often be difficult. On the other hand, if the law were changed, perhaps filers who lie about gambling losses would risk penalties, so at least some might be honest.

5. Finance research into problem gambling and finance help for compulsive gamblers

From time to time, creditors provide funds to all sorts of charitable outfits. If they helped finance research into compulsive gambling, such spending would play a dual role. It would be a public contribution, and it would help creditors learn more about the seriousness of the tie between gambling and bankruptcy.

Quite a bit of money is spent on alcohol and drug addiction research and rehabilitation. Both of those problems are viewed (at least by some people) as medical. Apparently, the public view toward gambling addiction is quite different. There's no drug involved, and little is spent on research or rehab. Yet, gambling addiction can indeed be viewed as a form of emotional or metal illness—and it's the one addiction that is growing most quickly in its impact on creditors.

In our research for this study, we found very little new research being conducted on compulsive gambling. The experts we interviewed said that no national survey of compulsive gamblers has been done in more than 20 years; only a handful of studies have been done by various states from time to time. Much of the available research has been done in academia with modest financial support, and it gets little followup attention.

Card issuers spend millions on sporting events, the Olympics, and even on the Smithsonian museums (Discover Card). These expenditures have a marketing value. A fractional amount diverted to gambling research could have an even better bottom line impact.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ROTHMAN].

Mr. ROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1596, the Bankruptcy Judgeship Act of 1997. I come to the floor today to speak not only as a Member of Congress but as a former county surrogate court judge. I am very concerned about the bankruptcy system in the United States, not that it does not work but that with the sheer number of cases being filed, Americans cannot be assured of speedy bankruptcy filings.

As the gentlewoman from California said, that means that individuals and businesses who are owed money by individuals and companies that take advantage of our bankruptcy laws, they will not receive their just compensation in a timely enough fashion. So as Members of Congress, as legislators, it is our responsibility to equip the judiciary with the tools they need to ensure fair and speedy bankruptcy trials for Americans.

In 1996 there were over a million bankruptcy filings in the United States. This was an increase of 27 percent over 1995 and more than triple the number filed since 1984. In my home State of New Jersey there were more than 34,000 filings in 1996, up almost 23 percent from the previous year.

While this number continues to rise, one thing has not changed. Since 1992, no new bankruptcy judges have been added. New Jersey's 34,000 bankruptcy cases were handled by only eight bankruptcy judges. It is, therefore, unreasonable to think that eight judges can adequately handle 34,000 cases, and that turns out to be the fact.

This number is too high. We cannot expect cases of this number to be heard expeditiously as well as thoroughly and fairly and creditors to be paid promptly if the number of judges does not increase. It is unfair for all of the parties involved.

We will be increasing with H.R. 1596 the number of new bankruptcy judges by 6 percent over 1992, even though the caseload went up 30 percent. I think that this is a good start, Mr. Speaker. H.R. 1596 puts into action the Judicial Conference's recent recommendation to add 7 permanent and 11 temporary judgeships nationwide, and I strongly urge my colleagues to vote for H.R. 1596.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in enthusiastic support of H.R. 1596, the Bankruptcy Judgeship Act of 1997.

Spurred by credit card debt, bankruptcy claims in the United States have escalated by more than 20 percent over the past 5 years, increasing from 971,000 in 1992 to 1.2 million in 1996. This has translated into expanding caseloads for U.S. bankruptcy courts and placed a substantial added burden upon bankruptcy judges and staff. The district of Maryland is among those jurisdictions affected most severely by the rise in bankruptcy filings, experiencing a staggering 35.8 percent jump in the last year, and an astounding 544 percent increase over the 12-year period beginning December 31, 1984, and ending December 31, 1996.

The Bankruptcy Judgeship Act will help to alleviate the mounting stress on the most severely overburdened U.S. bankruptcy courts by establishing an additional 7 permanent and 11 temporary bankruptcy judgeships in various jurisdictions around the country. Under H.R. 1596, Maryland would receive one permanent and two temporary bankruptcy judgeships.

I would like to commend the bill's lead sponsor, Mr. GEKAS, chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative law, and the rest of my colleagues on the Judiciary Committee, including Chairman HENRY HYDE, ranking member JOHN CONYERS, and the ranking member of the subcommittee, Mr. NADLER, for taking this action to help bankruptcy courts meet the challenge of rapidly expanding caseloads.

Enactment of this legislation will bring much-needed relief to the U.S. bankruptcy court system and more expeditious adjudication of bankruptcy claims. I strongly encourage all of my colleagues to support this important and timely legislation.

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, 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. GEKAS] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1596.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1600

CLARIFYING STATE AUTHORITY TO TAX COMPENSATION PAID TO CERTAIN EMPLOYEES

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1953) to clarify State authority to tax compensation paid to certain employees.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1953

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

SECTION 1. LIMITATION ON STATE AUTHORITY TO TAX COMPENSATION PAID TO INDIVIDUALS PERFORMING SERVICES AT FORT CAMPBELL, KENTUCKY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 4 of title 4, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"§ 115. Limitation on State authority to tax compensation paid to individual performing services at Fort Campbell, Kentucky

''Pay and compensation paid to an individual for personal services at Fort Campbell, Kentucky, shall be subject to taxation by the State or any political subdivision thereof of which such employee is a resident.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 4 of title 4, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''115. Limitation on State authority to tax compensation paid to individuals performing services at Fort Campbell, Kentucky.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to pay and compensation paid after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 2. CLARIFICATION OF STATE AUTHORITY TO TAX COMPENSATION PAID TO CERTAIN FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 111 of title 4, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(a) GENERAL RULE.—'' before ''The United States'' the first place it appears, and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(b) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN FEDERAL EMPLOYEES EMPLOYED AT FEDERAL HYDROELECTRIC FACILITIES LOCATED ON THE COLUMBIA RIVER.—Pay or compensation paid by the United States for personal services as an employee of the United States at a hydroelectric facility—

''(1) which is owned by the United States,

''(2) which is located on the Columbia River, and

''(3) portions of which are within the States of Oregon and Washington,

shall be subject to taxation by the State or any political subdivision thereof of which such employee is a resident.

''(c) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN FEDERAL EMPLOYEES EMPLOYED AT FEDERAL HYDROELECTRIC FACILITIES LOCATED ON THE MISSOURI RIVER.—Pay or compensation paid by the United States for personal services as an employee of the United States at a hydroelectric facility—

''(1) which is owned by the United States,

''(2) which is located on the Missouri River, and

''(3) portions of which are within the States of South Dakota and Nebraska,

shall be subject to taxation by the State or any political subdivision thereof of which such employee is a resident.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to pay and compensation paid after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. GOODLATTE]. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS] and the gentlewoman from California [Ms. LOFGREN] each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS]?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this piece of legislation. For several years now, we heard of this very unique, very peculiar situation that exists where, on borders between two States, there happens to be a facility in which residents and nonresidents alike, each from one of the States, happen to work in that facility. Some of the States are taxing nonresidents on income taxes where nonresidents in their own State might not have to pay that kind of tax. So this has caused a kind of conflict.

We are grateful to the Members of the House from the various States which were affected to give us insight and to give testimony at the hearings that we have held on this very touchy subject. The border between Oregon and Washington comes into play, as my colleagues will hear from the representatives from that area; the border between Tennessee and Kentucky, as well, where Fort Campbell is located. Of late, we had a similar situation arise, which was brought to our attention, between South Dakota and Nebraska.

So my colleagues will hear how this has affected the people who live and work in those areas. We believe that the legislation that is before us cures this very unfortunate situation and allows the nonresidents, as it were, in these six States to have a sense of certainty about to whom they have to pay taxes and where to file, et cetera.

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume and I rise in support of the motion to suspend the rules and adopt H.R. 1953.

(Ms. LOFGREN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, many responsibilities have devolved to the States in the last several years. At the same time, there has been less assistance from the Federal Government. State governments must deal with each of these new challenges while balancing their budgets every year.

Congress should only, with the greatest reluctance, interfere with the prerogative of States to tax economic activity within their borders. The three cases before us, however, present unique, narrowly defined instances in which the equities clearly argue for some relief for the very small number of workers affected. In fact, the very small number of individuals involved here probably have something to do with the fact they have been unable to find relief in the appropriate source, State governments.

In each case, a small number of workers enter a Federal facility from their home States. Because these facilities are bisected by State boundaries, their work takes them over the State line and brings them under the taxing authority of the neighboring State. As a result, they must pay income taxes to that neighboring State, even though they never actually use the roads or other State services.

Finally, unlike most States, the two neighboring States lack reciprocal tax agreements to give residents the ability not to be taxed by their home State on income taxed in the neighboring State. These are highly unusual cases. They are not simply cases of people working in neighboring States who do not want to pay taxes to that State.

The combination of these many unusual circumstances: The failure of the States to work out an equitable reciprocity agreement, along with the fact that these workers can be said to have worked in the neighboring State only in the narrowest and most technical sense, makes this legislation merited.

This legislation is in line with the very few previous instances in which Congress has taken similar actions. We are exercising a Federal power that must be used only with the greatest of care; and I believe this legislation does that, and I urge its adoption.

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

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume just to remark that the gentleman from New York, who is the ranking member on the subcommittee in charge of these proceedings, was very helpful from an insight that he has drawn as a member of the New York State Legislature, so that he was able to present to us a certain facet of this type of legislation which he has helped to craft in the language here to help us provide the proper vehicle for what we are attempting to do here.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BRYANT] such time as he may consume. The gentleman has been very helpful right from the beginning, and his perseverance is in no small measure responsible for the appearance of this bill on the floor here today.

Mr. BRYANT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS] for yielding me the time.

While I fully support all the provisions in this legislation, I want to speak for just a moment on the section which would prevent the State of Kentucky from unfairly taxing the workers who live in Tennessee but who work on the Kentucky side of Fort Campbell. This is a unique situation.

Fort Campbell is the only military installation which is located in two States. In fact, over 80 percent of the base is located in Tennessee, and it might interest my colleagues to know that the only reason we call this base Fort Campbell, KY, is that the post office is on the Kentucky side.

Because of its location, if a Tennessee resident working on the base is assigned to work on the Kentucky side, she must pay Kentucky State income taxes. Reciprocal agreements between two States normally would prevent this double taxation. However, because Tennessee does not impose an income tax on its State residents, a reciprocal agreement does not exist between Tennessee and Kentucky.

Mr. Speaker, passage of this legislation will not set a precedent for Federal preemption of State income tax laws because of the uniqueness of this case and the other two cases. Because this is a military installation, everyday benefits that would normally be provided by Kentucky in return for these taxes paid by Tennesseans are actually provided by either the State of Tennessee or by the military.

For example, a person who has been assigned to work on the Kentucky side of the post does not ever have to use a Kentucky road, since these roads have been paid for by the military and the post can be entered from the Tennessee side. The same is true in the case of fire and police protection.

This is an issue of fairness for the 2,200 Tennessee residents who are seeing their annual income reduced simply because they were assigned to work in a section of the base which is located in Kentucky.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to take a moment at this time to thank my colleagues on the subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS], the chairman, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER], the ranking member, for working with me on this issue.

Consideration of this legislation on the House floor represents a real victory for those who have worked so hard on the issue. For the last 10 years, legislation to correct this inequity has been introduced in the House, only to die at the end of each session of Congress due to inaction. This effort was first begun by then-Representative and now-Governor Don Sundquist, a friend of mine. And I am happy to have an opportunity to carry on this fight with him.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I would just further add that, in the last Congress, this issue was discussed on the

floor of the House and there was a great deal of distress and opposition from various State officials that is not presented today. This change is worth emphasizing because this is a very narrow exception that is not a precedent for telecommuting or anything broader than the very narrow circumstances that face us here today. I think we have done a good job of moving this forward. I commend the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Washington, Mrs. LINDA SMITH, who herself has been instrumental in keeping this committee focused on the special problem that she and the other Members have faced on that border between Oregon and Washington.

Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, sometimes we have a law that seems insignificant because it only affects a few people. But this particular day, it is very important to many people in Washington and Oregon, especially those that live in Washington, because for many years, they have been told there are not enough of them for Congress to pay attention. So I would like to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS], the chairman, for caring about justice for the few.

What has happened over the years is we have what is called a no man's land in Washington State and Oregon called a very wide river. It has many dams on it, and Federal employees work on that river. Over the years, one of the States, the State of Oregon, has decided that there is an imaginary line in the middle of the river and that they will have folks that get up each morning and pack their lunch and go to work never ever going to the State of Oregon, living in Washington, keep track of the hours as they go throughout the day, the hours that they walk onto the side of the river that Oregon has decided is their land. This has become a bone of contention over the years.

And I often hear taxation without representation. We hear this often. But really, sometimes people use it because they do not want to pay their share or they do not want to pay for services. These folks never drive on an Oregon road. They are never protected by Oregon law. There is never a fire engine that comes to protect their home. There is no service. There is nothing, except they walk across a Federal project part of the way through the day and then usually are required to pay about 10 percent tax on 50 percent of their income, without ever getting any service.

So today what we have is just common sense, but it is also justice for the few. And that is what America is about. We protect the rights of each individual. And the right to not have taxation without representation is just something we know is American.

So today I thank the chairman again and all the other Members, especially the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HASTINGS], who I am sure is on a plane coming home, if he is like so many Members, he is coming back here today because he has diligently brought it to the Chair, brought it to the committee, brought it to the limelight. And he has several of those dams, as I do, on the Columbia River, and his folks need to understand that he has been a bulldog on this. Even though it was only a few people, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HASTINGS] has cared deeply about the few.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to allow the RECORD to reflect what the gentlewoman from Washington, Mrs. LINDA SMITH, has said that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HASTINGS] too has been important in the promulgation of the legislation which is now before us. And he, I believe it was almost 2 years ago, was the first who brought this matter to our attention. And here we are today in full fruition of the solution of the problem that he brought then to the floor.

We now turn to another border, South Dakota and Nebraska.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. THUNE] to explain how that has occurred and how that was added to our legislation, because it reflected so much of the similarity between it and the other States in question.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS], the chairman, for yielding and for working with us on this important issue. This is something that is a very commonsense bill. It helps South Dakota families.

In fact, one of the things in South Dakota that we pride ourselves on is the fact that we are a low-tax State, and we like to attract economic development and people to come to our State because we have a low-tax environment. This is something that I think addresses an issue which works against that very principle.

In fact, in this particular case, this bill will save 35 families in my State of South Dakota $1,000 a year. These are people that live in South Dakota but work on a Federal project outside the taxing authority of Nebraska and South Dakota.

South Dakota residents work at Gavins Point, which is a Federal project on the Missouri River. They do not need Nebraska roads, facilities, goods, or services to access their worksite. In fact, these 35 families receive no benefits whatsoever for the tax dollars that they pay to the State of Nebraska. They cannot vote down there, and they cannot use Nebraska services.

We just heard previously from other speakers an important principle on which this country was founded, and that is the principle that you should not have taxation without representation. That is an inequity that has certainly cost the families of my State of South Dakota a substantial amount of tax revenues over the years.

So we are very pleased that the chairman and other Members of this body are willing to work with us to address this inequity and bring some fairness to the respective tax laws that we have.

I would just simply close by saying that those of us that live in South Dakota like the State of Nebraska. Many of us are Nebraska Cornhusker fans, but we would rather live in South Dakota. And that is where we want to live and pay taxes. And since we do not have a State income tax, it does have a significant economic impact on these families. And this bill addresses that. So I thank the chairman for working with us on this.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1953, a bill to tax more fairly workers at Federal facilities which border two States. This bill incorporates legislation I introduced earlier in this Congress to end the double taxation of Army Corps of Engineers employees working on dams across the Columbia River between Washington and Oregon.

Mr. Speaker, these Federal employees are currently being forced to pay income taxes to a State in which they do not work, live, vote, or receive benefits. For example: These workers can enter their dams from Washington State and need not use Oregon bridges or roads; workers paying taxes to Oregon have been denied Oregon unemployment benefits when they are laid off; they and their children are denied in-State tuition at Oregon universities; and they do not qualify for in-State fees for fishing and hunting licenses. Nor are they eligible for Oregon's comparatively inexpensive vehicle registration fees.

In short, these citizens never receive a single benefit from the taxes they are compelled to pay to the State of Oregon.

Beside the burden of paying taxes to two States, these workers must also bear the administrative burden of recording the percentage of their work day spent on each half of the dam. This is an unreasonable burden on these employees, who must frequently walk back and forth across their dams to carry out routine tasks. Furthermore, this costs the American taxpayers who must pay these Federal employees to track their time and movements when they might otherwise be doing the actual work for which they were hired.

H.R. 1953 would settle this problem in a manner consistent with previous legislation. In the Amtrak Act of 1990, Congress determined that railway employees who frequently cross State lines should only be required to pay income taxes to their State of legal residence. In the 104th Congress we passed the source tax bill which stipulated that pension benefits should be taxes only in the recipient's State of legal residence. In both cases, Congress intervened to clarify an interstate tax issue.

The administration has stated that congressional action is needed. The Human Resources Department of the Army Corps of Engineers in Portland has informed their employees that: "Congressional action will be required if we are to get this situation fixed." You may recall that the House debated this

issue last fall. Since that time hearings have been held, and we have worked with the Oregon delegation to address the concerns expressed earlier about this situation.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the excellent work of Mr. GEKAS, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative Law—together with Mr. NADLER, the ranking minority member of the subcommittee—in introducing H.R. 1953. Following hearings on this issue in April of this year, Mr. GEKAS prepared a bill which addresses double-taxed workers in Washington, Tennessee, and South Dakota, while preserving the right of States to collect taxes within their borders. This is an excellent bill, and deserving of all of our support.

I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan, commonsense measure which protects working people and their families from unfair taxation.

□ 1615

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1953.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRIVATE SECURITY OFFICER QUALITY ASSURANCE ACT OF 1997

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 103) to expedite State reviews of criminal records of applicants for private security officer employment, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 103

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 ''Private Security Officer Quality Assurance Act of 1997''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) employment of private security officers in the United States is growing rapidly;

(2) the private security industry provides numerous opportunities for entry-level job applicants, including individuals suffering from unemployment due to economic conditions or dislocations;

(3) sworn law enforcement officers provide significant services to the citizens of the United States in its public areas, and are only supplemented by private security officers who provide prevention and reporting service in support of, but not in place of, regular sworn police;

(4) given the growth of large private shopping malls, and the consequent reduction in the number of public shopping streets, the American public is more likely to have contact with private security personnel in the course of a day than with sworn law enforcement officers;

(5) regardless of the differences in their duties, skill, and responsibilities, the public has difficulty in discerning the difference between sworn law enforcement officers and private security personnel; and

(6) the American public demands the employment of qualified, well-trained private security personnel as an adjunct, but not a replacement for sworn law enforcement officers.

SEC. 3. BACKGROUND CHECKS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—An association of employers of private security officers, designated for the purpose of this section by the Attorney General, may submit fingerprints or other methods of positive identification approved by the Attorney General, to the Attorney General on behalf of any applicant for a State license or certificate of registration as a private security officer or employer of private security officers. In response to such a submission, the Attorney General may, to the extent provided by State law conforming to the requirements of the second paragraph under the heading ''Federal Bureau of Investigation'' and the subheading ''Salaries and Expenses'' in title II of Public Law 92–544 (86 Stat. 1115), exchange, for licensing and employment purposes, identification and criminal history records with the State governmental agencies to which such applicant has applied.

(b) REGULATIONS.—The Attorney General may prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out this section, including measures relating to the security, confidentiality, accuracy, use, and dissemination of information and audits and recordkeeping and the imposition of fees necessary for the recovery of costs.

(c) REPORT.—The Attorney General shall report to the Senate and House Committees on the Judiciary 2 years after the date of enactment of this bill on the number of inquiries made by the association of employers under this section and their disposition.

SEC. 4. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that States should participate in the background check system established under section 3.

SEC. 5. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this Act—

(1) the term ''employee'' includes an applicant for employment;

(2) the term ''employer'' means any person that—

(A) employs one or more private security officers; or

(B) provides, as an independent contractor, for consideration, the services of one or more private security officers (possibly including oneself);

(3) the term ''private security officer''—

(A) means—

(i) an individual who performs security services, full or part time, for consideration as an independent contractor or an employee, whether armed or unarmed and in uniform or plain clothes whose primary duty is to perform security services, or

(ii) an individual who is an employee of an electronic security system company who is engaged in one or more of the following activities in the State: burglar alarm technician, fire alarm technician, closed circuit television technician, access control technician, or security system monitor; but

(B) does not include—

(i) sworn police officers who have law enforcement powers in the State,

(ii) attorneys, accountants, and other professionals who are otherwise licensed in the State,

(iii) employees whose duties are primarily internal audit or credit functions,

(iv) persons whose duties may incidentally include the reporting or apprehension of shoplifters or trespassers, or

(v) an individual on active duty in the military service;

(4) the term ''certificate of registration'' means a license, permit, certificate, registration card, or other formal written permission from the State for the person to engage in providing security services;

(5) the term ''security services'' means the performance of one or more of the following:

(A) the observation or reporting of intrusion, larceny, vandalism, fire or trespass;

(B) the deterrence of theft or misappropriation of any goods, money, or other item of value;

(C) the observation or reporting of any unlawful activity;

(D) the protection of individuals or property, including proprietary information, from harm or misappropriation;

(E) the control of access to premises being protected;

(F) the secure movement of prisoners;

(G) the maintenance of order and safety at athletic, entertainment, or other public activities;

(H) the provision of canine services for protecting premises or for the detection of any unlawful device or substance; and

(I) the transportation of money or other valuables by armored vehicle; and

(6) the term ''State'' means any of the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the United States Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Guam, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR] and the gentlewoman from California [Ms. LOFGREN] each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in this great body in support of passage of the Private Security Officer Quality Assurance Act. I introduced this legislation along with the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ] at the beginning of this Congress. The gentleman from California has championed this bill not only in this Congress but in the previous Congresses as well.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, is identical to the bill that passed this House last Congress by a vote of 415 to 6. This bill will help ensure that private security officers undergo thorough and timely criminal background checks. It is straightforward and simple. It proposes an expedited procedure similar to those in use by the financial and parimutuel industries today to match the fingerprints of job applicants against records maintained by the FBI's Criminal Justice Services Division.

Mr. Speaker, there are more than 1.5 million private security officers in the United States. The security industry is