slipped through metal detectors and onto our planes and into secure environments was a matter of science fiction. The problem is that today it is a reality, and in only 6 days the law banning the Undetectable Firearms Act expires, and so we have to act now.

This law was enacted under President Reagan in 1988. It was reauthorized under President Clinton, and it was reauthorized again in 2003 under President Bush. When Ronald Reagan and Bill Clinton and George Bush agree on something, so should we. This has always been a matter of bipartisanship, and so we should continue that bipartisanship and pass this bill today. It is bipartisanship because it is a matter of common sense that we don't want to make it easy for terrorists and criminals to bring guns past metal detectors onto our planes and into secure environments.

As the gentleman from Virginia stated, in our view this bill is not perfect. I would have preferred to modernize the Undetectable Firearms Act to eliminate some loopholes in the law by requiring that certain metal components be permanent or not easily removed. I would have liked to close that loophole. But, frankly, I believe that even a loophole in a law is better than no law at all. A loophole can be closed down the line; that is a preferred scenario to no law at all.

So I am not going to oppose this first step because we can't get all of our steps. We will step forward and continue to support the modernization of the Undetectable Firearms Act. This for now is a very good step. It is a step that all of our colleagues should support. I again thank the gentleman from North Carolina for his bipartisan leadership, and I thank the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from New York for his comments and for his legislation. I urge my colleagues to support the legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL) for his generous words, and I appreciate them.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COBLE. 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 H.R. 3626, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3626, which would reauthorize the Undetectable Firearms Act for 10 years. This statute's current authorization lasts only through December 9, and we must—at a minimum—extend the current protections.

It is critical that we maintain the prohibition against the manufacture and possession of firearms that would escape detection by metal detectors or x-ray machines.

We must take necessary steps to help protect ourselves from violent criminals and terrorists who may plan to target secure facilities such as airports, courthouses, government buildings, stadiums, schools, and hospitals, which use firearms detection equipment.

While we must ensure the protections of the Undetectable Firearms Act do not lapse, we must also take up legislation as soon as possible to address a critical shortcoming in the statute. The law, as it currently exists, would allow the production of firearms whose detectability is provided by metal parts which may be easily removed without compromising the ability to fire.

I support the efforts of Representative Steve Israel to modernize the statute to address this problem, and I urge consideration of his proposal as soon as possible.

Because of the crisis of gun violence in our country, we must consider other important bills designed to protect public safety. We urgently need to expand the Brady background check system to guns sold at gun shows and through commercial advertisements. To do this, I call upon the House to pass H.R. 1565, the "Public Safety and Second Amendment Rights Protection Act." We should do that at a minimum, but we also need to consider other bills such as those to help curb illegal gun trafficking and ban the sale of high-capacity ammunition magazines.

We should also consider bills such as H.R. 1318, the Youth PROMISE Act, designed to promote proven crime prevention strategies. Instead, this House has ignored the daily toll of gun violence and refused to take action on this issue.

While I urge my colleagues to vote today to extend the Undetectable Firearms Act, I also urge the House to not shrink from its responsibility to take on the other issues related to gun violence prevention.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a Senior Member of the Judiciary Committee and the sponsor of numerous legislative proposals to reduce gun violence, I rise in strong support of extending H.R. 3626, the "Undetectable Firearms Act of 1988", which bans guns that can pass unnoticed through a metal detector. I support this legislation because it will help reduce gun violence and keep dangerous weapons out of the hands of terrorists. Gun violence has affected many of our districts and continues to be a pernicious problem on the national stage to which we have to address.

Every day 45 people are shot or killed because of an accident with a gun. When firearms are in the home they are 22 times more likely to be used in homicides, suicides, and accidents than in instances of self-defense. Even though 34 percent of American children live in a home with a gun, fewer than half of those homes store firearms in a way that denies access to children, meaning that guns are locked, unloaded, and separated from ammunition.

Mr. Speaker, the "Undetectable Firearms Act of 1988" was originally passed in 1988 and signed into law by President Reagan. It was reauthorized in 1998 and 2003. Unless reauthorized, the ban on undetectable firearms expires this week, on December 9, 2013. It is therefore imperative that we act now to extend the ban so we can reduce gun violence and enhance the safety of our first responders.

While we cannot stop every instance of gun violence, we can help reduce their prevalence. By acting now with this legislation, we can institute common-sense standards that are focused on protecting our nation from violence by those who would do us harm, without infringing on Americans' Second Amendment rights.

H.R. 2665 and H.R. 3626 can go a long way towards making our homes, schools, and streets safer for families across this country. We may not be able to prevent every gun-related tragedy from occurring in the future, but we have a responsibility to implement reasonable, common-sense standards so that innocent lives will not continue to be lost.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3626.

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.

CLARIFYING CERTAIN PROPERTY DESCRIPTIONS IN PROVO RIVER PROJECT TRANSFER ACT

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 255) to amend certain definitions contained in the Provo River Project Transfer Act for purposes of clarifying certain property descriptions, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 255

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

SECTION 1. CLARIFYING CERTAIN PROPERTY DESCRIPTIONS IN PROVO RIVER PROJECT TRANSFER ACT.

(a) PLEASANT GROVE PROPERTY.—Section 2(4)(A) of the Provo River Project Transfer Act (Public Law 108–382; 118 Stat. 2212) is amended by striking "of enactment of this Act" and inserting "on which the parcel is conveyed under section 3(a)(2)".

(b) PROVO RESERVOIR CANAL.—Section 2(5) of the Provo River Project Transfer Act (Public Law 108–382; 118 Stat. 2212) is amended—

(1) by striking "canal, and any associated land, rights-of-way, and facilities" and inserting "water conveyance facility historically known as the Provo Reservoir Canal and all associated bridges, fixtures, structures, facilities, lands, interests in land, and rights-of-way held,";

(2) by inserting "and forebay" after "Diversion Dam";

(3) by inserting "near the Jordan Narrows to the point where water is discharged to the Welby-Jacob Canal and the Utah Lake Distributing Canal" after "Penstock"; and

(4) by striking "of enactment of this Act" and inserting "on which the Provo Reservoir Canal is conveyed under section 3(a)(1)".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. 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 California?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 255, sponsored by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ), allows the Provo River Waters Users Association to own a canal facility that it has operated, maintained, and repaid for decades. This title transfer was the original intent of public law enacted in 2004, and the passage of this bill would remove existing legal barriers in order to fulfill that intent. A companion measure by Senator HATCH passed the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee in May.

The whole matter comes down to this: the canal was originally an open, earthen canal in a rural setting. The city of Provo grew up around it until, for a variety of reasons, it was decided to enclose the canal, essentially changing it to a pipeline. In order to make it possible for the local water authority to raise non-Federal capital to do so, Congress adopted the Provo River Transfer Act in 2004 to authorize the Bureau of Reclamation to convey title to the association for the canal as if existed when the act was adopted.

Now that the enclosure is completed and the time has come to transfer title—as Congress directed nearly a decade ago—the Bureau of Reclamation has opined that by covering the canal, it technically is no longer a canal but rather a piped facility, that it is now different than the facility in existence when Congress ordered the transfer of title. Therefore, it doesn't meet the specifications of the conveyance act.

So, in an only in Washington, D.C., moment, we now have this measure before us that changes the facility description in the 2004 act to the ''water conveyance facility historically known as the Provo Reservoir Canal,'' so that the title transfer can proceed.

The passage of this bill would amend outdated legal definitions while accelerating repayment to the U.S. Treasury. This legislation continues the positive trend demonstrated by the Natural Resources Committee of economically empowering our communities.

The Bureau of Reclamation supports the bill. I am unaware of any opposition, and I urge its adoption.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 255 is a technical correction for the Provo River Transfer Act. This change will allow for the title transfer of the Provo River Canal to the Provo River Water Users Association. The administration supports the legislation, and we do not oppose the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ), the author of the measure.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to thank both sides of the aisle. I want to thank Mr. MCCLINTOCK, the chairman of this subcommittee, for allowing us to move this forward, and I appreciate the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA), the ranking member of the committee, for allowing this to pass.

This is truly a technical change. It strikes the term ''canal'' and replaces it with ''water conveyance facility historically known as the Provo Reservoir Canal.'' The final payment to the Federal Government of $700,000 will be completed once this bill becomes law. It scores positively. It is truly a technical change.

I appreciate the indulgence of the Congress on both sides of the aisle for making this happen, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the measure, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 255.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

SHINGLE SPRINGS BAND OF MIWOK INDIANS LAND TRUST

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2388) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to take certain Federal lands located in El Dorado County, California, into trust for the benefit of the Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2388

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

SECTION 1. LAND INTO TRUST FOR THE SHINGLE SPRINGS BAND OF MIWOK INDIANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The land described in subsection (b) is hereby taken into trust for the benefit of the Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians, subject to valid existing rights and management agreements related to easements and rights-of-way.

(b) LAND DESCRIPTION.—The land taken into trust pursuant to subsection (a) is the approximately 40.852 acres of Federal land under the administrative jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management identified as ''Conveyance boundary'' on the map titled ''Shingle Springs Land Conveyance/Draft'' and dated June 7, 2012, including improvements and appurtenances thereto.

(c) GAMING.—Class II and class III gaming under the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.) shall not be permitted at any time on the land taken into trust pursuant to subsection (a).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. 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 California?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, the Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians occupies a Federal reservation in the Sierra foothills in El Dorado County, California. They lost much of their land when Highway 50 was constructed through the reservation several decades ago. They were left with enough land to eventually build a successful casino, but have very little additional space for tribal housing.

Adjacent to their reservation is a 40-acre abandoned and landlocked property. I say ''abandoned'' because it was never developed, and it is presently dangerously overgrown with scrub brush that is just waiting to become a wildfire, which could rapidly spread either to the existing reservation or to an adjacent residential neighborhood.

□ 1330

As it turns out, this abandoned parcel is owned by the Bureau of Land Management. The Bureau of Land Management didn't even know that it owned the property when the Miwok first approached it about this matter. In fact, I am told the BLM actually had to be convinced that it does, indeed, own the land that it has obviously never managed.

The Miwok would like to acquire this parcel for the reservation, making up some of the land they lost due to the construction of Highway 50. It would be used for tribal housing, and the bill specifically forbids its use for gambling, a condition that the Shingle Springs Band has agreed to.

The parcel is untended, overgrown, and unused, and this land transfer