

vote of 44-0. I look forward to the bill passing the House this week. Really, we have got to take care of this. Too many people are being taken advantage of, particularly our seniors. We can't have this happen.

I strongly support H.R. 6125 and ask my colleagues to vote "yes." I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in support of H.R. 6125, the Online Dating Safety Act. I thank the sponsors of this bill, Representatives VALADAO and PETTERSEN, for their leadership on the issue of online dating safety. I also thank Chair RODGERS for her willingness to work with me at committee to improve the bill.

As more and more consumers report using online dating services, it is important that they are made aware of potential harms. This bill ensures that when an online dating app bans someone for fraud, it notifies all the other users who have been in contact with that banned person on the app. This will help to reduce the number of people who fall victim to identified fraudsters looking to extort money from dating app users.

While there is more to be done to address harms that have arisen in the online dating space, this bill is an important step forward. I urge my colleagues to support the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. VALADAO).

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, first, I thank my colleague, my coauthor, BRITTANY PETTERSEN, for her support on this. I also thank the members and staff of the committee. They have been very, very helpful in us moving this bill forward.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of my bill, the Online Dating Safety Act. Each year, millions of people are deceived, defrauded, and misled by users of online dating apps.

While it is sadly common to see people lie about things like their age or occupation, this bill takes aim at the more sinister fraudsters who make their livelihoods preying on vulnerable individuals.

According to the Federal Trade Commission, romance scams resulted in victims losing \$1.3 billion in 2022 alone, with senior citizens being the most at-risk age group.

There are countless horror stories of people being conned out of their entire life savings, all because they trusted someone they met online. Individuals who meet online often take their conversations to other communication platforms, so even when the fraudulent account is removed, someone might not even know they are talking to someone who has been removed from that original platform.

This bill requires that the dating platform issue a fraud ban notification to users who have ever interacted with

the person who has been removed from the app for fraudulent activity. While we can't stop all criminals, this is a simple and important step to fill a communication gap and help people make more informed decisions about who they are really communicating with.

These apps have been around for years, but still there are few safeguards in place to protect users. I urge my colleagues to support this bill and prevent the widespread fraud.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Let me just say that this is an important step forward in dealing with online dating safety, and I support the bill and urge my colleagues to support it. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, again, I appreciate Mr. VALADAO putting forth this bill. We have got to do it. We have got to protect our seniors and others who use these apps. I encourage a "yes" vote on this particular bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 6125, 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.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY POLICY ISSUANCE REVIEW ACT

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 6231) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require a prioritized policy issuance review process for the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.
The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6231

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 "Department of Homeland Security Policy Issuance Review Act".

SEC. 2. POLICY ISSUANCE REVIEW PROCESS.

Section 701 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 341) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by redesignating paragraph (13) as paragraph (14); and

(B) by inserting after paragraph (12) the following new paragraph:

"(13) Overseeing the Department's process for review and approval of policy issuance documents.";

(2) by redesignating the second subsection (e) (relating to the definition of interoperable communications) as subsection (f); and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(g) POLICY ISSUANCE REVIEW PROCESS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection, the Under Secretary for Management shall require a prioritized periodic review process (in this subsection referred to as the 'Review Process') of Department policy issuance documents.

"(2) CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection and annually thereafter, the Under Secretary for Management shall provide to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a briefing on the Review Process, including relating to the Department's record of reviewing and updating existing policy issuance documents. Each such briefing shall include information relating to the following:

"(A) All policy issuance documents, including, with respect to each such document, the title, policy number, revision number, issue date, and last reviewed date.

"(B) All policy issuance documents canceled in the prior year.

"(C) An explanation of the methodology used to prioritize the review of policy issuance documents.

"(D) The procedures used by the Department to track and coordinate with Department components the issuance, review, and cancellations of policy issuance documents.

"(E) The number of staff and vacancies within the Management Directorate responsible for supporting the Review Process.

"(3) DEFINITION.—In this subsection the term 'policy issuance document'—

"(A) means a Department-level directive, instruction, designation, or delegation, issued in accordance with the process referred to in subsection (a)(13) or any process for issuing such documents consistent with Department policy as may be in effect; and

"(B) does not include documents—

"(i) issued in accordance with a process other than a process referred to in subsection (a)(13) or the Review Process; or

"(ii) documents published in the Federal Register.

"(4) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection may be construed to—

"(A) invalidate any policy issuance document created on, before, or after the date of the enactment of this subsection;

"(B) serve as a basis for action to challenge the validity of such a policy issuance document; or

"(C) create any right or benefit, whether substantive or procedural, enforceable by any person in any administrative or judicial proceeding."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GREEN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. CORREA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 6231.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 6231, the Department of Homeland Security Policy

Issuance Review Act. I thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. IVEY) for this commonsense oversight legislation. I urge support of the measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The Department of Homeland Security Policy Issuance Review Act will codify the Department of Homeland Security's policy issuance and review process to ensure DHS provides up-to-date policy guidance for its more than 260,000 employees.

Policies provide important clarity on what is expected of DHS employees as they carry out the critical work of the Department. These policies outline how to uphold civil liberties and civil rights while conducting criminal investigations, how to ensure grant funds are used in accordance with congressional intent, and how to incorporate new technology into the agency operations.

Some DHS policies have not been reviewed or updated for many years in accordance with the Department's requirements. H.R. 6231 will address this by providing Congress greater insight into the issuance, review, and revision of the Departmentwide policies.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. IVEY).

Mr. IVEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on behalf of my bill, the Department of Homeland Security Policy Issuance Review Act, H.R. 6231.

DHS has over 800 Departmentwide policies. While many of these policies relate to internal management functions of the Department, others provide critical guidance for employees on issues such as use of force by law enforcement officers, the personal and professional use of social media, and the ethical code of conduct.

The Department has a requirement that all policies be reviewed every 2 years. However, a recent review by the Committee on Homeland Security found that DHS rarely met this deadline, and some foundational policies had not received meaningful review since their issuance.

My bill addresses this shortcoming by making the Department's policy issuance and review process a formal responsibility of the DHS Under Secretary for management.

My bill also provides Congress with greater transparency into how and when DHS updates policies by requiring the Department to provide Congress an annual briefing on policies issued, reviewed, and canceled. My bill also requires DHS to inform Congress on its staffing needs to help ensure the Department has the resources needed to review and revise its policies in a timely manner.

H.R. 6231 is necessary to ensure that Congress has greater visibility into how the Department is managing its policy issuance program and to prevent any lengthy delays in the review and revision of critical departmental documents.

In closing, I thank my colleagues from both sides of the aisle for cosponsoring this bill, Representatives CLARKE, BISHOP of North Carolina, and EZELL. I would also like to thank my colleagues on the Homeland Security Committee for passing this legislation out of committee unanimously. Finally, I thank DHS staff, who provided valuable insight and feedback on the Department's policy review process.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

This bipartisan bill is a commonsense way for Congress to ensure that DHS policies are updated on time, and if they are not updated, that Congress will hear about it and take appropriate action.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 6231, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Again, I urge my colleagues to support this bill. This is a bipartisan bill. Mr. IVEY put a lot of work into this. It makes good common sense, and it allows us to oversee the Department with more authority and effectiveness. I fully support it, and I urge my colleagues to do so. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GREEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 6231.

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.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Byrd, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 288. An act to prevent, treat, and cure tuberculosis globally.

S. 4698. An act to authorize the Joint Task Forces of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes.

EMERGING INNOVATIVE BORDER TECHNOLOGIES ACT

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 7832) to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to develop a plan to identify, integrate, and deploy new, innovative, disruptive, or other emerging or advanced technologies to enhance, or address capability gaps in, border security operations, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 7832

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 "Emerging Innovative Border Technologies Act".

SEC. 2. INNOVATIVE AND EMERGING BORDER TECHNOLOGY PLAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security, acting through the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) and the Under Secretary for Science and Technology of the Department of Homeland Security, 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 a plan to identify, integrate, and deploy new, innovative, disruptive, or other emerging or advanced technologies that may incorporate artificial intelligence, machine-learning, automation, fiber-optic sensing technology, nanotechnology, optical and cognitive radar, modeling and simulation technology, hyperspectral and LIDAR sensors, imaging, identification, and categorization systems, or other emerging or advanced technologies, to enhance, or address capability gaps in, border security operations.

(b) CONTENTS.—The plan required under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) Information regarding how CBP utilizes CBP Innovation Team authority under subsection (c) and other mechanisms to carry out the purposes specified in subsection (a).

(2) An assessment of the contributions directly attributable to such utilization.

(3) Information regarding the composition of each CBP Innovation Team, and how each such Team coordinates and integrates efforts with the CBP acquisition program office and other partners within CBP and the Department of Homeland Security.

(4) Identification of technologies used by other Federal departments or agencies not in use by CBP that could assist in enhancing, or addressing capability gaps in, border security operations.

(5) An analysis of authorities available to CBP to procure technologies referred to subsection (a), and an assessment as to whether additional or alternative authorities are needed to carry out the purposes specified in such subsection.

(6) An explanation of how CBP plans to scale existing programs related to emerging or advanced technologies into programs of record.

(7) A description of each planned security-related technology program, including objectives, goals, and timelines for each such program.

(8) An assessment of the privacy and security impact on border communities of security-related technology.

(9) An assessment of CBP legacy border technology programs that could be phased out and replaced by technologies referred to in subsection (a), and cost estimates relating to such phase out and replacement.

(10) Information relating to how CBP is coordinating with the Department of Homeland Security's Science and Technology Directorate to—

(A) research and develop new, innovative, disruptive, or other emerging or advanced technologies to carry out the purposes specified in subsection (a);

(B) identify security-related technologies that are in development or deployed by the private and public sectors that may satisfy the mission needs of CBP, with or without adaptation;

(C) incentivize the private sector to develop technologies that may help CBP meet mission needs to enhance, or address capability gaps in, border security operations; and