of over 450,000 textile and manufacturing jobs here in the United States. Further, using data from the U.S. Department of Commerce, it is estimated that for every \$1 billion in manufacturing output, 12,500 jobs are created in the United States.

During these trying economic times, H.R. 3116 provides us with a unique opportunity to create new jobs here in America, thereby giving U.S. workers any opportunity to “Make it in America.” This is where we all should stand.

As a strong supporter of U.S. manufacturing, I believe that it is our duty as a Congress to protect American jobs through our support of those small businesses that manufacture high quality textile products here in the United States.

Lastly, let us not forget most importantly that H.R. 3116 takes away a vulnerability in the procurement system. The law enforcement officials who work to protect our southern border—and northern border, for that matter as well—have witnessed drug couriers using phony uniforms to avoid detection in the smuggling of illegal drugs into the United States.

Considering the loose regulations on the location and types of facilities that manufacture uniforms worn by those who protect our Nation, we must take necessary steps to prevent smugglers from using our own uniforms to assist in their illegal activities and, worse, highlight vulnerabilities in the U.S. Homeland Security environment.

I fully support this legislation, H.R. 3116, under consideration and urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote for its passage.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3116, the Berry Amendment Extension Act.

This bill amends the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to prohibit the Secretary of Homeland Security from procuring certain items—including textiles such as clothing, tents, canvas and cotton—unless they are grown, reprocessed, reused, or produced in the United States. By requiring the Secretary to procure certain items from within the U.S., this bill takes an important step in promoting U.S. job growth and supporting large and small businesses alike.

The Department of Homeland Security employs over 150,000 uniformed men and women who are dedicated to the Department's vital mission of protecting the homeland against a range of threats. The U.S. Customs and Border Protection, for example, employs over 21,000 officers and 20,000 Border

Patrol agents, and these numbers continue to grow. The Transportation Security Administration has 48,000 officers. The U.S. Coast Guard has over 50,000 uniformed personnel. These growing numbers represent an opportunity to produce uniforms and other materials in the U.S. to support their mission, rather than overseas. This, in turn, will help create American jobs in this troubled economy.

The bill provides for exceptions in certain situations, including procurements by vessels in foreign waters, emergency procurements, low-cost procurements, and if items of sufficient quantity or quality are not available when needed.

The bill also includes language requiring its provisions to be applied in a manner consistent with U.S. obligations under international agreements.

H.R. 3116 is a commonsense piece of legislation.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. KISSELL).

Mr. KISSELL. I would like to thank my colleague from California for yielding the time and also for her strong support for made in America and U.S. manufacturing.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3116, the Berry Amendment Extension Act. For over 60 years, the Berry Amendment has served as the law by which the Department of Defense has had to purchase uniforms for our military. It has served its purpose well in protecting the men and women of our services with having the best uniforms and also protecting Americans that make these uniforms in providing for the jobs thereof.

In January of 2009, shortly after I was sworn in as a freshman Congressman, folks came to me and asked me if I would help extend the Berry Act in homeland security to just the TSA part. Now, I could not understand why this had not been done before, but I was assured it had been tried and had been unsuccessful because there was apparently a lot of special interest that was in opposition to this.

Having worked 27 years in textiles myself, I gladly took on this initiative, and with a lot of help, we were able to overcome the special interest, and we were able to get the extension of the Berry Act to the amendment for the Recovery Act applying just to TSA. We immediately went to work to introduce a bill of legislation that would complete this process by making all of Homeland Security very compliant.

I'm glad to say with a lot of support, and a lot of bipartisan support, today we are successful in bringing that bill to the floor. It makes sense. It's only logical for all of the reasons that have been given that we extend to Homeland Security and all the people that work there, whether it be Border Patrol,

TSA, ICE, Coast Guard, and Secret Service, in whatever function that they have, the uniforms that are the best, and the best is always made in the United States.

Textiles have suffered a lot through the years. It's estimated that, since December of 2000, the United States has suffered a \$575 billion deficit in textiles and apparel, a loss of over 587,000 jobs. In the most recent economic downturn, textiles has lost 60,000 jobs with the closing of over 44 textiles plants.

But textiles has not gone away. Textiles is energetic. It's creative. It represents the American entrepreneurial spirit, and it is surviving. This bill is a logical step to not only protect our Nation's security by having American uniforms on those that protect us in Homeland Security, but also protects American security by protecting American jobs.

Mr. Speaker, just two examples of the good that came out of just the TSA amendment. We received a letter shortly after we passed this act that was from Arkansas. Twenty people wrote to thank us for passing that act because it saved their jobs. Now, that's just 20 people, but that's 20 families in an economic downturn that didn't have to worry about jobs. Richmond Yarns, located in a small town near my hometown, credits the TSA amendment for not only their survival but creating 80 additional jobs. We have seen this and heard this time and time again from just the amendment that we passed with TSA. We will see this expand even further when we pass this legislation.

I urge all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this commonsense H.R. 3116, the Berry Amendment Extension Act.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of Congress who grew up in a family that depended on a textile plant check to put food on the table, I am proud to yield 3 minutes to a real champion of the textile industry, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE).

□ 1050

Mr. COBLE. I thank my colleague from Alabama. You indicate your involvement and exposure to textile employment, as did my friend from North Carolina. My late mom was a textile worker, so I, too, appreciate the significance of textile employment.

The Berry amendment requires the U.S. Defense Department to buy American for certain products that are judged to be essential to our military readiness. Buy American means that 100 percent of the product is produced and manufactured in the United States.

The Berry amendment helps ensure that we have a reliable domestic source for certain vital goods during time of war, and that our troops are equipped with the highest quality equipment. The Berry amendment has worked well. I am not aware of any situation,

Mr. Speaker, where it has limited the ability of our military to procure items, and it has ensured that our troops receive the highest quality essential equipment. Finally, it helps contain costs in the long term.

H.R. 3116 will expand this requirement to the Department of Homeland Security. DHS, as we all know, has grown. And while the Berry amendment has been successful for our military, I see no reason why it would not be equally successful for DHS. The requirement is not unlimited because government procurement policies are also covered by the World Trade Organization rules. Berry-type requirements are only permissible for agencies that are critical to national security. As a result, Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that H.R. 3116 would only apply to the Transportation Security Administration because of its national security role in securing our various and sundry airports.

I am pleased that President Obama supported the Berry amendment while he was serving in the Senate and hope that his views on this matter have not changed, and I think they probably have not.

The Berry amendment, furthermore, has been endorsed by AMTAC, the American Manufacturing Trade Action Coalition, and NCTO, the National Council for Textile Organizations. Economically, this requirement makes a lot of sense. Currently the Berry amendment is responsible for approximately 70,000 jobs, half of which are in the domestic textile industry. Conservative estimates from textile industry associations indicate another 21,000 jobs could be created by extending the Berry amendment to the Department of Homeland Security.

I urge my colleagues to support this Berry amendment, a very worthwhile proposal.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. I urge Members to support the bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3116, the Berry amendment, extends the wisdom of our forefathers to properly secure our military uniforms to the 21st century of our extended protectors in homeland security such as the airport TSA workers and Customs and Border Protection workers. H.R. 3116 is putting American workers and the American economy first by making it in America.

I thank Mr. KISSELL and Chairman THOMPSON for their leadership, and I encourage my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise before you today to speak in support of H.R. 3116, the Berry Amendment Extension Act.

As introduced by the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. KISSELL, H.R. 3116 would require the Department of Homeland Security to purchase uniforms and textiles that are Made-

in-America under the Berry Amendment, just as the Department of Defense has done since 1941.

I am pleased to support this legislation which will serve as a means to support hard-working farmers and small textile manufacturers that are, unfortunately, becoming more and more uncommon in the United States.

Moreover, as Chairman of the House Committee on Homeland Security, I am always looking for ways to provide greater security for the United States. Representative KISSELL's legislation does just that.

At present, the uniforms worn by Department of Homeland Security personnel such as Customs and Border Protection Officers and Transportation Security Administration Officers are made in locations outside our Nation's borders.

On August 31, 2010, the Washington Post reported that drug couriers often move illegal drugs across the United States-Mexico border through the use of disguises.

Often times these "cloners" as they are referred to by law enforcement officials, wear false law enforcement uniforms made outside of the United States.

Under current policy, there is nothing to prevent these "cloners" from obtaining uniforms from foreign factories and using them to transport illegal drugs and other contraband across our borders.

By restricting the manufacturing of Department of Homeland Security uniforms to the United States, we will be taking a smart step forward to prevent foreign access to the badges, patches, and uniforms that identify our homeland security personnel.

This legislation has the support of the American Manufacturing Trade Action Coalition, the National Council of Textile Organizations and the American Apparel and Footwear Association.

Considering our Nation's current economic situation and the need to take every effort to secure our borders, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation, which will take sensible steps to create opportunities for domestic manufacturing, promote job creation in the United States, and make our country safer.

Ms. RICHARDSON. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. RICHARDSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3116, 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.

# FIRST RESPONDER ANTI-TERRORISM TRAINING RESOURCES ACT

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 3978) to amend the Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007 to authorize the Secretary of Homeland Security to accept and use gifts for otherwise authorized

activities of the Center for Domestic Preparedness that are related to preparedness for and response to terrorism, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the Senate amendments is as follows:

Senate amendments:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

## SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

*This Act may be cited as the "First Responder Anti-Terrorism Training Resources Act".*

## SEC. 2. ACCEPTANCE OF GIFTS FOR FIRST RESPONDER TERRORISM PREPAREDNESS AND RESPONSE TRAINING.

*(a) IN GENERAL.—The Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 101 et seq.) is amended—*

*(1) in title V (6 U.S.C. 311 et seq.), by adding at the end the following:*

### "SEC. 525. ACCEPTANCE OF GIFTS.

*"(a) AUTHORITY.—The Secretary may accept and use gifts of property, both real and personal, and may accept gifts of services, including from guest lecturers, for otherwise authorized activities of the Center for Domestic Preparedness that are related to efforts to prevent, prepare for, protect against, or respond to a natural disaster, act of terrorism, or other man-made disaster, including the use of a weapon of mass destruction.*

*"(b) PROHIBITION.—The Secretary may not accept a gift under this section if the Secretary determines that the use of the property or services would compromise the integrity or appearance of integrity of—*

*"(1) a program of the Department; or*

*"(2) an individual involved in a program of the Department.*

*"(c) REPORT.—*

*"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate an annual report disclosing—*

*"(A) any gifts that were accepted under this section during the year covered by the report;*

*"(B) how the gifts contribute to the mission of the Center for Domestic Preparedness; and*

*"(C) the amount of Federal savings that were generated from the acceptance of the gifts.*

*"(2) PUBLICATION.—Each report required under paragraph (1) shall be made publically available.";*

*(2) in section 873(b) (6 U.S.C. 453(b)), by striking "and by section 93" and all that follows through "or donations" and inserting "by section 93 of title 14, United States Code, or by section 525 or 884 of this Act, gifts or donations"; and*

*(3) in section 884 (6 U.S.C. 464), by adding at the end the following:*

*"(c) ACCEPTANCE AND USE OF GIFTS.—The Federal Law Enforcement Training Center may accept and use gifts of property, both real and personal, and accept services, for authorized purposes.".*

*(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—*

*(1) THE HOMELAND SECURITY ACT OF 2002.—The Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 101 et seq.) is amended in the table of contents by inserting after the item relating to section 524 the following:*

*"Sec. 525. Acceptance of gifts.".*

*(2) REPEAL.—The matter under the heading "SALARIES AND EXPENSES" under the heading "FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING CENTER" under title IV of the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2004 (6 U.S.C. 464a) is amended by striking "Provided, That in fiscal year 2004 and thereafter, the Center is authorized to accept and use gifts of property, both real and personal, and to accept services, for authorized purposes: Provided further," and inserting "Provided,".*

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to authorize the Secretary of Homeland Security to accept and use gifts for otherwise authorized activities of the Center for Domestic Preparedness that are related to preparedness for a response to terrorism, and for other purposes.".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. RICHARDSON) and the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of concurring in the Senate amendments to H.R. 3978, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As chairwoman of the Emergency Communications, Preparedness, and Response Subcommittee, I am pleased to join the original sponsor of this legislation, the ranking member of that very subcommittee, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, in strong support of the First Responder Anti-Terrorism Training Resources Act.

Mr. ROGERS' district is home to the Center for Domestic Preparedness, also known as the Center throughout my comments, and one of the Nation's premier training sites. At the Center, thousands of first responders from all 50 States receive hands-on training for real world incidents involving chemical, biological, explosive, radiological and other hazardous materials.

As we saw last week on nationwide TV when a ruptured pipeline sent a ball of fire into the neighborhoods of San Bruno, California, completely blowing to pieces four homes, killing four people, in addition to four people who are still missing, this training is vital, and we must continue to find creative ways to strengthen it.

I am pleased that the legislation before us today will enhance the training of our first responders. Given the Center's leading role in all-hazards training, the facility often receives offers of resources and donations, including training displays, emergency response equipment, and guest lectures.

The ability to accept, process, and utilize these donations and gifts would strengthen the Center's ability to offer high-quality emergency response training, as well as in difficult times reduce costs for the Center itself.

Pursuant to current rules and law, the Center for Domestic Preparedness currently lacks the legal authority to accept these types of resources, gifts, and services. The enactment of H.R.