

towels, pillows, baby supplies, toiletries, pet food, and over 60 cases of water.

In addition to reading, writing, and arithmetic, it is clear that the administration and faculty have also been teaching important lessons in compassion and generosity, which I am sure went along very well with the lessons being learned by these students from their families.

Ward Elementary met the call for assistance with extraordinary result. Its students should be commended for their giving spirit and commitment to helping others.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, OFFICE  
OF THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER,

Washington, DC, October 16, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,  
Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with two grand jury subpoenas for documents issued by the United States District Court for the Central District of Illinois.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with one of the subpoenas is consistent with the privileges and rights of the House. After further consultation with counsel, I will make the determinations required by Rule VIII with respect to the second subpoena.

Sincerely,

ED CASSIDY.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM DIRECTOR OF APPROPRIATIONS, THE HONORABLE CHAKA FATTAH, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Michelle Anderson-Lee, Director of Appropriations, the Honorable CHAKA FATTAH, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
October 16, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,  
Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives that I have been served with a subpoena, issued by the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, for testimony in a criminal case.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and rights of the House.

Sincerely,

MICHELLE ANDERSON-LEE,  
Director of Appropriations,  
Office of Congressman Chaka Fattah.

#### RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1600

#### AFTER RECESS

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

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

#### JUDICIAL REDRESS ACT OF 2015

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1428) to extend Privacy Act remedies to citizens of certified states, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1428

*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 "Judicial Redress Act of 2015".

#### SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF PRIVACY ACT REMEDIES TO CITIZENS OF DESIGNATED COUNTRIES.

(a) CIVIL ACTION; CIVIL REMEDIES.—With respect to covered records, a covered person may bring a civil action against an agency and obtain civil remedies, in the same manner, to the same extent, and subject to the same limitations, including exemptions and exceptions, as an individual may bring and obtain with respect to records under—

(1) section 552a(g)(1)(D) of title 5, United States Code, but only with respect to disclosures intentionally or willfully made in violation of section 552a(b) of such title; and

(2) subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 552a(g)(1) of title 5, United States Code, but such an action may only be brought against a designated Federal agency or component.

(b) EXCLUSIVE REMEDIES.—The remedies set forth in subsection (a) are the exclusive remedies available to a covered person under this section.

(c) APPLICATION OF THE PRIVACY ACT WITH RESPECT TO A COVERED PERSON.—For purposes of a civil action described in subsection (a), a covered person shall have the same rights, and be subject to the same limitations, including exemptions and exceptions, as an individual has and is subject to under section 552a of title 5, United States Code, when pursuing the civil remedies described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a).

(d) DESIGNATION OF COVERED COUNTRY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General may, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Secretary of Homeland Security, designate a foreign country or regional economic integration organization, or member country of such organization, as a "covered country" for purposes of this section if—

(A) the country or regional economic integration organization, or member country of such organization, has entered into an agreement with the United States that provides for appropriate privacy protections for information shared for the purpose of preventing, investigating, detecting, or prosecuting criminal offenses; or

(B) the Attorney General has determined that the country or regional economic integration organization, or member country of such organization, has effectively shared information with the United States for the purpose of preventing, investigating, detecting, or prosecuting criminal offenses and has appropriate privacy protections for such shared information.

(2) REMOVAL OF DESIGNATION.—The Attorney General may, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Secretary of Homeland Security, revoke the designation of a foreign country or regional economic integration organization, or member country of such organization, as a "covered country" if the Attorney General determines that such designated "covered country"—

(A) is not complying with the agreement described under paragraph (1)(A);

(B) no longer meets the requirements for designation under paragraph (1)(B); or

(C) impedes the transfer of information (for purposes of reporting or preventing unlawful activity) to the United States by a private entity or person.

(e) DESIGNATION OF DESIGNATED FEDERAL AGENCY OR COMPONENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General shall determine whether an agency or component thereof is a "designated Federal agency or component" for purposes of this section. The Attorney General shall not designate any agency or component thereof other than the Department of Justice or a component of the Department of Justice without the concurrence of the head of the relevant agency, or of the agency to which the component belongs.

(2) REQUIREMENTS FOR DESIGNATION.—The Attorney General may determine that an agency or component of an agency is a "designated Federal agency or component" for purposes of this section, if—

(A) the Attorney General determines that information exchanged by such agency with a covered country is within the scope of an agreement referred to in subsection (d)(1)(A); or

(B) with respect to a country or regional economic integration organization, or member country of such organization, that has been designated as a "covered country" under subsection (d)(1)(B), the Attorney General determines that designating such agency or component thereof is in the law enforcement interests of the United States.

(f) FEDERAL REGISTER REQUIREMENT; NON-REVIEWABLE DETERMINATION.—The Attorney General shall publish each determination made under subsections (d) and (e). Such determination shall not be subject to judicial or administrative review.

(g) JURISDICTION.—The United States District Court for the District of Columbia shall have exclusive jurisdiction over any claim arising under this section.

(h) DEFINITIONS.—In this Act:

(1) AGENCY.—The term "agency" has the meaning given that term in section 552(f) of title 5, United States Code.

(2) COVERED COUNTRY.—The term “covered country” means a country or regional economic integration organization, or member country of such organization, designated in accordance with subsection (d).

(3) COVERED PERSON.—The term “covered person” means a natural person (other than an individual) who is a citizen of a covered country.

(4) COVERED RECORD.—The term “covered record” has the same meaning for a covered person as a record has for an individual under section 552a of title 5, United States Code, once the covered record is transferred—

(A) by a public authority of, or private entity within, a country or regional economic organization, or member country of such organization, which at the time the record is transferred is a covered country; and

(B) to a designated Federal agency or component for purposes of preventing, investigating, detecting, or prosecuting criminal offenses.

(5) DESIGNATED FEDERAL AGENCY OR COMPONENT.—The term “designated Federal agency or component” means a Federal agency or component of an agency designated in accordance with subsection (e).

(6) INDIVIDUAL.—The term “individual” has the meaning given that term in section 552a(a)(2) of title 5, United States Code.

(i) PRESERVATION OF PRIVILEGES.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to waive any applicable privilege or require the disclosure of classified information. Upon an agency’s request, the district court shall review in camera and ex parte any submission by the agency in connection with this subsection.

(j) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This Act shall take effect 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 1428 currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

I would like to begin by thanking Mr. SENSENBRENNER and Ranking Member CONYERS for introducing this important bipartisan legislation to extend privacy protections and help ensure that the flow of law enforcement information between the European Union and the United States continues unimpeded.

In recent years, several broad and highly publicized leaks of classified U.S. intelligence information have eroded the global public’s trust in the United States Government and our technology sector. As a result, both the Federal Government and U.S. businesses that operate overseas are facing

growing challenges from proposals to limit the international flow of data.

Our allies in Europe, in particular, are concerned that the European public will no longer support law enforcement cooperation with U.S. authorities if we do not enact legislation to restore their public’s trust in U.S. privacy protections.

Moreover, American businesses across all sectors face negative commercial consequences abroad as a result of the climate that has been created by the unauthorized disclosure of classified data.

H.R. 1428, the Judicial Redress Act, can go a long way toward restoring our allies’ faith in U.S. data privacy protections and helping facilitate agreements such as the Data Privacy and Protection Agreement that enhance international cooperation.

According to the Department of Justice, the Judicial Redress Act is critical to reestablishing a trusting relationship between the European Union and the United States, to ensuring continued strong law enforcement cooperation between the United States and Europe, and to preserving the ability of American companies to do business internationally.

The Judicial Redress Act accomplishes this by granting citizens of designated foreign countries a limited number of civil remedies against the Federal Government, similar to those already provided U.S. citizens and lawful permanent residents under the Privacy Act.

This legislation is narrowly tailored in that it only applies with respect to information obtained through international law enforcement channels. Any lawsuit brought pursuant to this bill is subject to the same terms and restrictions that apply to U.S. citizens and lawful permanent residents under the Privacy Act.

If this legislation is enacted, citizens of designated foreign governments will be able to sue the United States in Federal District Court with respect to intentional and willful public disclosures of law enforcement information by the Federal Government that injure those citizens.

Additionally, for information that is not subject to an exemption under the Privacy Act, covered foreign citizens will be able to seek redress for failures by the Federal Government to grant access to records or to amend incorrect records. American citizens are already afforded these types of judicial redress rights in many foreign countries.

Although these may be limited civil remedies against the United States Government, they will provide European citizens with the core benefits of the Privacy Act and, in doing so, will greatly help to restore the public trust necessary for the continued success of our law enforcement cooperation with Europe.

The bill will also facilitate adoption of the Data Privacy and Protection Agreement and promote a healthy en-

vironment for U.S. companies that do business overseas.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM,

Washington, DC, October 6, 2015.

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

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I write concerning H.R. 1428, the Judicial Redress Act of 2015. As you know, the Committee on the Judiciary received an original referral and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform a secondary referral when the bill was introduced on March 18, 2015. I recognize and appreciate your desire to bring this legislation before the House of Representatives in an expeditious manner, and accordingly, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform will forego action on the bill.

The Committee takes this action with our mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 1428 at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation. Further, I request your support for the appointment of conferees from the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform during any House-Senate conference convened on this or related legislation.

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

Sincerely,

JASON CHAFFETZ,  
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,  
Washington, DC, October 6, 2015.

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

DEAR CHAIRMAN CHAFFETZ: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1428, the “Judicial Redress Act of 2015.” As you noted, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform was granted an additional referral on the bill.

I am most appreciative of your decision to forego formal action on H.R. 1428 so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor. I acknowledge that although you waived formal consideration of the bill, the Committee on the Oversight and Government Reform is in no way waiving its jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in those provisions of the bill that fall within your Rule X jurisdiction. I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees on any House-Senate conference involving this legislation.

I will include a copy of our letters in the Committee’s report on H.R. 1428 and in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of H.R. 1428.

Sincerely,

BOB GOODLATTE,  
Chairman.

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

Mr. Speaker, this legislation before us today is good for national security, good for privacy, and good for business. It is unquestionably the right thing to do for our Nation’s closest allies.

Under current law, United States citizens are entitled to access and request a correction to personal records

held by a Federal agency. If the agency denies access or fails to make a requested change or otherwise violates their privacy rights, then we may seek redress in Federal court.

Under current law, these rights are conveyed only to United States citizens and not to the citizens of our closest allies, even though many European countries offer our citizens similar rights overseas, probably somewhat like the Europeans give our folks monies when they record a song and play it over there, but we don't. We should have that same reciprocity and fairness.

H.R. 1428, the Judicial Redress Act, will extend these core privacy protections to the citizens of certain foreign countries, those designated by the Attorney General as trusted allies. This small change to our laws will afford immediate benefits both at home and abroad.

This act will facilitate information-sharing partnerships with law enforcement agencies across the globe. We know from experience that open lines of communication with our allies yield intelligence and save lives.

The act will enable the U.S. and the European Union to complete an umbrella agreement to govern information sharing across the Atlantic for law enforcement and counterterrorism purposes. This agreement, which would include significant protections for individual privacy, would not go into effect until we have made these changes.

Earlier this year a coalition of companies, trade associations, and civil rights organizations wrote to the leadership of both parties to outline the economic cost of "a significant erosion of global public trust in both the U.S. Government and the U.S. technology sector." Their fears appear to have been well founded.

Earlier this month, citing concerns about insufficient privacy safeguards in the United States, the European Court of Justice effectively suspended the safe harbor agreement that allows companies to move digital information across the Atlantic.

Although there is far more work to be done to restore the agreement, I hope that our allies will take this legislation as a sign of good faith and recognize that a basic right to privacy extends beyond our borders and we will work to restore the public trust necessary for the continued success of U.S. industry overseas.

The Judicial Redress Act is supported by the White House, the Department of Justice, and other Federal law enforcement agencies. It has been endorsed by the Chamber of Commerce, Information Technology Industry Council, Facebook, Google, Microsoft, and IBM, among others.

At base, this bill is a measure of basic fairness. Our friends abroad should have some course of redress with respect to information that they provided to the U.S. Government in the first place.

We all benefit when the information we share is accurate. Our partners in trade and security should have the ability to seek recourse when it is not.

I thank Representative SENSENBRENNER for his leadership on this issue, for his leadership on many issues, including sentencing reform, for his extreme knowledge of the world, and for sharing it with me on occasion. I thank Mr. GOODLATTE for those same talents and achievements.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations of the Committee on the Judiciary, and the chief sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, strong international relationships abroad are critical to the safety and advancement of the United States. That is why I was pleased to introduce the Judicial Redress Act of 2015 with Ranking Member JOHN CONYERS and to speak in favor of it today.

For many years, the United States and the European Union have worked together to secure data protection for their citizens under agreements known as safe harbor. Earlier this month, however, the European Court of Justice issued a landmark ruling invalidating the agreement because of privacy concerns.

The European court's ruling illustrates how fragile trust between nations can be. It is easily lost and hard to rebuild. Moreover, this lack of trust has had huge economic and security consequences for the United States. Our businesses have struggled against public backlash and protectionist policies, and our government has faced increasingly difficult negotiations to share law enforcement and intelligence data.

The Judicial Redress Act of 2015 is central to our efforts to rebuild strained relationships with our allies and to ensure privacy and security for both American and European Union citizens. The sudden termination of the safe harbor framework strikes a blow to U.S. businesses by complicating commercial data flows. If we fail to pass the Judicial Redress Act, we risk similar disruption to the sharing of law enforcement information.

In many ways, the Judicial Redress Act is a privacy bill. It is backed and supported by many of our country's top privacy advocates. But make no mistake. The bill is crucial to U.S. law enforcement. At the heart of the Judicial Redress Act is the pressing need for the continued sharing of law enforcement data across the Atlantic.

In our complex digital world, privacy and security are not competing values. They are weaved together inseparably, and today's policymakers must craft legal frameworks that support both.

This bill provides our allies with limited remedies relative to the data they share with the United States, similar to those American citizens enjoy under the Privacy Act. It is a way to support our foreign allies and to ensure the continued sharing of law enforcement data.

Specifically, the bill will give citizens of covered countries the ability to correct flawed information in their record and access U.S. courts if the U.S. Government unlawfully discloses their personal information.

As United States citizens, we already enjoy similar protections in Europe. Granting these rights to our closest allies and their citizens will be a positive step forward in restoring our international reputation and rebuilding trust.

In fact, our European colleagues have noted that the passage of the Judicial Redress Act is critical to negotiating a new agreement, central to their willingness to continue sharing law enforcement data with the United States and necessary to improving relations between nations.

If we fail to pass this bill, we will undermine several important international agreements, further harm our businesses operating in Europe, and severely limit sharing of law enforcement information.

The Judicial Redress Act currently enjoys broad support and has been endorsed by the Department of Justice as well as the Chamber of Commerce and numerous U.S. businesses.

I would like to thank my colleagues, Representatives JOHN CONYERS, RANDY FORBES, and GLENN THOMPSON, for cosponsoring this legislation, as well as Senators ORRIN HATCH and CHRISTOPHER MURPHY for their work on companion legislation in the Senate.

The Judicial Redress Act amounts to a small courtesy that will pay huge diplomatic and economic dividends. I urge my colleagues to pass this important bill and my colleagues in the Senate to take it up without delay.

Let's put the President's infamous pen to good use by signing this legislation.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I will perfunctorily reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS), a member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is important, I think, to come over here and discuss H.R. 1428, the Judicial Redress Act. Echoing a lot that has been said already, this is a great starting point for, really, a broader conversation about privacy rights and a conversation that is sorely needed.

I supported this bill when it passed the Committee on the Judiciary unanimously, and I am proud to support it today. The bill extends the same rights afforded to Americans under the 1974 Privacy Act to citizens of certain allied nations. Importantly, only citizens

of countries who extend similar rights to Americans for redress for privacy violations are eligible.

As everyone here is aware, revelations about U.S. surveillance operations created serious trust issues, and both the government and tech sectors experienced a decline in that global trust. Advances in technology and innovation have made it possible and necessary for law enforcement to exchange information, but it should not be done at the expense of privacy rights.

In order to restore global trust and ensure continued competitiveness for our thriving tech industry, we must work to restore consumers' faith that their data is secure in U.S. tech companies and their privacy rights are protected.

□ 1615

The United States tech industry employed an estimated 6.5 million people in 2014 and made up a large 7.1 percent of the U.S. GDP, which is going to do nothing but grow.

The free flow of transnational data is critical for the continued success of this industry that contributes in such a major way to our economy. We have to show our allies that they can be confident sharing data across the oceans and the various barriers.

The Judicial Redress Act is a step toward regaining trust and rebuilding cooperation with our allies, ensuring that U.S. businesses can continue to grow and thrive internationally. H.R. 1428 is particularly important because the U.S. and the EU have negotiated the Data Protection and Privacy Agreement for the last 2 years.

During the negotiations over the agreement, the EU Parliament and EU Commission made clear that the Safe Harbor Agreement would not be finalized absent U.S. enactment of a law to enable EU citizens to sue the U.S. Government for major privacy violations. With the European Court of Justice Ruling on the Safe Harbor Agreement, it is more important than ever that we create solutions that work for today's ever-changing tech industry, from the small companies to the household names. It is also critical that we work with our allies to create a clear standard for governing the privacy of personal information to ensure strong and cooperative exchanges between law enforcement.

Laws and agreements written before many of today's innovations even existed are due for an update, and this bill is an important first step that I am proud to support. I am thankful that the chairman has brought it forward for this body to put its stamp on and send to the Senate so that it will be taken up and then sent to the President so that we will continue to move forward in the protection of privacy rights for all Americans and our companies.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate being part of this bill, and thank you for your efforts.

I yield back the balance of my time.  
Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I again reiterate, this bill is a good bill. It is a very important bill that will help promote law enforcement cooperation around the globe and will help U.S. companies that do business overseas to be able to better obtain the respect and trust of foreign governments and foreign citizens, so I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.  
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. 1428.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

### SECURING THE CITIES ACT OF 2015

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3493) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish the Securing the Cities program to enhance the ability of the United States to detect and prevent terrorist attacks and other high consequence events utilizing nuclear or other radiological materials that pose a high risk to homeland security in high-risk urban areas, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3493

*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 "Securing the Cities Act of 2015".

#### SEC. 2. SECURING THE CITIES PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title XIX of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 591 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

##### "SEC. 1908. SECURING THE CITIES PROGRAM.

"(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Director for Domestic Nuclear Detection shall establish the 'Securing the Cities' ('STC') program to enhance the ability of the United States to detect and prevent terrorist attacks and other high consequence events utilizing nuclear or other radiological materials that pose a high risk to homeland security in high-risk urban areas. Through such program the Director shall—

"(1) assist State, local, tribal, and territorial governments in designing and implementing, or enhancing existing, architectures for coordinated and integrated detection and interdiction of nuclear or other radiological materials that are out of regulatory control;

"(2) support the development of a region-wide operating capability to detect and report on nuclear and other radioactive materials out of operational control;

"(3) provide resources to enhance detection, analysis, communication, and coordination to better integrate State, local, tribal, and territorial assets into Federal operations;

"(4) facilitate alarm adjudication and provide subject matter expertise and technical

assistance on concepts of operations, training, exercises, and alarm response protocols;

"(5) communicate with, and promote sharing of information about the presence or detection of nuclear or other radiological materials among appropriate Federal, State, local, tribal, and territorial governments, in a manner that ensures transparency with the jurisdictions served by such program; and

"(6) provide any other assistance the Director determines appropriate.

"(b) DESIGNATION OF JURISDICTIONS.—In carrying out the program under subsection (a), the Director shall designate jurisdictions from among high-risk urban areas under section 2003, and other cities and regions, as appropriate.

"(c) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.—The Director shall notify the Committee on Homeland Security and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate not later than three days before the designation of new jurisdictions under subsection (b) or other changes to participating jurisdictions.

"(d) GAO REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this section, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the congressional committees specified in subsection (c) an assessment, including an evaluation of the effectiveness, of the STC program under this section.

"(e) PROHIBITION ON ADDITIONAL FUNDING.—No funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section. This section shall be carried out using amounts otherwise appropriated or made available for such purpose."

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1907 the following new item:

"Sec. 1908. Securing the Cities program."

#### SEC. 3. MODEL EXERCISES.

Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director for Domestic Nuclear Detection of the Department of Homeland Security shall report to the Committee on Homeland Security and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate on the feasibility of the Director developing model exercises to test the preparedness of jurisdictions participating in the Securing the Cities program under section 1908 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (as added by section 2 of this Act) in meeting the challenges that may be posed by a range of nuclear and radiological threats.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. DONOVAN).

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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