(2) in subparagraph (C), by inserting '', if requested by the Institute of Education Sciences,'' after ''will participate''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. GOWDY) and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOWDY. 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 material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Earlier this year, this body debated and ultimately approved legislation authorizing scholarships to give needy District of Columbia students the opportunity to leave their public school and enroll in a private school of their choice.

Following the House's approval of the SOAR Act, the legislation was enacted into law as a part of the Department of Defense and Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, which was signed by the President on April 15.

We are here today because there are several small and technical modifications that need to be made in order for the scholarship program to achieve its goal. This legislation would clarify three provisions: first, the education requirements for teachers of scholarship students; second, how the nationally norm-referenced test would be administered in order to properly collect data to study the effectiveness of the program; and, third, which students participate in the study.

On November 3, the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform approved H.R. 3237, the SOAR Technical Corrections Act, by a voice vote.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to thank my colleague, Ms. NORTON, and my colleague, Ranking Member CUMMINGS, for working with us to ensure we had the appropriate language to modify the legislation that is before us today.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I appreciate Speaker BOEHNER, Senate Homeland Security and Government Affairs Committee Chair LIEBERMAN, and Oversight and Government Reform Chair ISSA, as well as my good colleague on the other side of the aisle, the subcommittee chairman, Mr. GOWDY, I appreciate that all of them have worked with us and have consulted with us on these technical changes, and I do not oppose this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I would again thank our colleagues Ms. NORTON and Mr. CUMMINGS, and I urge Members to support the passage of H.R. 3237.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. GOWDY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3237, 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.

PROMOTING DEVELOPMENT OF SOUTHWEST DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA WATERFRONT

Mr. GOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2297) to promote the development of the Southwest waterfront in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2297

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

SECTION 1. PROMOTING DEVELOPMENT OF SOUTHWEST WATERFRONT.

(a) UPDATED DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY.—Section 1 of the Act entitled ''An Act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia on behalf of the United States to transfer from the United States to the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency title to certain real property in said District'', approved September 8, 1960 (sec. 6–321.01, D.C. Official Code), is amended by striking all that follows the colon and inserting the following: ''The property located within the bounds of the site the legal description of which is the Southwest Waterfront Project Site (dated October 8, 2009) under Exhibit A of the document titled 'Intent to Clarify the Legal Description in Furtherance of Land Disposition Agreement', as filed with the Recorder of Deeds on October 27, 2009 as Instrument Number 2009116776.''.

(b) CLARIFICATION OF METHOD OF TRANSFER.—Section 1 of such Act (sec. 6–321.01, D.C. Official Code) is amended by inserting ''by one or more quitclaim deeds'' immediately after ''to transfer''.

(c) CLARIFICATION OF RELATION TO MASTER DEVELOPMENT PLAN.—Section 2 of such Act (sec. 6–321.02, D.C. Official Code) is amended—

(1) by striking ''an urban renewal plan'' and inserting ''a master plan''; and

(2) by striking ''such urban renewal plan'' and inserting ''such master plan''.

(d) EXPANDING PERMITTED DISPOSITIONS AND USES OF CERTAIN PROPERTY.—Section 4 of such Act (sec. 6–321.04, D.C. Official Code) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 4. The Agency is hereby authorized, in accordance with the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945 and section 1, to lease or sell to a redevelopment company or other lessee or purchaser such real property as may be transferred to the Agency under the authority of this Act.''.

(e) REPEAL OF REVERSION.—

(1) REPEAL.—Section 5 of such Act (sec. 6–321.05, D.C. Official Code) is repealed.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 3 of such Act (sec. 6–321.03, D.C. Official Code) is amended by striking ''Subject to the provisions of section 5 of this Act, the'' and inserting ''The''.

(f) CLARIFICATION OF ROLE OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AS SUCCESSOR IN INTEREST.—Section 8 of such Act (sec. 6–321.08, D.C. Official Code) is amended by striking ''the terms'' and all that follows and inserting ''any reference to the 'Agency' shall be deemed to be a reference to the District of Columbia as the successor in interest to the Agency.''.

SEC. 2. CLARIFICATION OF PERMITTED ACTIVITIES AT MUNICIPAL FISH MARKET.

The Act entitled ''An Act Authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make regulations respecting the rights and privileges of the fish wharf'', approved March 19, 1906 (sec. 37–205.01, D.C. Official Code), is amended—

(1) by striking ''operate as a municipal fish wharf and market'' and inserting ''operate as a market and for such other uses as the Mayor determines to be appropriate'';

(2) by striking '', and said wharf shall constitute the sole wharf for the landing of fish and oysters for sale in the District of Columbia''; and

(3) by striking ''operation of said municipal fish wharf and market'' and inserting ''operation of said market''.

SEC. 3. MAINE LOBSTERMAN MEMORIAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), nothing in this Act or any amendment made by this Act authorizes the removal, destruction, or obstruction of the Maine Lobsterman Memorial which is located near Maine Avenue in the District of Columbia as of the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) MOVEMENT OF MEMORIAL.—The Maine Lobsterman Memorial referred to in subsection (a) may be moved from its location as of the date of the enactment of this Act to another location on the Southwest waterfront near Maine Avenue in the District of Columbia if at that location there would be a clear, unimpeded pedestrian pathway and line of sight from the Memorial to the water.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. GOWDY) and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOWDY. 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 the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Although the United States Constitution gives Congress exclusive legislative authority over the Federal District, in 1973 we granted the District of Columbia some significant autonomy by approving the Home Rule Act. Congress still must act, however, before the city can pursue certain activities. This brings us to the legislation before us today.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2297 is needed to update zoning laws to allow the District the flexibility to lease or sell real property on the Southwest waterfront to a private-sector developer. There is

currently a $2 billion redevelopment plan pending to renovate this area, which is only a short distance from the United States Capitol building.

We hope this redevelopment plan will accomplish its goal of spurring economic development and bringing jobs to the city of Washington, D.C.

This legislation was approved by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform by a voice vote. I again would like to thank my colleague, Ms. HOLMES NORTON from the District of Columbia, and Ranking Member CUMMINGS for working with us on this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1350

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

I want to thank the chairman of the full committee, Mr. ISSA and my good friend on the other side who is managing the bill for the committee, the chair of the subcommittee, Mr. GOWDY, for working closely with us on this bill so that we could get it to the floor today. I also thank the ranking member of the full committee and Mr. DAVIS, the subcommittee ranking member, for their very important consultation.

H.R. 2297 will allow development of the waterfront area in Southwest Washington, D.C., by making technical changes concerning land owned by the District of Columbia. The District has owned the Southwest waterfront since the early 1960s, but the legislation that transferred the land to the District contained restraints typical of the pre-home-rule period.

H.R. 2297 updates that outdated legislation to allow for the highest and best use of the land. The limitations serve no Federal purpose, but the unintended effect was to make a wasted asset of land that could be productive and revenue- and jobs-producing. Federal agencies have been consulted on H.R. 2297 and raised no objections.

The bill will allow mixed-use development on the waterfront for the first time and will create jobs and raise local and Federal revenue at a time when they are needed most. The Federal Government has no interest in the Southwest waterfront other than the Maine Lobsterman Memorial and the Titanic Memorial, which the District and the National Park Service have worked together to preserve.

The bill also expands the types of goods that can be sold at the fish market on the waterfront—a market well known in the region. The bill includes language that we developed with Senator SUSAN COLLINS of Maine to ensure the protection of the Maine Lobsterman Memorial, which is located at the Southwest waterfront near Maine Avenue.

Mr. Speaker, this is a noncontroversial bill that passed committee by voice vote that removes out-of-date restrictions. It involves no cost to the Federal Government.

I urge passage of the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I would once again thank our colleague Ms. HOLMES NORTON and Ranking Member CUMMINGS. Mr. DAVIS, the ranking member of the subcommittee, as my colleague so aptly pointed out, also deserves credit.

With that, I would urge all of our fellow Members to support the passage of H.R. 2297, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. GOWDY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2297, 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.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 2:45 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 2:45 p.m.

□ 1451

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BASS of New Hampshire) at 2 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.

ONLINE CONSENT FOR SHARING VIDEO SERVICE USE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2471) to amend section 2710 of title 18, United States Code, to clarify that a videotape service provider may obtain a consumer's informed, written consent on an ongoing basis and that consent may be obtained through the Internet, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2471

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

SECTION 1. AMENDMENT.

Section 2710(b)(2) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

''(B) to any person with the informed, written consent (including through an electronic means using the Internet) in a form distinct and separate from any form setting forth other legal or financial obligations of the consumer given at one or both of the following times—

''(i) the time the disclosure is sought; and

''(ii) in advance for a set period of time or until consent is withdrawn by such consumer;''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) 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. 2471, as amended.

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.

Today I am pleased that we are considering a bipartisan bill to update the Video Privacy Protection Act of 1988. This bill will ensure that a law related to the handling of videotape rental information is updated to reflect the realities of the 21st century.

The VPPA was passed by Congress in the wake of Judge Robert Bork's 1987 Supreme Court nomination battle, during which a local Washington, D.C., newspaper obtained a list of videotapes the Bork family rented from its neighborhood videotape rental store. This disclosure caused bipartisan outrage, which resulted in the enactment of the VPPA.

The commercial video distribution landscape has changed dramatically since 1988. Back then, the primary consumer consumption of commercial video content occurred through the sale or rental of prerecorded videocassette tapes. This required users to travel to their local video rental store to pick a movie. Afterward, consumers had to travel back to the store to return the rented movie. Movies that consumers rented and enjoyed were recommended to friends primarily through face-to-face conversations. With today's technology, consumers can quickly and efficiently access video programming through a variety of platforms, including through Internet protocol-based video services, all without leaving their homes.

This bill updates the VPPA to allow videotape service providers to facilitate the sharing on social media networks of the movies watched or recommended by users. Specifically, it is narrowly crafted to preserve the VPPA's protections for consumers' privacy while modernizing the law to empower consumers to do more with their video consumption preferences, including sharing names of new or favorite TV shows or movies on social media in a simple way. However, it protects the consumer's control over the information by requiring consumer consent before any of this occurs, and it makes clear that a consumer can opt-in to the ongoing sharing of his or her favorite movies or TV shows without having to provide consent each and every time a movie is rented.

It also makes clear that written, affirmative consent can be provided