

in my district, as well as Minnesotans all across our state. Today, the law enforcement community continues to heal from this loss and it is my firm belief that they will ultimately do so because of their strength and resilience. We must never forget the heroic sacrifice of our fallen peace officers. The valiant bravery of these men and women helps ensure the safety of our families and communities.

Police officers bear an enormous responsibility for keeping our cities and towns safe. Throughout my career in public service, I have advocated for ensuring that local police departments have the funding resources they need to do their jobs successfully and compensate their officers fairly. From my work as a state legislator to the work I do here in Congress, supporting those who dedicate their lives to protecting the public has been, and will remain, a top priority.

This National Police Week, I urge my colleagues to join me in honoring the courage and sacrifice of all law enforcement officers and yield back the balance of my time.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015

SPEECH OF

HON. ROBERT A. BRADY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 1, 2014

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4487) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes:

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Madam Chair, earlier during debate colleagues criticized the production of secure credentials by the Government Printing Office for Federal agencies. Some of the statements, particularly the claim that this represents an “overreach” of the GPO’s statutory authority and that the GPO has a “monopoly on this issue” are simply not true, and I want to correct the RECORD.

At the request of then-Public Printer Robert Tapella, the Joint Committee on Printing, which I had the honor to chair during the 110th Congress, authorized GPO to perform this function. Since that time, every JCP chairman has overseen the GPO’s production of secure credentials and approved the GPO’s annual expenditures for this purpose.

Far from an “overreach,” secure credential work is firmly within the GPO’s statutory authority. GPO has a long history of secure credential work, such as with the manufacture of U.S. passport blanks since 1926. By definition, passports and all other forms of government credentials involve “printing,” the production of something in printed form. With secure credentials, intricate, multi-color modern printing embedded with anti-counterfeiting features is utterly indispensable to render a document immediately recognizable by handlers as the genuine article and thus inspire the confidence necessary to establish identity, facilitate border crossings and other purposes.

While serving as Public Printer, Mr. Tapella once declared that the production of secure credentials for the Federal Government does

not belong in the private sector. I happen to agree with him and believe Congress should direct as much secure credential business to GPO as possible. In my view, the production of Federal credentials is as inherently a government function as the production of United States currency, which is produced solely by the Treasury Department’s Bureau of Engraving and Printing.

But however much the former Public Printer and I may agree on this issue, the GPO today—under the leadership of Public Printer Davita Vance-Cooks—has taken a far more reasonable approach and simply makes the GPO available to all Federal agencies who wish to use its services. GPO asserts no “monopoly” nor can it as a practical matter, as Federal agencies are able to seek the services of either the public or private sector to meet their secure credential needs. With respect to the product at issue here, the GPO produces blank border-crossing cards for the State Department’s visa office, and the cards are subsequently personalized by the State Department’s own contractor, MorphoTrust. Moreover, the State Department continues to employ MorphoTrust to produce passport cards, another secure credential. As here, the State Department and a number of other agencies contract directly with private companies for many of their secure-credential needs. To say, therefore, that GPO has a “monopoly” on the work is silly.

On December 4, 2013, the House Administration Committee, on which I serve as Ranking Minority Member, held an oversight hearing on the recent report by the National Academy of Public Administration entitled “Rebooting the Government Printing Office: Keeping America Informed in the Digital Age.” Congress ordered the study. Among other things, the Academy found that unlike with passports, “the GPO is not the sole provider of smart cards [secure credentials]. Agencies may obtain smart cards from private sector vendors as well.” The Academy’s report endorsed GPO’s work in that field.

I urge my colleagues to read the Academy report, currently available on the Academy’s web site. I also urge Members to review the response provided by the GPO to questions submitted for the record of the December 2013 hearing concerning secure credentials, reprinted below. Clearly the GPO does not deserve the criticisms lodged earlier and elsewhere. The men and women of the GPO perform a valuable and necessary service in providing secure credentials to support the missions of Federal agencies involved in securing our borders and other law enforcement tasks.

EXCERPTED QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD SUBMITTED TO THE PUBLIC PRINTER, DAVITA VANCE-COOKS, FOLLOWING THE HOUSE ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE HEARING HELD DECEMBER 4, 2013

Question 7. GPO produces the millions of passports and related documents provided to Americans every year by the U.S. Department of State. You also provided sizeable quantities of other so-called “secure and intelligent documents” to the Department of Homeland Security. Do you foresee this portion of your business expanding in the future? Could GPO also produce such documents for state and local governments, as suggested in the NAPA study’s Recommendation #9?

Response. In the wake of 9/11 and the introduction HSPD-12 and related Federal identi-

fication requirements, there has been an increase in the Government’s need for secure credentials. With the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing, GPO implemented a capability in FY 2008 to help address this need. While GPO is far from the only provider of such requirements for Federal agencies, the volume of work processed by our capability has increased and is projected to increase in future years, as the report of the National Academy of Public Administration recently concluded. Regarding the production of secure credentials for state and local governments, GPO does not have the statutory authority to produce work that is not authorized by Federal law, nor are we equipped and staffed to handle secure credentials for all Federal agencies, much less for state and local governments.

Question 8. It is my understanding that aside from printing passports, GPO has also undertaken the manufacture of Border Crossing Cards and trusted traveler cards. Government agencies have been procuring from the private sector and issuing to their employees and contractors secure ID documents for decades. When did GPO get into the business of creating and providing secure credentials, other than passports? Can you please provide rationale as to why GPO believes that it should do this work for government agencies as opposed to the private sector, which has invested heavily to develop these new technologies?

Response. GPO provides a government-to-government solution to fulfill the requisitions of Federal agencies for secure credentials. Our program is staffed by cleared personnel and backed by a secure supply chain.

The establishment of our secure credential capability was endorsed to GPO management by GPO’s Inspector General in 2005. GPO’s proposal to set up a secure card center with its Security and Intelligent Documents business unit subsequently was approved in FY 2008 by the Joint Committee on Printing, which since then has also approved—on a bipartisan basis—all funding for this program in GPO’s annual spending plans. In 2010, we became the only Federal agency certified by the General Services Administration to graphically personalize HSPD-12 credentials. In 2012 the Joint Committee on Printing approved the establishment of a COOP capability for our secure credential operations.

GPO serves as a card integrator, working closely with private sector providers to obtain the products and services needed to fulfill requisitions submitted by Federal agencies. For several years we have been accepted member of the Secure Card Alliance, a consortium of private sector companies and Federal agencies including the National Institute for Standards and Technology, the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of State, the Department of Transportation, and the General Services Administration (<http://www.smartcardalliance.org/>). We work with the private sector for consulting, fabrication, design, materials, and supplies, essentially incorporating the best that industry has to offer into solutions sought by Federal agencies that requisition the work from us.

GPO’s secure credentials capability serves as a valuable resource to a number of Federal agencies, including the Joint Congressional Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies and the U.S. Capitol Police, which relied on us to provide secure law enforcement credentials for the 2009 and 2013 Presidential inaugurations. In addition to satisfactorily fulfilling Federal agency requisitions for secure

credentials, our card production program was endorsed in the recent report of the National Academy of Public Administration. GPO provides secure credential products and services on a reimbursable basis with no appropriated funds.

Throughout the existence of GPO's secure credentials program, we have been open and transparent about its operation. As noted above, we are a well-known member of the Smart Card Alliance. We are subject to the oversight of the Joint Committee on Printing and our House and Senate legislative oversight and appropriations committees. Additionally, our program has been the subject of oversight by our Office of Inspector General (see for example http://www.gpo.gov/pdfs/ig/audits/11-06_AuditReportIssued_March_31_2011.pdf); the IG's semiannual reports to Congress for several years routinely tracked oversight of the GPO's secure credentials program as a "management challenge" (see for example <http://www.gpo.gov/pdfs/ig/semi-annual/11-30-09.pdf>). We have kept the public informed through press releases (see for example <http://www.gpo.gov/pdfs/news-media/press/09news19.pdf>, <http://www.gpo.gov/pdfs/news-media/press/10news39.pdf>, and <http://www.gpo.gov/pdfs/news-media/press/11news60.pdf>), YouTube videos (see for example <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=leviY1qIPy0>, <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ettaBOW4UEA>, and <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mQxH1EZA71I>), GPO annual reports to Congress, and other media.

Question 9. GPO's mission statement, articulated recently in your agency's strategic plan "is to produce, protect, preserve, and distribute the official publications and information products of the Federal Government." Do you consider the production of secure credentials as fundamentally related to or falling under GPO's mission? Do you believe that the manufacture of secure credentials falls within the definition of "printing" under Section 501 of Title 44 U.S.C.? If so, has the GPO communicated this interpretation to federal agencies in any of its discussions with federal agencies? For ID cards and passports: what is the cost of the ink and graphics component per security card? What is the cost of the technological component per card?

Response. Our "produce, protect, preserve, and distribute the official publications and information products of the Federal Government" mission statement appears in our strategic plan and elsewhere to describe the informing function that GPO carries out, a function that is traceable to Article I in the Constitution. However, the public printing statutes of Title 44, U.S.C., make it clear that the performance of printing for the Government extends to a broad variety of products and services, some of which do not necessarily relate to an informing function. Over the years GPO has produced or procured tax forms, census forms, Social Security cards, ration cards, letterheads, envelopes, passports, postal cards, and other printed products that are associated with the operations of the Government. These products are produced by printing processes, including the processes of composition, presswork, and binding, which are defined in Title 44 as within GPO's authority to perform. The production of secure credentials for Federal agencies also involves printing processes, and so GPO is authorized to produce them

(though as a practical matter, GPO is able and equipped to produce only a limited amount of secure credential work). As long as Federal agencies submit a requisition that complies with the relevant provisions of Title 44 (certifying that the products requested are authorized by law, necessary to the public business, and backed by the necessary funding), GPO will perform the work. Federal agencies who have contacted us to discuss our secure credential capabilities are aware of this fact. Regarding the cost of ink and graphics component per security card, ink is a very small percentage of the material cost for any of our products (less than 1%). The technological component of our card business (chip and antenna) is about 20-25%.

Question 10. As you know, only about 16 percent of the GPO is appropriated by Congress. The rest of GPO's funding comes from "operating profits." Did Congress appropriate the money for the Secure Credential Innovation Center—which is what I understand to be a new multi-million dollar GPO facility? Or was that facility funded through operating profits from ID card and other sales? Will the facility affect overhead costs?

Response. There appears to be a misunderstanding about GPO's Secure Credential Innovation Center (SCIC). This is a small (529 sq ft) work space on the 5th floor of GPO's building C that is staffed by one FTE and equipped with a single opening laminator, laser cutter, CNC mill, plasma torch, UV epoxy curing station, and related equipment for the design and testing of security features requisitioned by Federal agencies for passports and other secure credentials. It is not a "multi-million dollar" facility. It was funded through the revolving fund, not appropriated funds.

We also opened a secure card COOP capability at our Stennis, MS, facility in 2013, with the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. The capital investment proposed for this project was \$2.2 million dollars, including \$1.5 million for a card printer and installation, \$450,000 for the required IT infrastructure, \$175,000 for necessary space renovations and security upgrades, and an estimated \$75,000 in support and travel costs. All costs were funded through GPO's revolving fund, and the project came in on time and under budget.

As costs of GPO's SID business unit, neither the Stennis facility nor the SCIC are included in overhead costs for the GPO as a whole. They are direct costs that are recovered through the rates charged for SID products.

As noted earlier, none of the funds for GPO's secure card capability are appropriated by Congress. Concerning GPO's finances under section 309 of Title 44, U.S.C., GPO does not generate "operating profits" but is limited to recovering its costs. Part of these costs includes the ability to generate funds for investment in necessary equipment and plant improvements.

Question 11. I've heard that GPO "sales teams" have been telling the State Department, the Department of Homeland Security, and other agencies that utilize ID card technologies for various programs—for example, to control access to our borders and to verify immigration status—that they are required by law to obtain their secure ID documents from the GPO, because the GPO is the government's printer. Do you believe

that this is the case? Do you believe government-issued secure ID cards must be manufactured by and purchased from the GPO, rather than the private sector? If so . . . do you believe the GPO has the technological and security capabilities to produce these types of items? If not . . . are GPO sales teams in error if and when they state that federal agencies are required to purchase these items from the GPO by law?

Response. In hearings before the House Legislative Branch Appropriations Subcommittee for FY 2010, former Public Printer Robert C. Tapella said, "I believe that Federal credentials belong in a Federally-owned, Federally-operated production environment and not in the private sector. And I think it is an inherently governmental activity" (Hearings, Part II, April 28, 2009, p. 166). GPO management today does not endorse this position nor would it be practical. As a member organization of the Smart Card Alliance, we acknowledge the role of the private sector secure credentials industry in providing products and services to Federal agencies, and we work closely with them in the integration of card components to meet the requirements of products requisitioned from us. We do not compete against private sector companies for secure credential work. GPO provides a limited capability that is available for the use of Federal agencies seeking the provision of services in a government-to-government setting, staffed by cleared personnel, and backed by a secure supply chain. As a postscript, GPO's SID business unit has one FTE (no sales teams) responsible for addressing inquiries for SID products and services that come from Federal agencies.

Question 12. It is my understanding that GPO either will soon or has recently begun manufacturing the US Border Crossing Card. The GPO "won" that business away from a private sector vendor. Please explain the process by which GPO "won" the contract away from the private sector and the decision-making behind GPO taking over production of the Border Crossing Card.

Response. We do not compete against private sector companies for secure credential work, and as a result we do not "win business away" from them. The Department of State submitted an SF-1 requisition to GPO for the production of the border crossing card. The decision to come to GPO for the production of this card was made by the Department, and the Department's requisition to us fulfilled all lawful requirements. GPO cannot participate in Federal agency RFPs where the private sector is involved. We are required by law to respond to requisitions for printing services from Federal agencies.

Question 13. Are you aware of testimony before the House Government Reform and Oversight Subcommittee on National Security that said that over 30,000 counterfeit US Border Crossing Cards have been found at our US borders? Now that GPO will be producing Border Crossing Cards, could you please explain to the Committee how you will ensure that these cards have the anti-counterfeit technologies required to make these cards truly secure? Do you feel that GPO has the technical expertise and capability to ensure that these cards are equipped with anti-counterfeit technologies?

Response. We are familiar with this testimony, which is posted online by the Subcommittee. (In reviewing the

testimony provided at the hearing, we noted that the number of Border Crossing Cards identified as fraudulent rather than counterfeit by Chairman Chaffetz was 13,000, and that this number was identified in FY 2009, at <http://oversight.house.gov/hearing/border-security-oversight-part-iii-border-crossing-cards-b1b2-visas/>, 2:04:15). GPO received the requisition from the Department of State to begin producing the Border Crossing Card in 2013. We also noted that in the hearing the value of the Nexus card, which used to cross the border with Canada, was described very positively. GPO produces the Nexus card for the Department of Homeland Security.

Concerning GPO's ability to produce cards with anti-counterfeit technologies, GPO has significant expertise in the field of secure document design based on our work with passports. We have designed Government credentials with advanced security features. We work closely with the Department of Homeland Security's fraudulent document lab experts to validate credential designs and utilize both Government and commercial laboratories to test and evaluate our credential performances. For the Border Crossing Card, GPO worked with forensic document examiners at the Department of Homeland Security and with Department of State personnel to develop a product designed to withstand attempts at counterfeiting. We have the expertise and capability to ensure that these cards are equipped with anti-counterfeit technologies.

Question 14. I have heard that one of the "selling points" GPO uses with executive branch agencies is that the GPO can manufacture cards for them while also avoiding the competitive bidding requirements under Federal Acquisition Regulations. Do you believe that the GPO is required to follow the Federal Acquisition Regulations when it buys microchips, antennae, software, laminating materials, substantive expertise and training for its employees? Do all of those items need to be competitively bid to the private sector? Or can GPO buy essentially whatever it wants from whoever it wants, because it is doing so with money from operating profits rather than congressionally appropriated funds? Do you believe that following Federal Acquisition regulations would save the GPO money?

Response. GPO's Materials Management Acquisition Regulation (MMAR) is based on the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) and is used as the authority for all procurements we make. Under the MMAR, GPO competitively bids for the acquisition of products and services used in GPO operations, including those required for the production of secure credentials. GPO's utilization of sole source procurement authority follows the same provisions established in the FAR for other Federal agencies.

As noted earlier, under the law GPO does not generate "operating profits" but is limited to recovering its costs. Part of these costs includes the ability to generate funds for investment in necessary equipment and plant improvements.

IN SUPPORT OF THE VETERANS HEALTH ADMINISTRATION (VHA) NATION-WIDE ACCESS REVIEW

HON. CORRINE BROWN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 2014

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, I rise today in support of Secretary of Veterans Affairs Eric Shinseki's announcement that the Veterans Health Administration (VHA) will complete a nation-wide access review. As stated, the purpose of this review is to ensure a full understanding of VA's policy and continued integrity in managing patient access to care. As part of the review during the next several weeks, a national face-to-face audit will be conducted at all clinics for every VA Medical Center.

I am confident in the health care our veterans in Florida are receiving. With eight VA Medical Centers in Florida, Georgia and Puerto Rico and over 55 clinics serving over 1.6 million veterans, veterans are getting the best in the world.

Over 2,312 physicians and 5,310 nurses are serving the 546,874 veterans who made nearly 8 million visits to the facilities in our region. Of the total 25,133 VA employees, one-third are veterans.

In 2013, 37,221 women received health care services at VA hospitals and clinics in Florida, South Georgia and the Caribbean—more than any other VA healthcare network nationwide. This means that more than 75 percent of women Veterans enrolled for VA healthcare in VISN 8 were seen by providers in 2013.

I am especially pleased at the new Jacksonville Replacement Outpatient Clinic that was recently opened. The two-story, 133,500 square foot clinic provides state of the art technology and increased specialty services including diagnostics, improved laboratory facilities, expansion of women's services, minor ambulatory surgical procedures, expanded mental health telehealth services and additional audiology.

When opened, the Orlando VA Medical Center will include 134 inpatient beds, an outpatient clinic, parking garages, chapel and central energy plant. Currently, the 120-bed community living center and 60-bed dormitory are open and accepting veterans.

The VA provides quality timely healthcare to our veterans. We have a duty to make sure that all those who have defended this country when called upon receive the care they have earned through their service. I support the Secretary in his nation-wide access review and look forward to hearing his report when it is finished.

BROWN V. BOARD OF EDUCATION 60TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. ROBERT HURT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 2014

Mr. HURT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate the 60th anniversary of the Brown v.

Board of Education decision, which occurred on May 17th, 1954, and paved the way for integration of American schools during the Civil Rights Movement.

This unanimous decision by the U.S. Supreme Court established that state laws allowing for segregated public schools were unconstitutional under the Fourteenth Amendment, energizing the movement to end Jim Crow laws dictating voting rights, public transportation, dining establishments, and almost every other aspect of American communities. One of the most important decisions in our nation's history, Brown was a deliberate rejection of a system of racial inequality.

Virginia's Fifth District is an integral part of the history of the Brown decision as Davis v. County School Board of Prince Edward School was one of the five combined cases decided by the Supreme Court in Brown. In 1951, 450 students at Moton High School, an African-American school in Farmville, Virginia, staged a walkout to protest the inferior facilities and unsuitable conditions at the school. The protest began as an effort to equalize educational opportunities for all students in the county, but quickly escalated to a battle for desegregation as the NAACP joined the Moton students' cause along with the other cases decided in Brown. Thanks to this pivotal decision and the efforts of so many upstanding Virginians, the students of Moton High School won a great victory against segregation to ensure equality for young people across the country. While it did not end the struggle for desegregation, it certainly was a catalyst for change.

The promise of equal opportunity is a core facet of our Constitution. Today, we thank those who courageously fought for equality, leading to the Brown decision that led to the dismantling of racial segregation in our nation's public schools and giving life to the promise of our Declaration of Independence that all men are created equal.

IN RECOGNITION OF JOHN OSTRUM AND ALAN KLAPAT OF THE WILKES-BARRE FIRE DEPARTMENT

HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 2014

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor John Ostrum and Alan Klapat of the Wilkes-Barre Fire Department, who were recently promoted from the rank of captain to assistant fire chief and deputy fire chief, respectively. Together, they have almost 60 years of combined experience serving the city of Wilkes-Barre.

John Ostrum, a second generation firefighter, is the most senior member of the fire department. After joining the Wilkes-Barre Fire Department as a firefighter in 1978, he has