United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, DECEMBER 3, 2013 No. 170

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, December 9, 2013, at 2 p.m.

House of Representatives

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 3, 2013

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LAMALFA).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
December 3, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DOUG LAMALFA to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

INFRASTRUCTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, Congress returns for the final days of this year's session facing the same conundrum: people here and back home are divided over the direction of our government; they don't agree on how to fund what a growing and aging America needs.

A year ago, we were engaged in a vigorous debate on taxation. More recently, we survived the controversy surrounding the government shutdown, and we still are at loggerheads.

There are strong feelings by some that now is not the time to raise taxes, yet the spending levels enshrined in the House budget cannot produce spending bills from the Appropriations Committee that can actually pass on the House floor. In some cases, they appear to not even be able to pass from subcommittee. All the while, we are looking at a sea of unmet needs and face a floundering economy.

There is one area that can help break the logjam. It won't solve all of our problems certainly, but it will help us significantly along the way. Congress should address the critical needs of our Nation's infrastructure deficit. Roads, bridges, transit systems are all increasingly at risk. We are facing an inadequate state of repair, construction of new facilities are on hold, and we are losing ground in meeting our own needs, let alone the challenges of global competition. Yet this challenge is an opportunity for some potential progress. We know what to do to meet this challenge. We can write a new transportation bill that will meet today's needs; it just needs more money.

There is a vast coalition that supports additional resources for infrastructure. The so-called ''special interests'' that are so often at odds are remarkably aligned when it comes time to recognize and fix this problem. Business, labor, professional groups, local government, environmentalists, truckers, bicyclists all agree.

The paralysis that surrounds questions of raising taxes does not necessarily need to apply in this case. Ronald Reagan, after all, was willing to sign into law a 5 cent gasoline tax increase 31 years ago when a nickel a gallon was real money. A user fee is, in fact, a different category from a general tax increase. The various groups that score such votes treat user fees differently.

As we are attempting to resolve budget differences, there is an opportunity to embrace more transportation resources through user fee mechanisms that will have broad national support and not inspire the same fierce philosophical debate that has plagued and paralyzed our deliberations for years. It has the added benefit of being the fastest way to put hundreds of thousands of people to work at family-wage jobs to help boost our flagging economy.

I strongly urge my colleagues to take a step back and look at this as a way to crack the code, to meet vast unmet needs of our constituents and stabilize a critical part of our budget. Who knows, if we can find a way to thread this particular transportation funding needle, how many additional opportunities to solve problems going forward can we then address?

Printed on recycled paper.

I think what it takes is simply some vision and some courage. That is why people sent us here in the first place. Congress should act, demonstrating the leadership to avoid the worsening infrastructure deficit, put people to work, make our families safer, healthier, and more economically secure.

AFGHANISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, during the Thanksgiving break, I wrote a letter to President Obama, which I would like to submit for the record.

The letter respectfully reminded the President that President Karzai continues to thumb his nose in the eyes of the American taxpayer. We have seen many news articles reporting Karzai's refusal to sign the bilateral security agreement that this administration has proposed, an agreement that would obligate United States money and United States troops for at least 10 more years in Afghanistan.

In an Associated Press article printed in my State paper, titled, ''Afghanistan President Delays Deal,'' the subtitle goes on to read, ''U.S. says it will pull out troops if security agreement isn't signed.''

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that the House will encourage the President to pull our troops out and stop spending money that we do not have in a country that does not even want our help. Furthermore, it is my hope that the House and Senate leadership will, in 2014, allow Congress to vote on this issue of the bilateral strategic agreement.

Mr. Speaker, it is wrong that the Afghan Parliament may vote on whether they want this agreement with the United States, but the House and the Senate that represent the American people can't even have a debate and vote on the will of the American people. I know that the American people want this debate to take place. Hopefully, in 2014, the leadership of the House will at least let us have this debate on the floor of the House.

Mr. Speaker, if you could have traveled with me during the break last week, you would have heard many people in the Third District of North Carolina who said to me that they are outraged that we will continue spending money in Afghanistan at a time when we have so many financial needs at home. It is absolutely unacceptable that a single American would give his life or limb overseas without the approval of Congress. It is absolutely unacceptable that the American taxpayer would give money to a corrupt regime while young and old alike go hungry here in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the President: Pull the troops out and bring them home now. There is not one thing history says we will ever change in Afghanistan, and nothing, history says, will change in Afghanistan. It is time to end this senseless waste of American lives and American money in Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, this poster beside me was in the Greensboro newspaper where Mr. MCGOVERN and I had written a letter saying it was time for us to pull our troops out. Mr. Speaker, this poster says ''News & Record, Greensboro, North Carolina, February 2011.'' That's 3 years ago. We are still there, and we are talking about 10 more years. Let Congress debate. Let Congress speak. Let Congress vote the will of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I ask God to please bless our men and women in uniform and to bless their families, and please, God, continue to bless America.

NOVEMBER 26, 2013.

PRESIDENT BARACK OBAMA,
The White House, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I write today due to the ongoing discussion between the United States and Afghanistan regarding a 10-year Bilateral Security Agreement to allow our troops to remain overseas beyond 2014. After reading today's Washington Post article titled ''Karzai tells Susan Rice of more demands for accord extending U.S. troop presence,'' I once again urge you to reconsider your stance on U.S. relations with Afghanistan.

This agreement will obligate billions of American tax dollars and expose American troops to further danger overseas—all while meeting President Karzai's ever-growing list of demands. After 12 years, billions of dollars, and President Karzai's continued disrespect for the United States, many in the House and Senate believe it is time to end our commitment to Afghanistan. However, despite the risks involved, the agreement will not be brought before Congress for a vote. It is a sad day when the Afghan government has voted on the agreement, but that opportunity has been denied to the United States Congress.

Mr. President, I have seen many people and spoken at many events while at home in Eastern North Carolina, and I have received nothing but support for my position that this agreement is entirely unacceptable. I respectfully ask you to take the wishes of the American public into consideration and oppose the Bilateral Security Agreement with Afghanistan.

Sincerely,

WALTER B. JONES,
Member of Congress.

THE PLIGHT OF SYRIA'S CHRISTIANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, as winter descends upon the Middle East, the plight of Syria's people who have endured nearly 3 years of savage civil war grows more desperate with each passing day.

Fighting rages on throughout much of the country, and with the government forces making headway in recent months, many of the rebel groups have splintered, turning on each other. As in wars throughout history, it is civilians, especially children, who have borne much of the suffering.

More than 9 million Syrians are in need of humanitarian assistance, and a quarter of these, 2.2 million, have fled the country, mostly to neighboring Lebanon, Jordan, and Turkey. Half of those refugees, more than a million people, are children.

Another 6.5 million Syrians are internally displaced, having fled their homes, but remaining inside the country, often in parts of Syria that have changed hands on multiple occasions and with attendant civilian suffering.

While all of Syria's people have been affected by fighting, it is Christians, who make up about 10 percent of the country's population, who are at greatest risk, given their small numbers and the increasingly religious nature of a war that started out as a broad-based secular movement that sought to change the character of the Syrian regime but not the regime itself.

For two millennia, Syria has been home to one of the oldest Christian communities in the world, a population dominated by the eastern churches, but also including smaller numbers of Catholics and Protestants. Syria's Christians have been comfortably and fully integrated into the economic, political, and cultural life of modern Syria and, despite their small numbers, are well represented among the country's elite. Tragically, this long, peaceful coexistence has been shattered, and half a million Syrian Christians, nearly one in four, have fled the country since the fighting began.

Like minorities the world over, Syrian Christians have tried to avoid getting dragged into the fighting that has gripped their homeland; but with their top two population centers, Aleppo and Homs, having seen some of the most savage fighting in the war, Christians have been unable to avoid being drawn into the conflict.

While the uprising against Syrian President Bashar Assad did not start out as a sectarian conflict, it has increasingly taken on a religious tone, as many of the rebels have wrapped themselves in the mantle of fundamentalist Islam.

Initially, the Free Syrian Army and other large rebel groupings distanced themselves from the more religious rebel factions, some of whom are linked to al Qaeda, but even they have adopted an increasingly Islamist tone in recent months. This has exacerbated the plight of the Christians who are increasingly targeted simply because they are Christian and because they are seen by many Muslims as having backed the government.

The truth is that Syrian Christians, many of whom have family members among my Armenian American constituents, did not rally to the regime. Syrian Christians, like most other Syrians, simply wanted a freer, more open society and a greater voice in their own government. It is a testament to the depth of Christian desperation that

atrocities perpetrated by radical Islamists have done more to test Christian neutrality than the use of chemical weapons and war crimes by the Assad regime.

Ending the Civil War through a negotiated solution represents the best prospect for peace, and the international community must insist that any agreement reached at the upcoming peace talks in Geneva or thereafter will guarantee the safety of Syria's minority populations.

In the meantime, America can do more to help those seeking refuge. That is why I have been working for much of the past year to convince the administration to allow humanitarian parole for the nearly 6,000 Syrians with approved immigrant petitions to the United States.

As hundreds of millions around the world prepare to celebrate the most joyful day of the Christian calendar, the international community must intensify its efforts to end this terrible war, and also to protect Syria's Christians and ensure the continued vitality of this 2,000-year-old community.

AMAZON PRIME AIR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the innovativeness of American enterprise flies off the radar.

According to Amazon CEO Jeff Bezos, the company is fixing to deliver packages to its customers via drones. It is called ''Amazon Prime Air.''

That's right. In just a few years, Bezos said people will be able to order something online and have it in their hands within 30 minutes by the use of drones. It sounds like something out of the Jetsons, doesn't it? Gone will be the days of the neighborhood mail carriers. Soon there will be a drone to replace them. According to Amazon, these drones can deliver packages up to 5 pounds, which makes up 90 percent of their deliveries.

Mr. Speaker, thousands of Americans use Amazon every year, especially around the holiday season. Amazon, unlike the glitch-ridden government Web sites, can efficiently use online Internet services that get a timely product to market. Think of how many drones could soon be flying around the sky. Here a drone, there a drone, everywhere a drone in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, Amazon is just one of many companies that will be looking to take advantage of this cost-effective drone technology in the coming years. And good for Amazon. I congratulate them.

The FAA is charged with the responsibility of coming up with ways to regulate drones for safety reasons, but who is watching out for the privacy of American citizens? Congress has the responsibility and the duty to set clear regulation for all drones in domestic use. Absent legislation to prevent surveillance of Americans, companies could use drones not only for delivery, but other ways that, in my opinion, violate the constitutional right of privacy.

The issue of concern, Mr. Speaker, is surveillance, not the delivery of packages. That includes surveillance of someone's backyard, snooping around with a drone, checking out a person's patio to see if that individual needs new patio furniture from the company.

□ 1015

Photographing swing sets, pools, or the people that are in the pools, or even looking into windows, all of that could be done with the use of drones under corporate America or by individuals. This would all be possible. So Congress must ensure that the expanded use of drones in the coming years does not come at the expense of the individual right to privacy.

After all, this is a right guaranteed to all Americans under the Fourth Amendment. That's why I have, along with Representative ZOE LOFGREN (Calif), introduced the bipartisan Preserving American Privacy Act. Our bill would deal with several things, and, once again, Mr. Speaker, we're talking about regulating surveillance and setting guidelines for the expectation of privacy for citizens.

It would, first of all, deal with the government. It would prohibit the government from using drones for targeted surveillance of an individual or their property without a search warrant. The Fourth Amendment applies to the use of drones when the government is involved. It would also prohibit individuals or companies from using drones to take photographs or audio recordings of private individuals without their consent.

This is private surveillance, or spying, or snooping, whatever you want to call it. It would restrict private individuals and law enforcement agencies from arming drones, which can be done.

As we enter this uncharted world of drone technology, Congress must be proactive and establish boundaries for drone use that safeguard the constitutional rights of Americans and not leave this up to the FAA.

Individuals are somewhat concerned that these new eyes in the skies may threaten their privacy, so Congress can and should immediately balance this high-tech development with our constitutional right of privacy.

Boundaries are needed before drones flood the skies of America. Just because Big Brother or individuals or companies can look into someone's backyard or through a window of a house doesn't mean it should be allowed. As the innovativeness of American enterprise flies off the radar, we should be mindful that technology may change, but the Constitution does not.

And that's just the way it is.

END HUNGER NOW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to welcome all of my colleagues back from their Thanksgiving holiday, and I trust that, like me, everybody had a great Thanksgiving along with a wonderful meal. But I'm here today to remind my colleagues, so that they don't forget, that for millions of our fellow citizens, they were without a Thanksgiving dinner. In fact, for millions of our fellow citizens, they go without meals on a regular basis. Men, women, and children, close to 50 million Americans, go hungry in our country, the richest country in the history of the world. It is a national scandal, and it is something that we need to do something about.

Mr. Speaker, the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, otherwise known as SNAP, helps struggling families put food on the table. It's a good program that, sadly, has come under attack by some—not all—but by some of my Republican friends, and for the life of me, I can't understand why.

The average SNAP benefit is about $1.40 per meal. The No Kid Hungry campaign, launched by the group Share Our Strength, recently did a chart which shows that the average cost of one Thanksgiving dinner is about $49.04. That's equal to about 35 SNAP meals.

The fact is that our food banks are at capacity. I went to a Thanksgiving dinner sponsored by my bishop that was filled with people looking for food. That same group run by the Catholic Charities delivered well over 1,000 meals to people in my community on that one Thanksgiving Day. But the notion that somehow charity can do it all, or that food banks can do it all, or that churches or synagogues or mosques can do it all, is just wrong.

I would urge my colleagues to visit a food bank, to visit a food pantry, talk to the people who run those organizations and let them inform you of who is showing up at their doorsteps. Talk to the people who go to these food banks. These are average people. Many of them are working families who earn so little that they still qualify for the SNAP benefit.

The White House released a report over the Thanksgiving holiday talking about the importance of the nutrition assistance program. The report highlights, among other things, that in 2012 SNAP kept nearly 5 million people out of poverty, including 2.2 million children. SNAP reduced child poverty by 3 percentage points in 2012, the largest child poverty impact of any safety net program other than refundable tax credits.

The program's benefits are targeted to those most in need and designed to support work. The large majority of SNAP participants are children, the elderly, or people with disabilities, and

about 95 percent of Federal spending on SNAP goes directly to subsidizing the food purchases of eligible households. It is one of the most efficiently run Federal programs. I wish the Department of Defense was run as efficiently as this. Our deficit would be much lower. Among SNAP households with at least one working age non-disabled adult, more than half work—more than half work—and more than 80 percent worked in the year before or after receiving SNAP.

Now, the legislation that the House Republican leadership rammed through this Congress and is now part of a negotiation on the farm bill would cut the program by close to $40 billion. That would result in nearly 4 million Americans losing access to SNAP next year, including working families with children, seniors, and veterans. Nearly 170,000 veterans would lose their benefits. In addition, 210,000 children and these families would also lose free school meals. These cuts would come on top of the significant benefit reduction already experienced by all SNAP recipients as a result of the American Recovery Act moneys running out.

I would say to my colleagues that what that cut that went into effect on November 1 means is that the average family of four would see a reduction of about $36 per month in their SNAP benefit. We're talking about food. We're talking about making sure in the richest country in the history of the world that nobody goes hungry.

I know that these are tough budgetary times, but if you want to find ways to save money, I would suggest we listen to my colleague, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, and get the hell out of Afghanistan. Stop supporting one of the most corrupt regimes on this planet today, the Karzai regime. Take those millions and those billions and reinvest it here at home. Reinvest it in a way that we end hunger now.

Mr. Speaker, for millions of our citizens who are hungry, what they worry about and what they fear is not halfway around the world. It is halfway down the block. We ought to make sure we get a farm bill that does not make hunger worse in this country, and if we have a farm bill that cuts SNAP significantly, I would urge all my colleagues to not only vote against it but fight against it. We can do better. Let's get a farm bill, but let's not make hunger worse.

UKRAINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHIMKUS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to condemn the recent actions taken by the Ukrainian Government on its own citizens. A couple weeks ago, I stood here hopeful, urging their government to look westward as they entered the Eastern Partnership Summit in Vilnius. While Georgia and Moldova have moved forward in signing association agreements with the European Union, the Government of Ukraine failed to sign this agreement. This move is disappointing and even more so for the Ukrainian citizens who long for closer ties with Europe.

Due to President Yanukovych's lack of action, Ukrainians have taken to the streets in protest and have been met with extreme brutality. I join with the State Department in urging the Ukrainian Government to respect the rights of its people and allow freedom of expression and assembly. Ukraine should not bully or take violent action if they desire to be a peaceful, democratic nation.

I will continue to support the citizens of Ukraine as they pursue democracy and freedom in their country. It is my wish that Ukraine will seek other means of integration with Europe and not fall to demands and pressure from Russia. It is time to look to the future, not to the Soviet-style rule that has plagued their past for countless years.

JPMORGAN CHASE SETTLEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, it has been reported that JPMorgan Chase has agreed to a $13 billion settlement of the civil suit filed by the United States Department of Justice and the Federal Housing Finance Agency in order to resolve several investigations into their mortgage securities finagling. JPMorgan and it affiliates knowingly misrepresented the value and quality of the mortgage bonds that it sold to the housing finance agency. Compared to the trillions that Wall Street banks have extracted in home equity from the American people, a $13 billion settlement with JPMorgan Chase doesn't come close to repaying the American people what they are owed back. More cases need to be filed to mete out justice and recoup what has been wrongly taken.

Of the $13 billion settlement, $4 billion will be for the Federal Housing Finance Agency which will go to Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. How that filters down to the street, to the ordinary homeowner, we can't predict. Two billion will be credited through JPMorgan's reduction of principal on mortgages in areas hardest hit by foreclosures like Detroit and cities like Cleveland and Toledo in Ohio.

JPMorgan Chase currently holds—get this—nearly 1 million mortgages: 208,000 mortgages considered seriously delinquent and an excess of 700,000 which are underwater. That's too much power over our marketplace in too few hands.

Five hundred million of the settlement will be credited for the removal of blight from neighborhoods through demolition, reducing interest rates, and offering new loans to low-income borrowers. My goodness, every community in America could use some of that. That's very little money for a very big hole.

This settlement may appear like a big step. It's a small step in the right direction. However, let me put these figures on the record. Last year, JPMorgan Chase made $21.3 billion in profits—and that doesn't count what's in their reserves. A settlement of $13 billion therefore is barely half of what JPMorgan made in all of last year after expenses. In fact, this settlement of $13 billion is equal to exactly half of what they had already set aside, $26 billion, for legal fees since 2010. By the way, they make their money by charging all of us high fees, or paying us nothing on our savings accounts and certificates of deposit.

Moreover, the settlement will also be largely tax deductible for the bank, as well. Although the tax law does not allow fines or penalties paid to the Federal Government to be tax deductible, that only accounts for $2 billion of the settlement that the bank has to pay in civil penalties to settle their legal claims. That leaves $7 billion in compensatory damages that the bank could claim, for guess what? In tax deductibles. Imagine that. This greatly reduces the impact this settlement has on correcting their bad behavior and mitigating the damages it has to pay in the lawsuit. Imagine if homeowners were allowed to deduct the damages they have incurred as a result of Wall Street's misbehavior. Now, there's an idea.

Here are some figures to ponder: Over the last couple years, the CEO of JPMorgan has taken home anywhere from $23 million plus bonuses, plus stock options, on an annual basis. Mary Erdoes, the CEO of their asset management division, last year it was reported was paid $15 million plus $5 million in bonuses—bonuses. This is before they have settled all of these mortgages that they hold belonging to the American people.

Matthew Zames, their co-chief CEO, $17 million plus $6 million in bonuses, and Daniel Pinto $17 million in salary alone plus $8 million in bonuses, not counting all their stock options, cars, you know, all those things that they're given in their privileged positions.

The American people are really sick of this. They really want justice. We need more legal cases filed, and Congress should reinstate the Glass-Steagall Act by passing H.R. 129, the Return to Prudent Banking Act of 2013. This will end what caused the financial crisis—too much power in too few hands, and the power to create money irresponsibly. Our country should never again have to endure this kind of collapse because of the mistakes that they made.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's time for community after community to replicate those legal cases that have been successful in extracting repayment to communities and to harmed families across our country.

□ 1030

Our U.S. Attorney, our housing organizations across this country, those Attorneys General who are awake in our 50 States, we need to go after the source, the source that created the collapse that our communities are still suffering from. They must be held accountable for the mortgages they still hold, and recoup for millions and millions of our people the home equity that was taken from them so cruelly.

AUDIE MURPHY RECEIVES TEXAS LEGISLATIVE MEDAL OF HONOR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the floor on a subject that Republicans and Democrats agree upon. Several of the other previous speakers have done so, and that is the idea of freedom for this country.

But I also rise today to pay special attention and give tribute to one of our Nation's greatest World War II war heroes, Audie Murphy. Major Murphy, who hailed from the Fourth District of Texas—my district—was an extraordinary man in many ways. Initially turned away by several branches of the United States armed services due to his young age and his slight build, Audie Murphy's patriotism led him to misrepresent his age in order to serve and defend his country.

This patriotism and his unusual courage in battle led him to distinction as the most decorated combat soldier of World War II, earning every U.S. military combat award for valor available from the United States Army, including the Medal of Honor, two Silver Stars, three Purple Hearts, and the Distinguished Service Cross. It is, therefore, fitting, though belated, that Major Murphy was awarded Texas' highest military honor, the Texas Legislative Medal of Honor, on October 29, 2013.

Major Murphy earned his first Medal of Honor on January 26, 1945, in France. Six tanks and waves of Nazi infantry attacked his Company B, but Second Lieutenant Murphy remained at his command post throughout the fierce fighting. Although he suffered a leg wound, he continued to fight for more than an hour until his ammunition was exhausted and the enemy was in retreat.

Audie Murphy did not stop where most men would on the battlefield, in fighting for his own life, or in fighting for his country. In fact, he lived out the remainder of his years after the war as an accredited writer, actor, and songwriter.

Mr. Speaker, despite this prestige, it should be noted that he was also a man of deep modesty who considered himself ''just another man.'' He fought not because he loved war, but because he loved the values and freedoms we enjoy in America. He felt compelled to do his duty to his country. Audie Murphy represents some of the greatest qualities of a hero, including an unfailing sense of duty, a strong sense of patriotism, and a degree of modesty that recognizes the humble roots of this great country.

We remember Audie Murphy because of his outstanding feats but also because he remains perhaps one of the truest examples of what it means to be American. I was proud to ride in many veterans parades with Audie Murphy and was pleased to know him as a personal friend. I also met his sisters. He was always loyal to his family and found time for them.

As a Representative of the Fourth District of Texas, I am proud to call Audie Murphy's home my home as well. The folks in the Fourth District are pleased that the great State of Texas has given Major Murphy due recognition for his outstanding service to our country by awarding him the Texas Legislative Medal of Honor.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in remembering this great American, this great hero, and to thank him and his family for his service.

PASS A BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, it was just about a year ago right now that I and 84 other new Members of Congress arrived in Washington to begin our orientation in the process of joining this body; and both Democrats and Republicans of that class of 2012, though we come from different perspectives and different districts, we received a pretty strong message from the electorate in 2012. It was the same message that I think many of us heard when we were back home last week for our Thanksgiving break. The message was: set aside the hyper-partisanship and get about the business of attending to the work of the American people.

So now as we face yet another set of self-inflicted wounds, political deadlines that have been set, we hear some rumblings that we may not do what we committed to do just a few weeks ago, and that is, put together a real budget that is a reflection of the values, the interests, and the needs of the American people.

We have already gone through one government shutdown just this last year which cost the American economy $24 billion. We cannot afford to let that happen again, and we cannot afford another short-term deal that does not provide the stability and the certainty that the private sector needs in order to make the kinds of investments that will put the American people back to work and get our economy moving again.

I am glad that there finally was agreement to go to conference on a budget, and many of us took that agreement at face value. We took the Members who agreed to that and the leadership at their word that it would be an effort to put together a budget that is a reflection of the needs and values of the American people, a budget that will invest in our kids, that will give them the skills they need in order to compete, that will invest in infrastructure, that will help industry deliver products to market and grow the economy, that will invest in manufacturing by passing the Make It In America plan, a plan of some 40 bills that would reinvigorate our manufacturing sector in this country.

And we can do it without slashing important programs simply by being more rational in terms of how we manage our budget. Cut the big tax loopholes for Big Oil and corporations that pay virtually no taxes in this country; and for sure, Mr. Speaker, end this mindless sequester, a scheme that was designed to be so bad that it would force the two parties together around a more rational approach to making decisions for the American people.

But instead of that, it has now been embraced by some in Congress not as something to be avoided but as the starting point for the next round of cuts to the essential programs that we need in order to drive investment and grow our economy. We just cannot afford to continue down this path.

According to the CBO, sequestration is already costing us jobs. Up to 1.6 million Americans are out of work or will be out of work because of these mindless cuts. And we are further cutting our safety net—programs like SNAP, unemployment, those things that we need in order to make sure that we have a floor of decency below which no American should ever be allowed to fall in the world's biggest, most powerful democracy and economy. It is unacceptable.

These cuts also hurt our future by slashing key investments in research at the NIH, trying to crack the code and solve some of the most difficult problems that we have in the diseases that so many Americans are struggling with. Yet we set aside that investment in the name of partisan politics.

We have got to get back to work. We have got to get back to the work that we were sent here to do because I think the 85 of us that came in last year at this time are not really that much different than the rest of the Members of this House. We were all sent here with that charge to get the business of the American people done. But somewhere along the way, partisanship has overcome democracy. We need to set aside this hyper-partisanship, get back to the business that we were sent here to do, and do the work of the American people.

Pass a budget. I am calling on my colleagues to do that and to not be drawn into what could be another partisan squabble for political purposes.

CONGRATULATING ERIC COWDEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Eric Cowden, a resident of Pennsylvania Furnace, Pennsylvania, a constituent of mine. This past month, Eric, a graduate of Penn State University, was recognized by the National Future Farmers of America with the organization's highest honor, the FFA Honorary American Degree.

As a youngster growing up on the family farm in Washington County, Pennsylvania, Eric was involved with the FFA, like many students in rural communities, showing steer, heifers, and lambs from a young age. Upon graduating from Penn State with a degree in agricultural sciences and earning his master's in business from Delaware Valley College, Eric went on to work for the Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture. There, he administered the Rural Youth grant program, led the county fair in the agri-tourism division, and eventually rose to director of the central region office for the department. Eric also holds several leadership roles with the Marcellus Shale Coalition, bringing together two of Pennsylvania's most historic and important industries: energy and agriculture.

Eric is well deserving of this honor, and we thank him for his leadership in the field of agriculture and agricultural education.

SAFE CLIMATE CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, on February 15, a small group of Democratic Members of the House joined together to form the Safe Climate Caucus. We vowed to come to the House floor every day to talk about the defining environmental challenge of our time: climate change. Today marks the 100th day we have spoken on the House floor.

The Safe Climate Caucus is composed of Representatives from across this country. We come from the west coast, the east coast, the North, the South, and the Midwest. We come from coastal regions, urban areas, and rural communities. We represent a cross-section of America.

We started the Safe Climate Caucus because of the enormous disconnect that exists between what scientists are telling us about the dangers of climate change and the conspiracy of silence and denial that exists in this House. There is a mountain of evidence that climate change is a real and dangerous threat to the future of our children and grandchildren. Yet this body refuses to accept the scientific reality.

I wish my Republican colleagues would open their eyes and escape their congressional bubble. Firefighters across the West know that fires are getting bigger and more dangerous. Farmers in the Midwest know that droughts and floods are becoming more common and more intense. Coastal communities know that rising sea levels and extreme storms threaten their very existence. And just last month, a supertyphoon—perhaps the strongest ever recorded—demolished entire cities in the Philippines.

Extreme weather, sea level rise, heat waves, droughts, flooding, wildfires, pests—that is what climate change looks like. So what is this House doing? Denying, obstructing, and weakening the Clean Air Act.

In June, the International Energy Agency warned that, if we don't act now, avoiding catastrophic climate change will cost trillions of dollars. In October, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change concluded that the evidence that the Earth is warming is ''unequivocal.'' This is the same level of confidence that scientists have that smoking causes cancer. Last month, the World Meteorological Association reported that the levels of heat-trapping gases in the atmosphere set new records, reaching concentrations higher than any in the last 800,000 years. Yet this House endures it all.

We challenged the Republicans on the Energy and Commerce Committee to come to the floor and debate us, to defend their record of inaction. They never showed up. The committee won't even hold a hearing to listen to the scientists. Democrats are in the minority, so we can't call hearings. But we won't be muzzled.

Since February, the members of the Safe Climate Caucus reported on the alarms that the scientists are sounding.

□ 1045

In fact, today marks the 100th legislative day that members from the Safe Climate Caucus have spoken out. Except during the Republican shutdown of the government, our members have come to the floor every day we have been in session. It has not always been easy to keep this streak of speeches alive, but we have come because of the commitment of our 31 members to take action before it is too late.

We are speaking out because we know we have a duty to our neighbors, to our children, and to our grandchildren. We know that when future generations look back at these times, they won't remember the debates we have had on the deficit. They won't remember the debates we have had on boosting oil drilling. What they will want to know is whether we acted to protect the world from catastrophic climate change while we still had time, and they will want to know whether we made the investments we need to make the United States the world leader in the clean energy technologies of the future.

We are at a critical juncture. I urge all Members to join with the Safe Climate Caucus in ensuring we make the right choices for our future and for our economy.

OBAMACARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, since ObamaCare implementation began on October 1, the President has spent much of his time talking about the malfunctioning Web site. However, I would remind the President of his own words several weeks ago: ObamaCare is more than just a Web site.

The Web site was supposed to be the easy part, and as more people sign onto it, they will be made aware of the real problems with ObamaCare. In fact, when the millions of Americans currently losing their health care plans try to log on to healthcare.gov, they will be met with drastically increased premiums, skyrocketing out-of-pocket costs, and reduced access to the doctors and hospitals they know. These problems are in direct contrast to the repeated promises made by the President.

My constituents are rightly concerned with these broken promises and are regularly contacting me and my office to voice their concerns. For instance, Jillian in Sparta, Tennessee, wrote to me:

> Every year in the past, my health care insurance has increased by a small percentage—sometimes 5 percent, sometimes 7 percent. This past week, I received my new premiums for 2014. They increased by 250 percent. Same plan, same coverage, same insurance company.

And Jillian isn't alone. Nearly three times as many Americans say they have been hurt rather than helped by ObamaCare, according to a recent poll. This from a law that the President promised would lower insurance premiums by as much as $2,500.

Mr. Speaker, ObamaCare is much more than a Web site. It is an unmitigated disaster. The effects of this law are wreaking havoc on our health care system and exposing the President's broken promises to Americans across this country.

My House Republican colleagues and I have tried repeatedly to protect Americans from this law, but the only way to do so is for Democrats to join us. For instance, the Senate can act right now to pass the Fairness for American Families Act that was passed out of the House this summer. This legislation would give fairness under ObamaCare by delaying the law's mandate for people, not just big businesses.

The President may be all in on his health care law, but that doesn't mean congressional Democrats need to follow him off of a cliff.

As disapproval of ObamaCare continues to rise, I ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to distance themselves from ObamaCare and join us by trying to protect the American

people from this law's disastrous effects.

SEQUESTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD. Mr. Speaker, as budget negotiations move forward, Congress must remain committed to work in a bipartisan manner to find reasonable solutions to create jobs, expand the economy, and strengthen the middle class, while continuing to reduce the deficit in a responsible way.

To do so, Congress must lift the across-the-board sequester cuts that are inflicting damage to communities across the Nation. There is no question that we need to cut the deficit, but we should do so without cutting programs that seniors, veterans, small business owners, students, and our children rely on.

In California, it is estimated that, with sequestration, more than 15,000 children will not receive vaccinations for diseases such as measles, whooping cough, and influenza, and 8,200 children will be eliminated from federally funded early childhood education programs such as Head Start. This is unacceptable, and Congress must fix it.

After the extensive damage done by the government shutdown that cost the economy $24 billion, according to an assessment by Standard & Poor's, we must avoid another shutdown and another crisis by passing a budget that does away with sequestration. Americans cannot afford budget policies that weaken our economy, squeeze the middle class, and cost hundreds of thousands of jobs.

Congress needs to come to a compromise on a real spending plan that will increase revenue rather than just slashing critical programs. Congress needs to make sure that Medicare and Medicaid are protected and strengthened.

Mr. Speaker, I stand ready to support a commonsense, job-creating budget.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 51 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Loving God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

As we face a new day, help us to discover the power of resting in You and receiving assurance and encouragement in Your amazing grace.

Send Your Spirit down upon the Members of the people's House. May they be reminded always of who they are. Grant them wisdom, insight, and vision, that the work they do will be for the betterment of our Nation during a time of struggle for so many Americans.

May they earn the trust and respect of those they represent, whether or not they had earned their vote, and make history that expands the great legacy of so many who have served in this Chamber before now—a legacy of noble service, sometimes political risk, but always great leadership.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HAHN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. HAHN led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

> I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

JULIA'S STORY PROVES PRESIDENT OBAMA'S EMPTY PROMISES

(Mr. HULTGREN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I was saddened and angered by a recent email I received from a distraught constituent. Julia from Gurnee, Illinois, told me she is now one of the millions whose health insurance will be canceled because of ObamaCare. Buying a comparable plan means her out-of-pocket expenses will jump more than $5,200 a year. Worse, the smaller network excludes her current doctor—the doctor she has seen for 33 years. Only doubling her premiums would allow her to keep the doctor who has known and cared for her for most of her adult life.

The President promised middle class families would pay $2,500 less in annual health care costs under ObamaCare. He promised they would be able to keep their insurance plans and their doctors. Julia's story proves again how empty those promises were.

The Senate and the President must act, as the House has, to allow all Americans to keep their doctors. Americans can't afford more broken promises.

PROYECTO INMIGRANTE

(Mr. VEASEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. VEASEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Proyecto Inmigrante on their 8-year anniversary on December 7. Proyecto Inmigrante is a nonprofit organization in Dallas and Fort Worth that, since 2005, has served our community by providing low-cost and reliable immigration counseling.

I admire the hard work and perseverance of its executive director, Douglas Interiano, and the entire staff and volunteers who work hard to help their clients navigate the immigration system to become permanent residents and citizens and to also help them apply for deferred action.

Proyecto also serves a very critical role in protecting a vulnerable immigrant community from fraud and abuse. These efforts take courage, conviction, and selflessness that, as the holiday season approaches, remind us that we should serve others and look beyond ourselves.

Respecting our immigrant community and working hard to enact comprehensive immigration reform should be an urgent national priority for the country. I look forward to continuing that fight, and I am honored that our Nation will have Proyecto Inmigrante as an ally in that effort. Keep up the good work, and good luck on future years of service.

J.W. HENDRIX WAS RIGHT

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, constituents across South Carolina's Second Congressional District are hurting because of the President's failing government health care takeover. As millions of Americans continue to receive policy cancelations, it is increasingly clear that ObamaCare is destroying jobs.

Angela from Lexington writes:

> ObamaCare has caused my son to lose his insurance that was provided through his employer. They said they could not afford the new requirements. My son finally got a job that provided medical insurance, and then the President takes it away. There's definitely something wrong here.

The President has broken multiple promises to the American people. As

premiums increase, insurance is lost, and patients lose access to their doctors, we must work together to continue to replace ObamaCare with positive plans, as long introduced by Congressman Dr. TOM PRICE.

Small businessowners such as the late J.W. Hendrix warned of Big Government abuses' denying young people opportunity to fulfill the American Dream.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

NEW MARKETS TAX CREDIT PROGRAM

(Mr. HIGGINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the New Markets Tax Credit program which is set to expire at the end of this year.

This program has proven critical toward making successful investments in communities like my own in western New York. In the city of Buffalo, New Markets investments have leveraged over $180 million for projects, including restoration of historic Electric Tower and the development of the Innovation Center on the Buffalo Niagara Medical Campus. Thanks to New Markets Tax Credit-leveraged funding, construction is currently underway on Roswell Park Cancer Institute's new Clinical Sciences Center.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when our economy is recovering from collapse, support for programs that yield economic development and job creation is more critical than ever. I have joined my colleagues in seeking a permanent extension of this program, and I encourage our other colleagues to join us in the same pursuit.

OBAMACARE AND CHOICES

(Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about choices. For my constituents, ObamaCare is about tough choices and about unfair choices.

Barbara from Indianapolis recently logged on to my Web site to share her ObamaCare story, which is about her choices. She's a single mom trying to give her daughter the gift of a college education in a tough economy. President Obama's holiday gift to her, however, was a $200 increase in her monthly premium. Barbara wrote:

> For a single mother trying to put her child through college, it's too much. Where do I cut? My daughter's education? Medical coverage? A place to live? Food?

For Barbara, the choices posed by the increased premium posed by ObamaCare are tough and unfair. Too many of my constituents are being forced to make these same unfair choices. They shouldn't have to choose between paying for college or paying for health insurance.

Mr. Speaker, our choice is clear: the law is not working. Barbara and her daughter deserve a better path forward.

COMPREHENSIVE IMMIGRATION REFORM

(Ms. HAHN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, the clock is ticking with just 8 legislative days left this year, but I believe there's still time to bring comprehensive immigration reform to this floor for a vote.

There is an incredible group of people that are fasting on the National Mall as a plea to us to pass some form of comprehensive immigration. Today marks day 22 of their fast, but their faith and commitment to change keeps them going.

These men and women are sacrificing their health, and do you mean to tell me that we can't find the humanity and compassion to pass a comprehensive immigration bill, Speaker BOEHNER? Are you kidding me?

This isn't who we are as a nation. Cesar Chavez and Mahatma Gandhi called fasting a fervent prayer, but we must do our part on behalf of the families who have been hurt by this delay of comprehensive immigration reform. I'm standing with these courageous people and immigrant families all across this Nation in demanding a vote on an immigration bill.

Let's stop this shameful delay and bring a bill to this floor for a vote by the end of the year.

THE MEDICARE OPT-OUT BILL

(Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, at a time when Americans continue to see their health care options diminished by the President's disastrous health care law, it's critical that we work to return choice and freedom to the American people. That's why I introduced H.R. 3498, a commonsense bill that gives seniors the freedom to make their own health care decisions and opt out of Medicare.

If folks like Warren Buffett or Ross Perot want to opt out of Medicare part A but they don't want or need a government entitlement paying for their care, we should let them. This bill truly tells seniors ''if you like your current coverage, you can keep it'' without the risk of losing other benefits like Social Security.

Seniors want, need, and deserve the right to choose a health care plan that fits their needs. I urge my colleagues to join my efforts in returning freedom and choice to American seniors.

THE EFFECT OF BUDGET CUTS ON EDUCATION AND SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH

(Mrs. BEATTY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, we've heard a lot about choices and constituents and what we should do. Well, let me say to you, Mr. Speaker, and to this Nation, our Nation is at a crossroads. The decisions we make today will affect the long-term economic stability of our Nation.

Congress must pass a budget that helps grow our Nation and creates jobs. We must eliminate the sequester and invest in our future by funding Federal research and education programs. For example, in my district, Ohio State University, one of the Nation's premier research institutions, has recently experienced a 7.2 percent decrease in Federal funding because of the sequester and other budget cuts to Federal research and development.

If this downward trend continues, no question—no question—it will affect our Nation's next generation of science, discovery, and innovation while slowing jobs growth. Federal investment in research and education are put to use in places like world-class laboratories, clinical trials, and energy innovation centers. We must sustain these investments. Our Nation's economic security depends on it.

BIPARTISAN SOLUTIONS FOR PROSPERITY

(Mr. YODER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, the American people are still most concerned about job opportunities and economic growth. They're concerned with their checkbooks and family budgets as the winter months and holiday seasons arrive.

All too often, Washington, D.C., makes it harder on the economy and the American people, not easier. Layer upon layer of government mandates, regulations, and taxes suffocate our struggling economy and come down hard upon the hardworking American people.

The House must remain committed to focusing on job creation, economic prosperity, and opportunities for all Americans to succeed. This week, the House will continue our efforts to put more Americans back to work by focusing on pro-jobs legislation that make it easier for our small businesses to access resources they need to expand and add employees.

We will work to pass legislation that builds on hydropower in our country, creating good-paying jobs through continuing to develop our all-of-the-above national energy policy.

Mr. Speaker, the American people want Congress to work together for the

betterment of our entire Nation. We must come together and support these bipartisan solutions that encourage economic growth, better paying jobs, and lead to more economic prosperity for all.

□ 1215

1973 HOWARD HIGH SCHOOL BASKETBALL TEAM

(Mr. CARNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize the 1973 basketball team from Howard High School in Wilmington, Delaware. This year marks 40 years since Howard's sensational '73 team won Delaware's boys State championship with an undefeated season of 24–0.

Howard's '73 team wasn't the biggest; but the Wildcats were disciplined, and they played with a lot of heart. They were led by their brilliant guards David Roane and Kenny Hynson and the irrepressible Mike Miller, who battled much taller players under the boards.

Supported by a big family of coaches, teachers, classmates, and Howard alumni, the Wildcats became the first team in Delaware history to finish the season undefeated.

There were several games where it looked like Howard might get knocked off, including a nail-biter against the much bigger Salesianum in the State semifinal; but the Wildcats were always able to pull out the victory in the end.

Today I want to recognize Howard High School's 1973 boys basketball team, honor them for their historic season, and thank them for the work they continue to do for youth in the State of Delaware.

HOMEOWNERS FLOOD INSURANCE RELIEF ACT

(Mr. BILIRAKIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, homeowners in my home State of Florida and across the country face significant flood insurance rate increases as a result of the reforms made to address the solvency of the National Flood Insurance Program.

To ensure that NFIP remains both affordable for homeowners and sustainable for taxpayers, I have introduced H.R. 3312, the Homeowners Flood Insurance Relief Act. The bill would cap a homeowner's premiums at the end of a 10-year phase-in to no more than the appraised value of the structure over the course of a 30-year mortgage. It would also allow homeowners to pay premiums on a more affordable monthly basis rather than an annual lump sum.

These commonsense changes will ensure that homeowners stay in the program and any increased premiums do not harm the already fragile housing market's recovery. Furthermore, they continue the intent of the NFIP, protecting homeowners from devastating floods while also ensuring the program is able to cover its costs.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to move this legislation forward.

CLIMATE CHANGE

(Ms. MATSUI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a member of the Safe Climate Caucus to highlight the 100th legislative day that my colleagues and I have come to the House floor and called for action on climate change.

Since we started this effort, California has been rocked by devastating wildfires, the Midwest has been damaged by tornadoes, an early-season blizzard has wiped out livestock in the Dakotas, and deadly floods have destroyed parts of Colorado.

Extreme weather events caused by climate change continue to affect families and businesses across this country. These are not random occurrences, but constant reminders that climate change is real. We will continue to make our voices heard on the House floor until everyone comes to the table, effective action is taken, and future generations are protected.

OBAMACARE IS NOT WORKING

(Mr. DUFFY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Speaker, as I listen to the conversation this morning and the 1 minutes that are given, I don't hear many of my friends across the aisle talking about ObamaCare.

When I am back at home, I am hearing from thousands of people who have lost their insurance—people who did the right thing: Americans who bought insurance to cover themselves and their families who have now lost their insurance; Americans who we asked to do the right thing, and they did it.

In Wisconsin, 95 percent of Wisconsinites were covered. Instead of working on the 5 percent that weren't covered, we have now abandoned our health care system, and it is broken for those Americans who tried to do the right thing.

In my district, Denise needs a kidney transplant. She has lost her insurance. She has lost her doctor. She is going to the exchange looking for insurance, and the one option that she has doesn't provide coverage for her current doctor. This is life and death for so many Americans.

I hope that my friends across the aisle will start to talk about ObamaCare and how we fix it to make it work for the American people, because right now it is not working.

A NEW DAY FOR HEALTH CARE IN AMERICA

(Mr. YARMUTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, the prior speaker's prayers are about to be answered.

Mr. Speaker, my State of Kentucky is a national model for how the Affordable Care Act can make our constituents' lives more secure and their businesses stronger. I would like to share one story. Will Russell is the owner of Why Louisville, a small independent business in my district that specializes in locally designed clothing and art. The father of a 1-year-old, he also has a preexisting condition that led insurance companies to deny him coverage for the past 15 years.

Thanks to the Affordable Care Act, beginning January 1, Will and his wife and son will be covered under a plan they found on Kynect, Kentucky's health insurance exchange. Will estimates his family will save $300 a month. Add that to the peace of mind that comes with knowing he will never face medical bankruptcy and the threat of losing his thriving business just because he didn't have access to insurance.

He has been so pleased with the ease and affordability of Kynect that he is now exploring coverage for his employees for the first time through the State's small business exchange. Mr. Speaker, Will's story is one among millions of Americans who are finding expanded care through the Affordable Care Act. To quote Will:

> It's going to be a new day for my family, for me, and so many people just like us in Kentucky and throughout the country.

SHARE YOUR OBAMACARE STORY

(Mr. GOSAR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the millions of Americans who have lost their health insurance under ObamaCare.

The House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, the Federal Government's chief watchdog, is holding a field hearing this Friday in Apache Junction, Arizona, entitled, ''ObamaCare Implementation, the Broken Promise: If You Like Your Current Plan, You Can Keep It.'' As a member of this committee, I am joining Chairman DARRELL ISSA to listen to Arizonans tell their ObamaCare nightmares.

I want to know how this terrible law is hurting you personally so we can show President Obama and the Senate Democrats the damage ObamaCare is inflicting throughout Arizona and across the country. I encourage you all to come and let your voices be heard.

Mr. Speaker, we are listening. If you are not able to attend, but would like to share your story, please visit www.gop.gov/yourstory. ObamaCare has always been fundamentally flawed. I will continue to do all I can to protect the American people from this horrific law.

UNFINISHED LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

(Ms. TITUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, with fewer than 7 legislative days left in the year, the window to address the staggering list of unfinished business before the House is rapidly closing: no farm bill, no long-term budget, no tax reform, no ENDA, no comprehensive immigration package, no replacement for the sequester. In fact, the GOP has continuously failed to govern and create real solutions to the pressing issues facing this country.

Over the past 11 months, Republicans have undermined the important economic progress that we have made, disproportionately harming low-income women and children and keeping 11 million undocumented immigrants in the shadows. They have gutted nutritional programs, voted to repeal health care reform 43 times, and shut down the government in a fit of pique, putting millions at economic risk.

This holiday season, as Americans enjoy exchanging gifts with family and friends, I am afraid all they are going to find from House Republicans is a lump of coal.

CAUGHT BETWEEN A ROCK AND A HARD PLACE

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, ObamaCare exemplifies perfectly the problem of bureaucratic hubris. Confident that Americans would come to see their mass-produced health care as ''better,'' the ''suits'' in Washington chose to pass a completely partisan law and, regardless of promises, forced unwanted insurance changes on millions of Americans.

Many of my constituents object to the characterization of ''better.'' Coverage isn't better if it is not what a family wants or needs. It is not better if its shiny new mandates make health care unaffordable.

Holli from St. Clemmons knows this too well. She wrote to say:

> I am a geriatric care manager. I pay $171 per month. My deductible is $2,500. I went on www.healthcare.gov and was informed I now will get no financial assistance to pay for my plan. If I choose the lowest cost plan, I will be paying $330 per month. My doctor is not listed as a provider, and my drug deductible will be $2,500. I feel I am caught between a rock and a hard place.

''Better,'' for Holli, would be a health care law that doesn't make her insurance preferences illegal.

SAFE CLIMATE CAUCUS

(Mrs. CAPPS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 100th consecutive legislative day the Safe Climate Caucus has spoken on the House floor calling for action to address climate change.

The science, itself, is clear: climate change is already contributing to significant environmental changes—unprecedented droughts, floods, and hurricanes, to name a few.

But climate change is not only a serious environmental problem. It is a serious economic problem as well. American businesses, large and small, understand this threat; and they are responding accordingly. They are increasing their energy efficiency, reducing pollution, and implementing more sustainable business practices. American businesses understand that the changing climate is already hurting their bottom line, and they are taking action to strengthen their competitiveness and their resiliency.

Congress should be doing the same. Yet our majority continues to stick its head in the sand and do nothing. Climate change poses a real and immediate threat to our economy, and we really can't afford to wait any longer. I urge my colleagues to join with American businesses in taking action now to address this urgent problem.

TIME FOR REAL SOLUTIONS

(Mr. HUDSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to one number that has remained too high for too long, and that is the number of unemployed people in this country. Right now, that number stands at 11.3 million. That is 11.3 million of our fellow Americans. These are not just statistics. These are real people. They are our friends, our neighbors, our children; and they deserve better. These are policies that encourage real economic growth that will create jobs Americans need—not higher health care costs, policy cancelations, and threats of job loss brought on by ObamaCare.

This unworkable law is causing health care premiums to rise all across the country, particularly in my home State of North Carolina; and millions of Americans have had their insurance policies canceled. This is not a plan for growth. It is a plan for more strain on hardworking Americans. It is time for real solutions. It is time to get Americans back to work.

THIS CONGRESS IS LAZY

(Ms. WILSON of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, by the end of December, 1.3 million unemployed Americans will lose their unemployment benefits because Congress refuses to act. It has been 1,066 days since I arrived in Congress, and the Republican leaders have still not allowed a single vote on serious legislation to address our unemployment crisis.

As we approach the holidays, many families will grieve and worry. Many will suffer because, in January 2014, they will be the victims of the unemployment crisis. The sad fact is this: we have solutions, but the Republican leaders have abandoned these commonsense solutions and will not bring them to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, in this tight jobs market, it is not the unemployed who are lazy. It is this Congress that is lazy. Our mantra should be: Jobs, jobs, jobs.

□ 1230

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

(Mr. MCCAUL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the Affordable Care Act.

As the American people know, Members of Congress now are covered by this law. And, rightly so, we should engage in the D.C. exchange. I want to tell you about my personal experience with the D.C. exchange.

The President said you can keep your health care plan and that your premiums will go down. Mr. Speaker, I lost my health care plan. I have five children. My premiums have gone up significantly. I don't know if I can keep all the same doctors that treat my children.

If this is such a great law, why isn't the President of the United States covered by this law? On day one, why didn't the President of the United States have a Rose Garden ceremony as customer number one under his law, ObamaCare, and sign up for this? The answer is that he hasn't signed up for it because maybe he doesn't think it is good enough for his family, but yet it is good enough for the American people.

That is the height of hypocrisy and arrogance in Washington, and it needs to stop.

UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

(Ms. KUSTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in support of H.R. 3546, the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Extension Act of 2013.

Without congressional action, the Federal Emergency Unemployment

Compensation program will expire just days after Christmas. If this happens, 1.3 million Americans, including 1,300 Granite Staters, will be cut off from their benefits on December 28. We cannot let that happen. These benefits provide a vital lifeline to Granite Staters and Americans all across this country who are struggling to find work.

With only 8 legislative days remaining before the end of 2013, the time is now to extend this critical program. This bill would extend unemployment insurance through the end of 2014, giving hardworking people in New Hampshire the boost they need to find work.

I recently held a Career and Opportunities Fair, where I saw over 300 people striving for a better job and a brighter future. Let's give them that chance. Please pass this legislation.

JOBS AND OBAMACARE IV

(Mr. MILLER of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, House Republicans have a plan to provide real solutions that will help all Americans in this very tough economy. We want to spur economic growth, create more jobs, and provide fairness for everyone. But what do the President and his Democrat allies have to offer the 11 million Americans who are out of work today? They have offered up ObamaCare.

This deeply flawed law is forcing hardworking Americans to shell out more of their hard-earned money for higher insurance costs. It is causing millions of Americans to lose their insurance coverage altogether.

Too many Americans are already struggling to make ends meet. It is not fair that they are being forced to deal with the ObamaCare train wreck, too.

It is time for real solutions.

REINTRODUCTION OF THE STOP HARMING OUR KIDS RESOLUTION

(Ms. SPEIER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, when Jerry Spencer told his family that he was gay, his mother told him not to worry about it because they would ''fix it.'' This began 7 years of going through so-called ''conversion therapy'' to try to make him straight.

He was forced to put blocks of ice on his hands while he looked at pictures of guys holding hands and would only be given relief from the pain if he pleaded to see a picture of a man and woman holding hands. Other survivors of this quackery were told to strip down and hold their genitalia or snap themselves with a rubber band each time they experienced same-sex attraction. Jerry said that after each therapy session he was ''a little more destroyed.''

These attempts to change LGBT youth are extremely harmful and can cause depression, substance abuse, anxiety, self-destructive behavior, and even suicide. These practices have been rejected by every mainstream mental health association as neither safe nor effective. These efforts frequently increase family rejection, which we know make LGBT youth eight times more likely to report attempting suicide, five times more likely to report high levels of depression, and three times more likely to use illegal drugs.

Recognizing these harms, California and New Jersey have passed laws to protect minors. State legislatures in Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, New York, and Ohio are considering similar measures.

This week, I will introduce the Stop Harming Our Kids resolution to encourage other States to pass laws to protect LGBT minors from these harmful and damaging practices.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. AMODEI). 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.

TSA LOOSE CHANGE ACT

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1095) to amend title 49, United States Code, to direct the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security (Transportation Security Administration) to transfer unclaimed money recovered at airport security checkpoints to nonprofit organizations that provide places of rest and recuperation at airports for members of the Armed Forces and their families, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1095

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 ''TSA Loose Change Act''.

SEC. 2. DISPOSITION OF UNCLAIMED MONEY RECOVERED AT AIRPORT SECURITY CHECKPOINTS.

(a) DISPOSITION OF UNCLAIMED MONEY.—Section 44945(a) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting ''after the date of enactment of the TSA Loose Change Act,'' after ''title 31,'';

(2) by striking ''shall be retained by the Transportation Security Administration'' and all that follows through ''this chapter'' and inserting ''shall be annually transferred, based on requests for proposals, by the Assistant Secretary to nonprofit organizations that operate airport centers in multiple locations throughout the United States to provide places of rest and recuperation for members of the Armed Forces and their families''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''The Assistant Secretary shall ensure that the name of each nonprofit agency to which funds are transferred under this subsection is printed in the Federal Register.''.

(b) ANNUAL REPORT.—Section 515(b) of the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2005 (Public Law 108-334; 118 Stat. 1318; 49 U.S.C. 44945 note) is amended—

(1) by striking ''the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives'' and inserting ''the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives''; and

(2) by striking ''and specifically how the unclaimed money is being used to provide civil aviation security'' and inserting ''and the amount of unclaimed money transferred to nonprofit organizations under section 44945(a) of title 49, United States Code, and the dates of such transfers''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL) and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RICHMOND) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

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

I stand in strong support of this bill, the TSA Loose Change Act, sponsored by my friend and chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, Congressman JEFF MILLER, and 42 bipartisan cosponsors.

The Committee on Homeland Security ordered this legislation reported during the 112th Congress and again this Congress, but this is the first time it is being considered by the full House. I am pleased to be here today to express my strong support for the measure, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. Speaker, in the hustle and bustle of our Nation's airports, with millions of people traveling every day, it is no surprise that some travelers will inadvertently leave behind loose change at TSA screening checkpoints. That pocket change may not add up to much at one airport, but when you total it across 450 airports, it amounts to half a million dollars every year.

TSA is currently authorized to keep the money for its own use, but the agency has been slow to spend it, and already receives $7 billion towards its operations ever year. I believe this bill is a unique opportunity to put that loose change to better use by spending it on airport centers that provide our military heroes with a more relaxing and comfortable experience while they travel. What better time to make this change than during this busy holiday

season when servicemembers are traveling to spend time with their loved ones?

According to the CBO, this bill will not have a significant impact on the budget in any given year, given the modest amount of money involved. Supporting our military servicemembers and their families is a goal we can all get behind, and this bill represents a commonsense step toward that objective.

Earlier this year, we passed the Helping Heroes Fly Act, sponsored by the Congresswoman from Hawaii, TULSI GABBARD. That bill is already making a difference for wounded warriors traveling through our airports, and H.R. 1095 is another chance to further our commitment to our U.S. soldiers.

I commend Chairman MILLER for sponsoring this legislation, as well as my colleagues on the committee and across the aisle for their support.

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

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

I rise in support of H.R. 1095, the TSA Loose Change Act. It is a straightforward bill with an admirable goal: take unclaimed money left behind at passenger screening checkpoints, often in the form of loose change, and put it to good use aiding our servicemembers and their families as they travel.

Under current law, unclaimed money left at passenger screening checkpoints is used to offset civil aviation security costs. In recent years, TSA has collected slightly less than $500,000 annually in unclaimed money at checkpoints. H.R. 1095 would amend current law by directing that these funds be transferred to a nonprofit organization, such as the United Service Organizations, to provide places of relaxation and recuperation at airports for members of the Armed Forces and their families.

I am pleased to lend my support for this legislation. I know that the chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee has been a champion of this legislation for several Congresses now, and I applaud him for his persistence on this issue.

Chairman MILLER will be glad to know that this is not the first bill regarding servicemembers and veterans that the committee has seen moved during this Congress. Earlier this year, the Helping Heroes Fly Act, of which I was an original cosponsor, went on to become law. That legislation, introduced by my colleague on the Committee on Homeland Security, Representative GABBARD from Hawaii, requires TSA to provide expedited screening for severely injured servicemembers and veterans. Together, the Helping Heroes Fly Act and the TSA Loose Change Act display the committee's commitment to honoring our servicemembers and veterans.

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

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER), the sponsor of the legislation and chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I first want to thank the chairman, my good friend, Mr. MCCAUL; the ranking member, Mr. THOMPSON; Chairman HUDSON; Congressman ROGERS of Alabama; and all the members of the Homeland Security Committee for their support of this important piece of legislation.

As a proud supporter of the military, as many of us in this Chamber are, I am grateful to each of my colleagues and their hardworking staffs for the opportunity to help advance H.R. 1095, the TSA Loose Change Act, which is on the floor with us today.

This act is a commonsense piece of legislation with bipartisan support, has no impact on the Federal budget, and supports our men and women in uniform who dedicate their lives in defense of the freedom that we enjoy. As a result of this bill's passage, travelers' unclaimed change left at airport security checkpoints, which is currently retained by the Department of Homeland Security, would be put to good use right there in airports across America. What may seem like a small amount of change left behind to some—nickels, dimes, quarters, and pennies—actually amounts to hundreds of thousands of dollars each year and can make a significant difference if used wisely.

By directing TSA to transfer unclaimed money to nonprofit organizations that provide a place of rest and recuperation area for our Nation's military at our Nation's airports, H.R. 1095 would ensure that thousands of coins, when bundled together, will be used in support of millions of our Nation's warriors.

I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 1095.

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

Mr. MCCAUL. I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON), chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation Security.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my strong support for the TSA Loose Change Act, authored by my good friend, JEFF MILLER of Florida.

We see loose change at security lines in every airport, from Charlotte down to Pensacola and all across this Nation. It may not seem like much, but as people quickly shuffle through the checkpoints and leave change behind, it adds up to almost $500,000 a year. Under current law, the money is used for civil aviation security, but this bill will allow TSA to use this loose change to direct it to a good cause.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with Mr. MILLER. This money should be put to the use of supporting our military members and their families by providing them a place to rest at the airports.

I would like to thank Chairman MILLER for his tireless effort, his work on this issue, and also thank other members of the Homeland Security Committee. I particularly want to recognize the ranking member on our subcommittee, Mr. RICHMOND, who has dedicated himself to this work. He has worked with me on this and many other issues in a bipartisan way.

Mr. Speaker, that is what the American people are looking for. They are looking for us to come here and work together for solutions for the American people. Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the work that we have produced with this bill, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

□ 1245

Mr. RICHMOND. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, let me thank the chairman of the full Committee on Homeland Security, who is the chairman of the committee that I am ranking member on, and Mr. MILLER for introducing this legislation and for working in such a bipartisan manner. Of course, let me thank my ranking member, Mr. THOMPSON, from the neighboring State of Mississippi.

This bill is a bipartisan effort, and it goes to show the American people that we do have good common sense here in Congress and that we do things that are right just because they are the right things to do.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation, which will give resources to some of our most valuable citizens in the country—the ones who put their lives on the line for us—so that we may help them in expediting and in making their travels more relaxed throughout the United States.

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

Mr. MCCAUL. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to thank HUDSON, Chairman MILLER, Ranking Member RICHMOND, and Ranking Member THOMPSON. I am proud of the work we have done on this committee.

At a time of intense partisanship and acrimony, we have conducted ourselves very professionally and in a bipartisan way. I think when it comes to national security issues that is precisely what we should be doing. It is what the American people, as Chairman HUDSON said, expect and deserve.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this bipartisan, commonsense bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1095, the "TSA Loose Change Act."

This legislation, introduced by the Chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, received the unanimous support of the Committee on Homeland Security in October.

It would require the Transportation Security Administration to transfer money left behind by passengers at airport security checkpoints to nonprofit organizations such as the United Services Organization.

Under this measure, places of rest and relaxation for service members and their families

at our nation's airports would have new resources to provide critical services.

Over the past few years, TSA has collected, on average, over $400,000 per year at passenger screening checkpoints.

Last year, the agency collected over $500,000.

To be clear, this is money left behind by passengers that goes unclaimed.

Currently, TSA is obligated by law to use those funds for security operations.

Given that TSA has a robust budget and troubling propensity for spending taxpayer dollars on programs that do not work, such as its behavior detection program, I am supportive of redirecting these unclaimed monies to the worthy cause of maintaining dedicated spaces for relaxation at our nation's airports for our service members and their loved ones.

During the holiday season, service members and their families will be traveling through airports across the country to be with family, friends, and colleagues.

H.R. 1095 seeks to ensure that organizations, such as the United Service Organization, have the resources necessary to ensure their comfort as they do so.

I would like to point out that this legislation builds upon the Committee on Homeland Security's previous work this Congress to support service members and veterans.

Earlier this Congress, the Committee saw enactment of the Helping Heroes Fly Act.

That legislation, introduced by Representative GABBARD, a member of the Committee, requires TSA to provide expedited screening for severely injured service members and veterans.

I am hopeful that the legislation before us today is met with the same support as that measure and likewise becomes a public law.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1095, the TSA Loose Change Act. I support the goals of the bill that would allow the Transportation Security Administration, TSA, to transfer monies left by travelers at airport security check points to USO-type organizations.

The bill is intended to provide support to organizations that exist for the sole purpose of lifting the spirits of America's troops and their families.

Travelers often see young men and women of the armed services in airports who often travel for hours and sometimes days to reach their destinations.

It is important that while they or their families are traveling they are provided with access to rest areas and a warm welcome.

The TSA Loose Change Act modifies existing law by requiring TSA to transfer unclaimed loose change found at passenger screening checkpoints to organizations that provide places of rest and recuperation at airports to service members and their families, such as the USO.

Last year, TSA collected over $500,000 in unclaimed money at passenger screening checkpoints.

Under H.R. 1095, this money will go to the noble cause of providing support for service members and their families.

During Committee consideration of this bill in October, during Full Homeland Security Committee markup, I offered an amendment to the bill that will require TSA to publish in the Federal Register the name of the organization that successfully applies for the funds via the Request for Proposals process called for in the bill.

I was pleased that my amendment was met with the unanimous support of the Committee and is now a part of the legislation before the House today.

With my amendment included, we can have confidence that we will have knowledge of the organizations or organization that receives the money and can ensure its proper use.

I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support our troops and their families by voting in favor of this amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1095, 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.

TRANSPORTATION SECURITY ACQUISITION REFORM ACT

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2719) to require the Transportation Security Administration to implement best practices and improve transparency with regard to technology acquisition programs, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2719

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 ''Transportation Security Acquisition Reform Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The Transportation Security Administration (in this Act referred to as ''TSA'') does not consistently implement Department of Homeland Security policies and Government best practices for acquisition and procurement.

(2) TSA has not developed a multiyear technology investment plan. As a result, TSA has underutilized innovation opportunities within the private sector, including from small businesses.

(3) Due in part to the deficiencies referred to in paragraphs (1) and (2), TSA has faced challenges in meeting key performance requirements for several major acquisitions and procurements, resulting in reduced security effectiveness and wasted expenditures.

SEC. 3. TRANSPORTATION SECURITY ADMINISTRATION ACQUISITION REFORM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title XVI of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (116 Stat. 2312) is amended to read as follows:

''TITLE XVI—TRANSPORTATION SECURITY

''Subtitle A—General Provisions

''SEC. 1601. DEFINITIONS.

''In this title:

''(1) ADMINISTRATION.—The term 'Administration' means the Transportation Security Administration.

''(2) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term 'Administrator' means the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration.

''(3) SECURITY-RELATED TECHNOLOGY.—The term 'security-related technology' means any technology that assists the Administration in the prevention of, or defense against, threats to United States transportation systems, including threats to people, property, and information.

''Subtitle B—Transportation Security Administration Acquisition Improvements

''SEC. 1611. MULTIYEAR TECHNOLOGY INVESTMENT PLAN.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator—

''(1) not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Transportation Security Acquisition Reform Act, shall develop and transmit to Congress a strategic multiyear technology investment plan, which may include a classified addendum to report sensitive transportation security risks, technology vulnerabilities, or other sensitive security information; and

''(2) to the extent possible, shall publish such plan in an unclassified format within the public domain.

''(b) CONSULTATION.—The Administrator shall develop the multiyear technology investment plan in consultation with the Under Secretary for Management, the Chief Information Officer, and the Under Secretary for Science and Technology.

''(c) APPROVAL.—The Secretary must have approved the multiyear technology investment plan before it is published under subsection (a)(2).

''(d) CONTENTS OF PLAN.—The multiyear technology investment plan shall include the following:

''(1) An analysis of transportation security risks and the associated technology gaps, including consideration of the most recent Quadrennial Homeland Security Review under section 707.

''(2) A set of transportation security-related technology acquisition needs that—

''(A) is prioritized based on risk and gaps identified under paragraph (1); and

''(B) includes planned technology programs and projects with defined objectives, goals, and measures.

''(3) An analysis of current trends in domestic and international passenger travel.

''(4) An identification of currently deployed security-related technologies that are at or near the end of their lifecycle.

''(5) An identification of test, evaluation, modeling, and simulation capabilities that will be required to support the acquisition of the security-related technologies to meet those needs.

''(6) An identification of opportunities for public-private partnerships, small and disadvantaged company participation, intragovernment collaboration, university centers of excellence, and national laboratory technology transfer.

''(7) An identification of the Administration's acquisition workforce needs that will be required for the management of planned security-related technology acquisitions, including consideration of leveraging acquisition expertise of other Federal agencies.

''(8) An identification of the security resources, including information security resources, that will be required to protect security-related technology from physical or cyber theft, diversion, sabotage, or attack.

''(9) An identification of initiatives to streamline the Administration's acquisition process and provide greater predictability and clarity to small, medium, and large businesses, including the timeline for testing and evaluation.

''(e) LEVERAGING THE PRIVATE SECTOR.—To the extent possible, and in a manner that is consistent with fair and equitable practices, the plan shall—

''(1) leverage emerging technology trends and research and development investment trends within the public and private sectors;

''(2) incorporate feedback and input received from the private sector through requests for information, industry days, and other innovative means consistent with the Federal Acquisition Regulation; and

''(3) leverage market research conducted by the Under Secretary for Science and Technology to identify technologies that exist or are in development that, with or without adaptation, could be utilized to meet mission needs.

''(f) DISCLOSURE.—The Administrator shall include with the plan required under this section a list of any nongovernment persons that contributed to the writing of the plan.

''(g) UPDATE AND REPORT.—Once every 2 years after the initial strategic plan is transmitted to Congress, the Administrator shall transmit to Congress an update of the plan and a report on the extent to which each security-related technology acquired by the Administration since the last issuance or update of the plan is consistent with the planned technology programs and projects identified under subsection (d)(2) for that technology.

''SEC. 1612. ACQUISITION JUSTIFICATION AND REPORTS.

''(a) ACQUISITION JUSTIFICATION.—Before the Administration implements any security-related technology acquisition, the Administrator shall, in accordance with the Department's policies and directives, conduct a comprehensive analysis to determine whether the acquisition is justified. The analysis shall include, but may not be limited to, the following:

''(1) An identification of the type and level of risk to transportation security that would be addressed by such technology acquisition.

''(2) An assessment of how the proposed acquisition aligns to the multiyear technology investment plan developed under section 1611.

''(3) A comparison of the total expected lifecycle cost against the total expected quantitative and qualitative benefits to transportation security.

''(4) An analysis of alternative security solutions to determine if the proposed technology acquisition is the most effective and cost-efficient solution based on cost-benefit considerations.

''(5) An evaluation of the privacy and civil liberties implications of the proposed acquisition, and a determination that the proposed acquisition is consistent with fair information practice principles issued by the Privacy Officer of the Department. To the extent practicable, the evaluation shall include consultation with organizations that advocate for the protection of privacy and civil liberties.

''(6) Confirmation that there are no significant risks to human health and safety posed by the proposed acquisition.

''(b) REPORTS AND CERTIFICATION TO CONGRESS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than the end of the 30-day period preceding the award by the Administration of a contract for any security-related technology acquisition exceeding $30,000,000, the Administrator shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate the results of the comprehensive acquisition analysis required under this section and a certification by the Administrator that the security benefits justify the contract cost.

''(2) EXTENSION DUE TO IMMINENT TERRORIST THREAT.—If there is a known or suspected imminent threat to transportation security, the Administrator may reduce the 30-day period under paragraph (1) to 5 days in order to rapidly respond.

''(3) NOTICE TO CONGRESS.—The Administrator shall provide immediate notice of such imminent threat to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate.

''SEC. 1613. ACQUISITION BASELINE ESTABLISHMENT AND REPORTS.

''(a) BASELINE REQUIREMENTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Before the Administration implements any security-related technology acquisition, the appropriate acquisition official of the Department shall establish and document a set of formal baseline requirements.

''(2) CONTENTS.—The baseline requirements shall—

''(A) include the estimated costs (including lifecycle costs), schedule, and performance milestones for the planned duration of the acquisition; and

''(B) identify the acquisition risks and a plan for mitigating these risks.

''(3) FEASIBILITY.—In establishing the performance milestones under paragraph (2), the appropriate acquisition official of the Department shall, to the extent possible and in consultation with the Under Secretary for Science and Technology, ensure that achieving these milestones is technologically feasible.

''(4) TEST AND EVALUATION PLAN.—The Administrator, in consultation with the Under Secretary for Science and Technology, shall develop a test and evaluation plan that, at a minimum, describes—

''(A) the activities that will be required to assess acquired technologies against the performance milestones established under paragraph (2);

''(B) the necessary and cost-effective combination of laboratory testing, field testing, modeling, simulation, and supporting analysis to ensure that such technologies meet the Administration's mission needs; and

''(C) an efficient schedule to ensure that test and evaluation activities are completed without undue delay.

''(5) VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION.—The appropriate acquisition official of the Department—

''(A) subject to subparagraph (B), shall utilize independent reviewers to verify and validate the performance milestones and cost estimates developed under paragraph (2) for a security-related technology that pursuant to section 1611(d)(2) has been identified as a high priority need in the most recent multiyear technology investment plan; and

''(B) shall ensure that the utilization of independent reviewers does not unduly delay the schedule of any acquisition.

''(6) STREAMLINING ACCESS FOR INTERESTED VENDORS.—The Administrator shall establish a streamlined process for an interested vendor of a security-related technology to request and receive appropriate access to the baseline requirements and test and evaluation plans that are necessary for the vendor to participate in the acquisitions process for such technology.

''(b) REVIEW OF BASELINE REQUIREMENTS AND DEVIATION; REPORT TO CONGRESS.—

''(1) REVIEW.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The appropriate acquisition official of the Department shall review and assess each implemented acquisition to determine if the acquisition is meeting the baseline requirements established under subsection (a).

''(B) TEST AND EVALUATION ASSESSMENT.—The review shall include an assessment of whether the planned testing and evaluation activities have been completed and the results of such testing and evaluation demonstrate that the performance milestones are technologically feasible.

''(2) REPORT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall report to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate the results of any assessment that finds that—

''(i) the actual or planned costs exceed the baseline costs by more than 10 percent;

''(ii) the actual or planned schedule for delivery has been delayed by more than 180 days; or

''(iii) there is a failure to meet any performance milestone that directly impacts security effectiveness.

''(B) CAUSE.—The report shall include the cause for such excessive costs, delay, or failure, and a plan for corrective action.

''(C) TIMELINESS.—The report required under this section shall be provided to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate no later than 30 days after identifying such excessive costs, delay, or failure.

''SEC. 1614. INVENTORY UTILIZATION.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Before the procurement of additional quantities of equipment to fulfill a mission need, the Administrator shall, to the extent practicable, utilize any existing units in the Administration's inventory to meet that need.

''(b) TRACKING OF INVENTORY.—

''(1) LOCATION.—The Administrator shall establish a process for tracking the location of security-related equipment in such inventory.

''(2) UTILIZATION.—The Administrator shall—

''(A) establish a process for tracking the utilization status of security-related technology in such inventory; and

''(B) implement internal controls to ensure accurate data on security-related technology utilization.

''(3) QUANTITY.—The Administrator shall establish a process for tracking the quantity of security-related equipment in such inventory.

''(c) LOGISTICS MANAGEMENT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall establish logistics principles for managing inventory in an effective and efficient manner.

''(2) LIMITATION ON JUST-IN-TIME LOGISTICS.—The Administrator may not use just-in-time logistics if doing so would—

''(A) inhibit necessary planning for large-scale delivery of equipment to airports or other facilities; or

''(B) unduly diminish surge capacity for response to a terrorist threat.

''SEC. 1615. SMALL BUSINESS CONTRACTING GOALS.

''Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of the Transportation Security Acquisition Reform Act, and annually thereafter, the Administrator shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report that includes the following:

''(1) A restatement of the Administration's published goals for contracting with small businesses, including small and disadvantaged businesses, and the Administration's performance record with respect to meeting those goals during the preceding fiscal year.

''(2) If such goals were not met, or the Administration's performance was below the published goals of the Department, an itemized list of challenges, including deviations from the Administration's subcontracting plans and the extent to which contract bundling was a factor, that contributed to the level of performance during the preceding fiscal year.

''(3) An action plan, with benchmarks, for addressing each of the challenges identified in paragraph (2), prepared after consultation with the Secretary of Defense and the heads of Federal departments and agencies that achieved their published goals for prime contracting with small and minority owned businesses, including small and disadvantaged businesses, in prior fiscal years, to identify policies and procedures that could be incorporated at the Administration in furtherance of achieving the Administration's published goal for such contracting.

''(4) The status of implementing such action plan that was developed in the preceding fiscal year in accordance with paragraph (3).

''SEC. 1616. CONSISTENCY WITH THE FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATION AND DEPARTMENTAL POLICIES AND DIRECTIVES.

''The Administrator shall execute responsibilities set forth in this subtitle in a manner consistent with, and not duplicative of, the Federal Acquisition Regulation and the Department's policies and directives.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of such Act is amended by

striking the items relating to title XVI and inserting the following:

''TITLE XVI—TRANSPORTATION SECURITY

''Subtitle A—General Provisions

''Sec. 1601. Definitions.

''Subtitle B—Transportation Security Administration Acquisition Improvements

''Sec. 1611. Multiyear technology investment plan.

''Sec. 1612. Acquisition justification and reports.

''Sec. 1613. Acquisition baseline establishment and reports.

''Sec. 1614. Inventory utilization.

''Sec. 1615. Small business contracting goals.

''Sec. 1616. Consistency with the Federal Acquisition Regulation and departmental policies and directives.''.

(c) PRIOR AMENDMENTS NOT AFFECTED.—This section shall not be construed to affect any amendment made by title XVI of such Act as in effect before the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 4. GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE REPORTS.

(a) IMPLEMENTATION OF PREVIOUS RECOMMENDATIONS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall assess and report to Congress on implementation by the Transportation Security Administration of recommendations regarding the acquisition of technology that were made by the Government Accountability Office before the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) IMPLEMENTATION OF SUBTITLE B OF TITLE XVI.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act and 3 years thereafter, the Comptroller General of the United States shall evaluate and report to Congress the Transportation Security Administration's progress in implementing subtitle B of title XVI of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (116 Stat. 2312), as amended by this Act (including provisions added to such subtitle after the date of enactment of this Act), including any efficiencies, cost savings, or delays that have resulted from such implementation.

SEC. 5. REPORT ON FEASIBILITY OF INVENTORY TRACKING.

Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration shall report to Congress on the feasibility of tracking transportation security-related technology of the Administration through automated information and data capture technologies.

SEC. 6. GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE REVIEW OF TSA'S TEST AND EVALUATION PROCESS.

Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall evaluate and report to Congress on the Transportation Security Administration's testing and evaluation activities related to security-related technologies. The report shall include—

(1) information on the extent to which —

(A) the execution of such testing and evaluation activities is aligned, temporally and otherwise, with the Administration's acquisition needs, planned procurements, and acquistions for technology programs and projects; and

(B) the extent to which security-related technologies that have been tested, evaluated, and certified for use by the Administration are not procured by the Administration, including information about why that occurs; and

(2) recommendations to—

(A) improve the efficiency and efficacy of such testing and evaluation activities; and

(B) better align such testing and evaluation with the acquisitions process.

SEC. 7. NO ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act and the amendments made by this Act, and this Act and such amendments shall be carried out using amounts otherwise available for such purpose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL) and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RICHMOND) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I rise in support of this bill, the Transportation Security Acquisition Reform Act, which was developed and introduced by the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, the chairman of the Transportation Security Subcommittee, Mr. HUDSON.

Over the course of several years, the Committee on Homeland Security has conducted extensive oversight of TSA technology acquisition programs. During this session, the Subcommittee on Transportation Security has continued this critical oversight function, and has taken it to the next level under Chairman HUDSON's leadership.

Poor planning, excessive costs, a clumsy test and evaluation process, and other flaws have had a crippling effect on passenger travel and our security effectiveness. H.R. 2719 is common sense, bipartisan, and is an important step toward addressing the very deficiencies that have left travelers without adequate privacy protections—for instance, $200 million worth of screening equipment sitting in warehouses and hundreds of machines abruptly pulled out of airports before the end of their life cycles.

H.R. 2719 requires TSA to develop a multiyear technology investment plan to serve as a roadmap for industry and to shed new light on TSA's spending decisions. It gives Congress early warning when technology programs exceed their intended costs, are unduly delayed, or do not provide the security results initially promised. It also requires TSA to get a handle on its broken inventory management process. Mr. Speaker, recommendations from across government and industry were incorporated into this crucial piece of legislation, and numerous industry stakeholders have expressed their support for this bill.

I appreciate the hard work of my colleagues on the committee, especially Mr. HUDSON's from North Carolina and Mr. RICHMOND's from Louisiana. I appreciate the bipartisan approach they took in crafting this important piece of legislation and the collaborative, deliberative process that they followed to bring this bill to the floor in their first years as chair and ranking member of this subcommittee.

I urge my colleagues to join us in passing this vital piece of legislation that will further protect our transportation systems and the American taxpayer. Let's send this bill to the Senate and on to the President for his signature.

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

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

I rise in strong support of H.R. 2719, the Transportation Security Acquisition Reform Act.

H.R. 2719 addresses longstanding concerns that I and other members of this committee have raised about the Transportation Security Administration's stewardship of taxpayer funds when pursuing, acquiring, and deploying security-related technologies. Importantly, the bill also seeks to address TSA's lackluster record of contracting with small businesses.

Earlier this year, the Subcommittee on Transportation Security, of which I am the ranking member, held a hearing with industry stakeholders. We heard from representatives of both small and large businesses on how to improve TSA's acquisition practices and on how the agency can engage with small businesses more effectively. Simply put, TSA's failure to meet its goals for prime contracting with small businesses is unacceptable. There are ample small, minority-owned and disadvantaged businesses that are ready, willing, and able to provide services and technologies to TSA that would enhance our security and likely reduce contracting costs. If TSA cannot identify such businesses, I would be happy to refer them to some.

The bill takes a significant step toward holding TSA more accountable for achieving its goals for contracting with small and disadvantaged businesses by requiring the agency to develop an action plan to accomplish its goals and report to Congress on how it plans to get there.

I thank the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON), for his willingness to have included small businesses in the discussion as we developed the legislation before the House today. Indeed, at every turn, this legislation was developed in a bipartisan fashion, and the final product is better for that.

The bill tackles head-on the lack of transparency and accountability that has plagued TSA's acquisition practices since the agency's inception. Among TSA's most notable and costly acquisition missteps are the ''puffer machines,'' which did not work, and the whole body AIT machines, which could not be modified to protect passengers' privacy. While no legislation can guarantee that an agency will not falter when acquiring technologies, H.R. 2719 represents a significant step in the right direction.

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

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON), the sponsor of this legislation and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation Security.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support a critical piece of legislation, the Transportation Security Acquisition Reform Act, which I introduced in July and have been working on for many months.

I thank Chairman MCCAUL for helping move this bill through our committee, and I commend all of the members on the committee for a swift and unanimous vote to bring this bill to the floor. Again, this was a unanimous vote both in the subcommittee and in the full committee. This bill has the bipartisan support of our chairman and ranking member on the full committee as well as having mine and the ranking member's on the Transportation Security Subcommittee. Let me also say that this bill would not be possible if Mr. THOMPSON and Mr. RICHMOND were not willing to work with me on this. Frankly, their collaboration made this better legislation. As I have said before, the American people expect us to come here and work together for solutions, and this is a prime example of that.

This bill has withstood the careful scrutiny of our committee's oversight, and it has also been endorsed by numerous stakeholders outside the Capitol, and I submit for the RECORD their letters of support.

Mr. Speaker, in today's partisan culture of a divided Congress, I am very proud to report that we can come together from across the aisle in order to address very real issues that we have in the Transportation Security Administration, those being acquisition and procurement. For over 10 years, we have all witnessed hundreds of millions of dollars being wasted on failed technologies and have witnessed machines sitting idly in warehouses. Poor planning, inventory management, and limited communication with stakeholders have decreased security, limited innovation, and squandered taxpayer dollars.

I recognize that TSA is constantly trying to respond to new threats—they have a difficult job—but in some cases, the pressures to perform and deploy new technologies can lead to a reactive approach without sufficient planning. They still have a long way to go. Having a long-term plan that leverages experts within government and within industry can help to prevent these capability gaps. Our bill provides that roadmap to success.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot continue to let TSA drag its feet on establishing greater transparency and accountability for technologies that protect our Nation's traveling public. It is incumbent upon us to make sure that taxpayer dollars are being used effectively and efficiently. We must take action. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

JULY 23, 2013.

Hon. RICHARD HUDSON,
Chairman, House Subcommittee on Transportation Security, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HUDSON: On behalf of the Airports Council International-North America (ACI-NA), which represents local, regional, and state governing bodies that own and operate commercial airports throughout the United States and Canada, I am pleased to offer our endorsement of H.R. 2719, the Transportation Security Acquisition Reform Act.

Airport operators have long advocated for the Transportation Security Administration (TSA) to implement best practices and improve the transparency of its technology acquisition programs. H.R. 2719 would also require TSA to incorporate feedback and input from the private sector on technology trends and other research and development information that helps TSA develop a strategic plan on technology acquisition.

Again, thank you for your continued support of airport operators and on recognizing the need to improve TSA's technology acquisition process. We look forward to working with you on the passage of H.R. 2719.

Sincerely,

DEBORAH MCELROY,
Interim President, AIRPORTS COUNCIL INTERNATIONAL-NORTH AMERICA.

U.S. TRAVEL ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, July 24, 2013.

Hon. RICHARD HUDSON,
Chairman, Transportation Security Subcommittee, House Committee on Homeland Security, Washington, DC.

Hon. CEDRIC RICHMOND,
Ranking Member, Transportation Security Subcommittee, House Committee on Homeland Security, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HUDSON AND RANKING MEMBER RICHMOND: On behalf of the U.S. Travel Association, it is my pleasure to lend our support for two bills the subcommittee will be marking up later this week—namely, H.R. 1204, the Aviation Security Stakeholder Participation Act, and H.R. 2719, the Transportation Security Acquisition Reform Act. Both of these bills are consistent with the recommendations for transportation security and travel facilitation that U.S. Travel made when issuing ''A Better Way: Building a World-Class System for Aviation Security.'' Specifically, we applaud the provisions of H.R. 1204, which recognize the role of the travel industry as a stakeholder in the Aviation Security Advisory Committee. Additionally, we strongly support the sections of H.R. 2719, which require the Transportation Security Administration (TSA) to develop a multiyear technology investment plan.

The U.S. Travel Association is the national, non-profit organization representing all components of the travel industry that generates $2.0 trillion in economic output and supports 14.6 million jobs. U.S. Travel's mission is to increase travel to and within the United States.

We look forward to working with you to see the House pass both of these important pieces of legislation.

Sincerely,

ROGER J. DOW,
President & CEO.

SECURITY INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION,
Silver Spring, MD, July 23, 2013.

Hon. RICHARD HUDSON,
Chairman, House Homeland Security Committee, Subcommittee on Transportation Security, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HUDSON: On behalf of the Security Industry Association (SIA), I would like to commend your bipartisan efforts toward procurement reform at the Transportation Security Administration (TSA) and, more specifically, H.R. 2719, the Transportation Security Acquisition Reform Act.

Many of our more than 480 member companies have supported and continue to support the work of TSA since the agency's inception. As with any new organization, there are challenges. But we could probably agree there are other agencies, which have been in existence for decades, facing greater challenges than TSA.

However, whenever there is an opportunity to improve how the government purchases goods and services, no matter what agency or government entity is involved, there is cause to celebrate. A better procurement process ideally works for all parties involved, and we are very pleased that you and the committee have recognized the role of industry when crafting the current legislation.

Please know that SIA stands ready to assist the efforts of you, Ranking Member Cedric Richmond and the entire committee.

Sincerely,

DON ERICKSON,
CEO.

SECURITY MANUFACTURERS COALITION,
Alexandria, VA, October 1, 2013.

Hon. RICHARD HUDSON,
House Committee on Homeland Security, Subcommittee on Transportation Security, Washington, DC.

Hon. CEDRIC RICHMOND,
House Committee on Homeland Security, Subcommittee on Transportation Security, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HUDSON AND RANKING MEMBER RICHMOND: On behalf of the Security Manufacturers Coalition (SMC), I want to thank you and the Committee for your time and efforts to begin the process of bringing meaningful reforms to the TSA acquisition process. As you know the SMC membership is made up of nine of the leading U.S. manufacturers of security screening technology. This scanning equipment is used in every major airport in the U.S. and abroad, operating continuously 365 days a year, as part of the overall effort to ensure the security of the traveling public.

The Coalition supports H.R. 2719 as a step in creating a more transparent, predictable, and efficient process for TSA to streamline the acquisition and deployment of security screening technology. We appreciate the committee's acknowledgement and inclusion of a multi-year technology investment plan in the legislation. The inclusion of a five-year plan of investments is important for technology manufacturers because it enables them to make critical research, planning, and investment decisions for the future, and to help TSA meet its mission needs.

We also support the inclusion of bill language to limit the practice of just-in-time logistics (JIT). JIT delivery is a risky and potentially damaging approach for screening technology which will put the supply chain, manufacturing base and American jobs at risk. Highly specialized technology manufacturers require long-lead time components specific to screening people and baggage in airports, along with a predictable forecast of procurements to maintain a steady state of production and surge capability. Unpredictable procurements cause workforce reductions and increase program risks because

manufacturers may not be able to ramp up production or meet delivery rates for unplanned or short notice requirements. We appreciate the common sense approach to inventory, supply chain management that balances manufacturing with Government acquisition and deployment plans.

Finally, we appreciate the Committee's desire to ensure that the reporting requirements in the bill not add extra steps and time to an already cumbersome acquisition process. As you are aware, the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) has established regulations and reports that govern its acquisitions process. We are pleased that the Committee intends to ensure that the Congressional reporting requirements in the bill will compliment, rather than duplicate, existing reporting processes within the DHS and TSA.

Once again, thank you for all of your hard work on this legislation. The members of the Coalition sincerely appreciate the collaborative way in which you and your staff have engaged our ideas on this important legislation. We look forward to working with you and other stakeholders in the future to offer solutions to improve the ability of airports to have access to better technology solutions that create a safer aviation system for passengers.

Sincerely,

T.J. SCHULTZ,
Director.

GENERAL AVIATION MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, October 28, 2013.

Chairman MICHAEL MCCAUL,
Committee on Homeland Security, Washington, DC.

Ranking Member BENNIE THOMPSON,
Committee on Homeland Security, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCCAUL AND RANKING MEMBER THOMPSON: On behalf of the General Aviation Manufacturers Association, we write to urge committee passage of H.R. 1204, the Aviation Security Stakeholder Participation Act of 2013, introduced by Congressman Bennie Thompson, and H.R. 2719, the Transportation Security Acquisition and Reform Act, introduced by Transportation Security Chairman Richard Hudson. These items are slated to be marked up by the House Homeland Security Committee on October 29, 2013.

GAMA supports passage of H.R. 1204, the Aviation Security Stakeholder Participation Act of 2013, given the important step this measure takes to ensure that stakeholders are included in the policymaking process at TSA. H.R. 1204 establishes the Aviation Security Advisory Committee, in statute, to ensure that all aviation stakeholders, including general aviation, are able to provide input to the TSA in advance of policies being formally proposed. We are also encouraged that H.R. 1204 provides for a general aviation advisory subcommittee to specifically consider issues related to general aviation.

We also support passage of H.R. 2719, the Transportation Security Acquisition and Reform Act, given the focus it places on reform for the agency. While our member companies' involvement in TSA acquisition is limited, the objectives of this legislation are laudable and we hope such efforts will be applied to other areas of TSA governance.

In general, we are pleased that both bills place a priority on improving key processes at the agency. Our member companies remain confounded by a bureaucracy that penalizes manufacturers competing in a global environment for government inaction. Almost ten years have elapsed since TSA was directed to promulgate a final rulemaking to secure repair stations overseas. Today, we still await approval of this rule. While efforts have been made to move this rule forward, the overall government process for TSA security rulemaking lacks accountability and appears to be profoundly dysfunctional.

We urge the committee to favorably consider these bills and to continue their critical and constructive oversight of the Department of Homeland Security and its agencies.

Sincerely,

PETER J. BUNCE,
President and CEO.

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would like to take this opportunity to thank the chairman of Homeland Security, Mr. MCCAUL, and the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. HUDSON, for the bipartisan manner in which they have handled not only this bill but all of the bills. It is typical of how we conduct ourselves on the committee. I especially thank my ranking member, Mr. THOMPSON from Mississippi, as we put the goals, the safety, and the value of the American public over partisanship.

This bill does four things that I am really excited about. It creates jobs through working with small businesses. It provides greater transparency with the acquisition process. It creates more efficiencies within the Department and saves the American taxpayers money. Last but certainly not least, it makes our traveling public safer.

With these goals that we have made a priority in crafting this legislation and in pushing it through, I am happy with the final product, and I would urge all of our Members to support it.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I want to associate myself with the gentleman from Louisiana's remarks.

I do think this is a very important bill that will ultimately save taxpayer dollars and that will make the system more efficient while, at the same time, better protecting the traveling public, which, I think, is what it is all about. So I urge the adoption of this bill in order to provide these necessary reforms to TSA acquisition.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2719, the "Transportation Security Acquisition Reform Act."

For years, as both chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Homeland Security, I have been troubled about the way TSA goes about acquiring technology.

Time and again, we have seen taxpayer dollars wasted on technologies that either do not work or cannot be upgraded to meet the agency's needs.

I have also been troubled by TSA's apparent inability to effectively manage its inventory of security-related technology and meet its goals for contracting with small and disadvantaged businesses.

The bill before us today addresses these concerns through greater transparency and accountability.

In this age of sequestration, TSA cannot purchase technologies on a whim and outside of robust acquisitions controls.

Under H.R. 2719, of which I was proud to be an original cosponsor, TSA will be required to develop and publish a multi-year technology investment plan that will guide the agency's security-related technology purchases.

This plan will give both the agency and Congress a clear understanding of how taxpayer dollars will be allocated in future years.

The bill also requires TSA to develop a plan for managing its inventory of security-related technology.

Earlier this year, the Department of Homeland Security's Office of Inspector General found that TSA had more than 17,000 items in its warehouse inventory, at an estimated cost of $185 million.

The IG concluded that TSA may be able to put approximately $800,000 per year to better use by managing its inventory more effectively.

For fiscal year 2012, TSA's goal for prime contracting with small businesses was set at 23 percent, yet the agency barely reached 16 percent.

To address TSA's chronic problems meeting small business contracting goals, the bill also requires TSA to consult with other federal agencies that get small business contracting done and done right.

Under H.R. 2719, TSA will be required to develop an action plan for improving its performance and report to Congress on its progress in implementing the plan.

For too long, TSA has relied upon the same limited number of companies to develop and produce the security-related technologies it puts into the field.

Doing so comes at the peril of small and minority-owned businesses that are essential to innovation.

This dynamic also results in additional costs to taxpayers due to a lack of competition in the marketplace.

H.R. 2719 received the unanimous support of the Committee on Homeland Security in October.

The bill also received the support of the members of the Committee's Subcommittee on Transportation Security as it moved through the regular order earlier this year.

I look forward to the bill receiving the support of the Full House today.

With that Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Subcommittee Chairman HUDSON and Ranking Member RICHMOND for working in collaboration to develop and see this legislation to the House floor.

I urge support for the bill.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2719, the "Transportation Security Acquisition Reform Act." The bill requires the Transportation Security Administration to implement best practices and improve transparency regarding technology acquisition.

I thank the Chairman MICHAEL MCCAUL and Ranking Member BENNIE THOMPSON for their bipartisan effort to make air travel safer.

I want to take this time to remember Gerardo I. Hernandez, a Transportation Security Administration officer who was killed in the line of duty at the Los Angeles International Airport.

There were two other TSA officers wounded along with a schoolteacher during a gun battle with two airport police officers.

I continue to keep them, their families, colleagues and friends in my thoughts and prayers.

This incident punctuates the importance of securing our airports and flights from threats. A critical component of the security strategy being pursued is related to the acquisition and use of technology.

The Transportation Security Acquisition Reform Act builds upon the Committee on Homeland Security's work on the issue of TSA's acquisition practices.

For years, I, along with Ranking Member THOMPSON and my fellow colleagues on the Committee have urged TSA to be more transparent and accountable when acquiring security-related technologies. H.R. 2719 requires just that.

It also requires TSA to take a hard look at the obstacles it has encountered in the area of small business contracting and to identify ways to improve in that area.

There were three Jackson Lee amendments offered to improve the bill that aid in meeting the goals of the bill.

The first Jackson Lee amendment directs the Comptroller of the United States to provide a report to the House and Senate Committees on Homeland Security on their findings regarding the status of the Transportation Security Administration's (TSA) implementation of GAO recommendations related to acquisition of security technology.

The second Jackson Lee amendment directs the TSA to provide a report to the House and Senate Homeland Security Committees on the feasibility of inventory tracking through automated information and data capture technologies.

This Jackson Lee amendment allows the TSA to investigate private sector use of inventory tracking technology and determine if any of these technologies would be beneficial to the agency.

The third Jackson Lee amendment states that to the extent practicable, the Chief Privacy Officer for the Department of Homeland Security shall include consultation with organizations that advocate for the protection of privacy and civil liberties.

These Jackson Lee amendments were adopted en bloc by the Full Committee and are included in H.R. 2719.

I was pleased to support this legislation during both the Subcommittee and Full Committee markups of the measure and continue to support it today.

Critically, this legislation requires TSA to develop a multiyear plan for its investments in security-related technology.

With the plan, vision, and oversight this bill mandates, I am hopeful TSA's missteps in the area of security-related technology acquisition will soon be a thing of the past.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of H.R. 2719. I yield back my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2719, as amended.

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. RICHMOND. 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.

AVIATION SECURITY STAKEHOLDER PARTICIPATION ACT OF 2013

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1204) to amend title 49, United States Code, to direct the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security (Transportation Security Administration) to establish an Aviation Security Advisory Committee, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1204

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 ''Aviation Security Stakeholder Participation Act of 2013''.

SEC. 2. AVIATION SECURITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter II of chapter 449 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§ 44946. Aviation Security Advisory Committee

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Assistant Secretary shall establish within the Transportation Security Administration an advisory committee to be known as the 'Aviation Security Advisory Committee'.

''(b) DUTIES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Assistant Secretary shall consult the Advisory Committee on aviation security matters, including on the development, refinement, and implementation of policies, programs, rulemaking, and security directives pertaining to aviation security, while adhering to sensitive security guidelines.

''(2) RECOMMENDATIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Advisory Committee shall develop, at the request of the Assistant Secretary, recommendations for improvements to aviation security.

''(B) RECOMMENDATIONS OF SUBCOMMITTEES.—Recommendations agreed upon by the subcommittees established under this section shall be approved by the Advisory Committee for transmission to the Assistant Secretary.

''(3) PERIODIC REPORTS.—The Advisory Committee shall periodically submit to the Assistant Secretary—

''(A) reports on matters identified by the Assistant Secretary; and

''(B) reports on other matters identified by a majority of the members of the Advisory Committee.

''(4) ANNUAL REPORT.—The Advisory Committee shall submit to the Assistant Secretary an annual report providing information on the activities, findings, and recommendations of the Advisory Committee, including its subcommittees, for the preceding year.

''(5) FEEDBACK.—Not later than 90 days after receiving recommendations transmitted by the Advisory Committee under paragraph (4), the Assistant Secretary shall respond in writing to the Advisory Committee with feedback on each of such recommendations, an action plan to implement any of such recommendations with which the Assistant Secretary concurs, and a detailed justification for why any of such recommendations have been rejected.

''(6) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.—Not later than 30 days after providing written feedback to the Advisory Committee in accordance with paragraph (5), the Assistant Secretary shall brief the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate on such feedback.

''(7) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Prior to briefing the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate in accordance with paragraph (6), the Assistant Secretary shall submit to such committees a report containing information relating to the recommendations transmitted by the Advisory Committee in accordance with paragraph (4).

''(c) MEMBERSHIP.—

''(1) APPOINTMENT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Assistant Secretary shall appoint the members of the Advisory Committee.

''(B) COMPOSITION.—The membership of the Advisory Committee shall consist of individuals representing not more than 32 member organizations. Each organization shall be represented by one individual (or the individual's designee).

''(C) REPRESENTATION.—The membership of the Advisory Committee shall include representatives of air carriers, all cargo air transportation, indirect air carriers, labor organizations representing air carrier employees, aircraft manufacturers, airport operators, general aviation, privacy organizations, the travel industry, airport based businesses, including minority owned small businesses, businesses that conduct security operations at airports, aeronautical repair stations, passenger advocacy groups, the aviation technology security industry, including biometrics, victims of terrorist acts against aviation, and law enforcement and security experts.

''(2) REMOVAL.—The Assistant Secretary may review the participation of a member of the Advisory Committee and remove such member for cause at any time.

''(3) PROHIBITION ON COMPENSATION.—The members of the Advisory Committee shall not receive pay, allowances, or benefits from the Government by reason of their service on the Advisory Committee.

''(4) MEETINGS.—The Assistant Secretary shall require the Advisory Committee to meet at least semiannually and may convene additional meetings as necessary.

''(d) AIR CARGO SECURITY SUBCOMMITTEE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Assistant Secretary shall establish within the Advisory Committee an air cargo security subcommittee to provide recommendations on air cargo security issues, including the implementation of the air cargo security programs established by the Transportation Security Administration to screen air cargo on passenger aircraft and all-cargo aircraft in accordance with established cargo screening mandates.

''(2) MEETINGS AND REPORTING.—The subcommittee shall meet at least quarterly and submit to the Advisory Committee for inclusion in the annual report required under subsection (b)(4) information, including recommendations, regarding air cargo security. Such submissions shall include recommendations to improve the Transportation Security Administration's cargo security initiatives established to meet the requirements of section 44901(g).

''(3) MEMBERSHIP.—The subcommittee shall—

''(A) include members of the Advisory Committee with expertise in air cargo operations; and

''(B) be cochaired by a Government and industry official.

''(e) GENERAL AVIATION SECURITY SUBCOMMITTEE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Assistant Secretary shall establish within the Advisory Committee a general aviation subcommittee to provide recommendations on transportation security issues for general aviation facilities, general aviation

aircraft, and helicopter operations at general aviation and commercial service airports.

''(2) MEETINGS AND REPORTING.—The subcommittee shall meet at least quarterly and submit to the Advisory Committee for inclusion in the annual report required under subsection (b)(4) information, including recommendations, regarding aviation security at general aviation airports.

''(3) MEMBERSHIP.—The subcommittee shall—

''(A) include members of the Advisory Committee with expertise in general aviation; and

''(B) be cochaired by a Government and industry official.

''(f) PERIMETER SECURITY, EXIT LANE SECURITY, AND ACCESS CONTROL SUBCOMMITTEE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Assistant Secretary shall establish within the Advisory Committee an airport perimeter security, exit lane security, and access control subcommittee to provide recommendations on airport perimeter security, exit lane security at commercial service airports, and access control issues.

''(2) MEETINGS AND REPORTING.—The subcommittee shall meet at least quarterly and submit to the Advisory Committee for inclusion in the annual report required under subsection (b)(4) information, including recommendations, regarding improving perimeter security, exit lane security at commercial service airports, and access control procedures at commercial service and general aviation airports.

''(3) MEMBERSHIP.—The subcommittee shall—

''(A) include members of the Advisory Committee with expertise in airport perimeter security and access control issues; and

''(B) be co-chaired by a Government and industry official.

''(g) RISK-BASED SUBCOMMITTEE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Assistant Secretary shall establish within the Advisory Committee a risk-based subcommittee to provide recommendations on passenger screening policies and cargo.

''(2) MEETINGS AND REPORTING.—The subcommittee shall meet at least quarterly and submit to the Advisory Committee for inclusion in the annual report required under subsection (b)(4) information, including recommendations, regarding the Transportation Security Administration's risk-based security programs.

''(3) MEMBERSHIP.—The subcommittee shall—

''(A) include members of the Advisory Committee with expertise in passenger advocacy and airport security operations; and

''(B) be cochaired by a Government and industry official.

''(h) SECURITY TECHNOLOGY SUBCOMMITTEE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Assistant Secretary shall establish within the Advisory Committee a security technology subcommittee to provide recommendations on security technology issues, including harmonization of security technology standards and requirements.

''(2) MEETINGS AND REPORTING.—The subcommittee shall meet at least quarterly and submit to the Advisory Committee for inclusion in the annual report required under subsection (b)(4) information, including recommendations, regarding security technology. Such submissions shall include recommendations to improve the Transportation Security Administration's utilization of security technology and harmonization of security technology standards and requirements. All recommendations shall be in furtherance of aviation security and technology neutral.

''(3) MEMBERSHIP.—The subcommittee shall—

''(A) include members of the Advisory Committee with expertise in checkpoint, baggage, and air cargo security technology; and

''(B) be co-chaired by a Government and industry official.

''(i) OTHER SUBCOMMITTEES.—The Assistant Secretary, in consultation with the Advisory Committee, may establish within the Advisory Committee any other subcommittee that the Assistant Secretary and Advisory Committee determine necessary.

''(j) SUBJECT MATTER EXPERTS.—Each subcommittee under this section shall include subject matter experts with relevant expertise who are appointed by the respective subcommittee chairperson.

''(k) NONAPPLICABILITY OF FACA.—The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall not apply to the Advisory Committee and its subcommittees.

''(l) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the following definitions apply:

''(1) ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—The term 'Advisory Committee' means the Aviation Security Advisory Committee established under subsection (a).

''(2) ASSISTANT SECRETARY.—The term 'Assistant Secretary' means the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security (Transportation Security Administration).

''(3) PERIMETER SECURITY.—The term 'perimeter security'—

''(A) means procedures or systems to monitor, secure, and prevent unauthorized access to an airport, including its airfield and terminal; and

''(B) includes the fence area surrounding an airport, access gates, and access controls.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for subchapter II of chapter 449 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''44946. Aviation Security Advisory Committee.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL) and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RICHMOND) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

□ 1300

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bill, the Aviation Security Stakeholder Participation Act of 2013, sponsored by the ranking member of the full Committee on Homeland Security, Mr. THOMPSON.

Mr. Speaker, the American people know that the TSA is charged with protecting our aviation systems against another horrific terrorist attack like we experienced on September 11, 2001. However, the role of industry stakeholders—from pilots and flight attendants to private screening companies and airport operators—is equally as critical, albeit less visible.

TSA is in the spotlight, for better or for worse; but many of TSA's private sector partners are also responsible for implementing effective security programs and keeping travelers safe. This shared responsibility is precisely why TSA cannot make decisions in a vacuum, as it has been known to do.

The bill before us sends a necessary message to TSA leadership, and frankly to all DHS leadership, that the Congress values stakeholder input, private sector collaboration, and thoughtful planning prior to rolling out new policies and procedures that affect millions of travelers.

The Aviation Security Advisory Committee that is authorized in this legislation serves as a valuable sounding board for TSA decisionmakers. By codifying the committee in statute, we will prevent a needless expiration of its charter and disbandment, which has already happened once under TSA.

As chairman of the Committee on Homeland Security, I am proud of the manner in which this bill was thoughtfully considered and amended in committee by Members on both sides of the aisle, and I thank the ranking member for his work on this important issue.

I think the more recent example we have with the knives being allowed on the airplanes without input and participation by the flight attendants and the pilots is a classic example of this Department not talking to the private sector about what can better protect them and passengers on airplanes. Of course, that decision was reversed by the Director of TSA, eventually, after he consulted with the stakeholders in the community. This bill will provide that they consult with those stakeholders before such decisions are made.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise in support of H.R. 1204, the Aviation Security Stakeholder Participation Act.

Mr. Speaker, soliciting input from impacted stakeholders is critical to developing effective policies. H.R. 1204, introduced by the ranking member of the Committee on Homeland Security, Representative THOMPSON of Mississippi, codifies that sentiment by making permanent the Aviation Security Advisory Committee.

Soon after 9/11, industry representatives from all corners of the transportation sector gathered to support TSA's efforts to develop an efficient, effective, and workable security program. For a number of years, the advisory committee was a productive partner to TSA. Unfortunately, TSA allowed the advisory committee to become inactive by letting the charter lapse.

Although the Aviation Security Advisory Committee's charter was renewed in 2011, it was only in response to congressional pressure by Ranking Member THOMPSON in this committee and the repeated complaints about the lack of dialogue between TSA and the industry stakeholders. The advisory committee is a valuable asset to our Nation's aviation security because it helps ensure that the policies that TSA develops are responsive to security challenges and can be effectively integrated into security operations. Simply

put, the advisory committee is too valuable to Homeland Security to risk it becoming inactive again.

I applaud Ranking Member THOMPSON for introducing this legislation to make the Aviation Security Advisory Committee permanent, and I thank the chairman of the Homeland Security Committee for making sure that it moved through the process quickly, and both for seeing the wisdom of making this legislation law.

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

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON), chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation Security.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Aviation Security Stakeholder Participation Act introduced by my friend, the ranking member of the Homeland Security Committee, Mr. BENNIE THOMPSON.

This commonsense bill ensures stakeholders have a seat at the table when working with their partners at the Transportation Security Administration. Too many times in government we see a lack of communication between government officials and industry stakeholders. This gap is troubling as it creates a vacuum of ideas and does not allow for a flow of information between the Federal Government and the private sector that is necessary.

Mr. THOMPSON's bill, which passed out of our committee unanimously, would bridge that gap by allowing the Aviation Security Advisory Committee to take effect and have the constant line of communication to exchange ideas and formulate thoughtful procedures at the agency responsible for security of commercial aviation.

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

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON), the ranking member of the Committee on Homeland Security.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 1204, the Aviation Security Stakeholder Participation Act of 2013.

Last Congress, I introduced a version of the legislation before us today when the charter for the Aviation Security Advisory Committee was allowed to expire, resulting in the advisory committee becoming inactive.

Since shortly after the terrorist attacks of September 11, the advisory committee has provided formal stakeholder input and advice to TSA with respect to aviation security policies. I was pleased that in response to my bill, then-Secretary Napolitano restored this critical forum for stakeholder input.

To prevent a lapse in the advisory committee's operation, it is important that it be codified in law. That is exactly what H.R. 1204 does.

The bill authorizes, in law, the establishment of the Aviation Security Advisory Committee to provide representatives from air carriers, aircraft manufacturers, airport operators, general aviation stakeholders and labor organizations, among others, an opportunity to provide input into policymaking and have their voices heard.

It also requires the establishment of subcommittees to focus on cargo security, general aviation security, perimeter security, exit lane security, security-related technologies, and risk-based security, respectively.

Whatever your thoughts about TSA's policy decisions, I believe we can all agree that such decisions should be made only after meaningful consultation and coordination with stakeholders.

Earlier this year, when TSA announced proposed changes in its Prohibited Items List that would have resulted in knives being allowed on planes for the first time since 9/11, we got a firsthand glimpse of the problems that arise when stakeholders are not consulted.

Only after an overwhelmingly negative reaction to this decision did Administrator Pistole put the issue before the advisory committee for review. Ultimately, after this critical consultation, TSA reversed its decision.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that consultation is important; it is clear that codifying this bill is that necessary. But I would also like to add that there are other organizations who want to be placed in the record in support of it: the Cargo Airline Association, the Association of Flight Attendants, the U.S. Travel Association, the Airports Council International, the Security Manufacturers Coalition, the General Aviation Manufacturers Association, and the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to once again support legislation to codify the Aviation Security Advisory Committee.

AIRCRAFT OWNERS AND PILOTS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, September 30, 2013.

Hon. BENNIE G. THOMPSON,
Ranking Member, House Committee on Homeland Security, Washington, DC.

DEAR RANKING MEMBER THOMPSON: I write on behalf of the nearly 400,000 members of the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association (AOPA) in support of your legislation H.R. 1204, the ''Aviation Security Stakeholder Participation Act of 2013.''

Your legislation requires TSA to formally establish an Aviation Security Advisory Committee (ASAC) to advise on aviation security matters. The ASAC will ensure that general aviation (GA) has a seat at the table for discussion of programs and policy changes related to the improvement of aviation security. Also, the creation of a dedicated GA Security Subcommittee will provide that our community is consulted before major policy changes occur that have a direct impact on GA pilots, aircraft, and airports.

We look forward to working with the Committee in the future to continue to improve general aviation security.

Sincerely,

LORRAINE HOWERTON,
AOPA, Vice President of Legislative Affairs.

GENERAL AVIATION MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, October 28, 2013.

Chairman MICHAEL MCCAUL,
Committee on Homeland Security, Washington, DC.

Ranking Member BENNIE THOMPSON,
Committee on Homeland Security, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCCAUL AND RANKING MEMBER THOMPSON: On behalf of the General Aviation Manufacturers Association, we write to urge committee passage of H.R. 1204, the Aviation Security Stakeholder Participation Act of 2013, introduced by Congressman BENNIE THOMPSON, and H.R. 2719, the Transportation Security Acquisition and Reform Act, introduced by Transportation Security Chairman RICHARD HUDSON. These items are slated to be marked up by the House Homeland Security Committee on October 29, 2013.

GAMA supports passage of H.R. 1204, the Aviation Security Stakeholder Participation Act of 2013, given the important step this measure takes to ensure that stakeholders are included in the policymaking process at TSA. H.R. 1204 establishes the Aviation Security Advisory Committee, in statute, to ensure that all aviation stakeholders, including general aviation, are able to provide input to the TSA in advance of policies being formally proposed. We are also encouraged that H.R. 1204 provides for a general aviation advisory subcommittee to specifically consider issues related to general aviation.

We also support passage of H.R. 2719, the Transportation Security Acquisition and Reform Act, given the focus it places on reform for the agency. While our member companies' involvement in TSA acquisition is limited, the objectives of this legislation are laudable and we hope such efforts will be applied to other areas of TSA governance.

In general, we are pleased that both bills place a priority on improving key processes at the agency. Our member companies remain confounded by a bureaucracy that penalizes manufacturers competing in a global environment for government inaction. Almost ten years have elapsed since TSA was directed to promulgate a final rulemaking to secure repair stations overseas. Today, we still await approval of this rule. While efforts have been made to move this rule forward, the overall government process for TSA security rulemaking lacks accountability and appears to be profoundly dysfunctional.

We urge the committee to favorably consider these bills and to continue their critical and constructive oversight of the Department of Homeland Security and its agencies.

Sincerely,

PETER J. BUNCE,
President and CEO.

Washington, DC, September 6, 2013.

Hon. BENNIE THOMPSON,
Ranking Member, Committee on Homeland Security, Washington, DC.

DEAR RANKING MEMBER THOMPSON: On behalf of the members of the Cargo Airline Association, I am writing to support H.R. 1204, the Aviation Stakeholder Participation Act of 2013. This Bill would require the reestablishment and maintenance of an Aviation Security Advisory Committee (ASAC) to facilitate communications between the Transportation Security Administration (TSA) and the aviation industry.

Historically, the ASAC formed the basis of major initiatives, with industry members working closely with Government Agencies to address a variety of security-related issues. These issues have been traditionally discussed in various Working Groups or Sub-Committees established under the ASAC umbrella. A prime example of the utility of this structure was the establishment of three air cargo Working Groups formed to develop proposed new regulations to address air cargo security threats after the September 11, 2001, attacks. The recommendations of these Working Groups eventually formed the basis of an entirely new TSA air cargo regulatory scheme. H.R. 1204 contains a mandate, not only for ASAC itself, but also for various Sub-Committees that would address the key issues of the day. We support your efforts to ensure ASAC remains a forum for the aviation industry and TSA to work together.

Sincerely,

STEPHEN A. ALTERMAN,
President.

SECURITY MANUFACTURERS COALITION,
Alexandria, VA, October 25, 2013.

Hon. BENNIE THOMPSON,
Ranking Member, House Committee on Homeland Security, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: On behalf of the Security Manufacturers Coalition (SMC), I want to express SMC's support for HR 1204, the ''Aviation Security Stakeholder Participation Act of 2013.'' The Act, as we understand it, would codify the Transportation Security Administration's (TSA) Aviation Security Advisory Committee (ASAC).

As you know the SMC membership is made up of nine of the leading U.S. manufacturers of security screening technology. This scanning equipment is used in every major airport in the U.S. and abroad, operating continuously 365 days a year, as part of the overall effort to ensure the security of the traveling public. The SMC formed with the primary purpose of creating a conduit for TSA and the industry to work closely on specific issues facing the development and deployment of screening technology.

The ASAC has been a valuable tool to foster an open dialogue between TSA and aviation interest groups and businesses. We believe the bill reinforces the proposition that a robust, risked-based security system is the product of input from all interested stakeholders.

Thank you for your willingness to take the lead on this important issue. The members of the Coalition sincerely appreciate your interest in preserving through legislation a committee that will make recommendations that will create a safer aviation system for passengers.

Sincerely,

T.J. SCHULZ,
Director, Security Manufacturers Coalition.

ASSOCIATION OF FLIGHT ATTENDANTS—CWA, AFL–CIO,
Washington, DC, March 14, 2013.

Hon. BENNIE THOMPSON,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON, On behalf of the Association of Flight Attendants—CWA, I am writing to thank you for introducing legislation to make the Aviation Security Advisory Committee (ASAC) permanent.

Having been a member of ASAC throughout its operative years since 1989, I can assure you that it should be required to function on an ongoing basis to ensure that the varied and valuable perspectives of the stakeholders affected by aviation security policy and programs are given the opportunity to provide advice and recommendations to the TSA in order to enhance its processes of evaluating and countering threats to aviation security.

Since 9/11, much has been asked of crewmembers to improve aviation security and flight attendants serve as the last line of defense on board the aircraft. Your bill to establish a permanent ASAC will ensure that the forum for their input, as well as that of other stakeholder members of the ASAC, will contribute to a more thorough process for aviation security without interruption.

Sincerely,

CHRISTOPHER J. WITKOWSKI,
Director, Air Safety, Health and Security.

U.S. TRAVEL ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, July 24, 2013.

Rep. RICHARD HUDSON,
Chairman, Transportation Security Subcommittee, House Committee on Homeland Security, Washington, DC.

Rep. CEDRIC RICHMOND,
Ranking Member, Transportation Security Subcommittee, House Committee on Homeland Security, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HUDSON AND RANKING MEMBER RICHMOND: On behalf of the U.S. Travel Association, it is my pleasure to lend our support for two bills the subcommittee will be marking up later this week—namely, H.R. 1204, the Aviation Security Stakeholder Participation Act, and H.R. 2719, the Transportation Security Acquisition Reform Act. Both of these bills are consistent with the recommendations for transportation security and travel facilitation that U.S. Travel made when issuing ''A Better Way: Building a World-Class System for Aviation Security.'' Specifically, we applaud the provisions of H.R. 1204, which recognize the role of the travel industry as a stakeholder in the Aviation Security Advisory Committee. Additionally, we strongly support the sections of H.R. 2719, which require the Transportation Security Administration (TSA) to develop a multiyear technology investment plan.

The U.S. Travel Association is the national, non-profit organization representing all components of the travel industry that generates $2.0 trillion in economic output and supports 14.6 million jobs. U.S. Travel's mission is to increase travel to and within the United States.

We look forward to working with you to see the House pass both of these important pieces of legislation.

Sincerely,

ROGER J. DOW,
President & CEO.

AIRPORTS COUNCIL INTERNATIONAL,
JULY 24, 2013.

Hon. BENNIE G. THOMPSON,
Ranking Member, House Committee on Homeland Security, Washington, DC.

DEAR RANKING MEMBER THOMPSON: On behalf of the Airports Council International—North America (ACI-NA), which represents local, regional, and state governing bodies that own and operate commercial airports throughout the United States and Canada, I am pleased to offer our endorsement of H.R. 1204, the Aviation Security Stakeholder Participation Act of 2013.

Airport operators have long advocated for the Transportation Security Administration (TSA) to re-establish the Aviation Security Advisory Committee (ASAC). The ASAC allowed aviation stakeholders, including airport operators to advise TSA on aviation security policies, programs, rulemakings and security directives pertaining to aviation security. H.R. 1204 would allow the ASAC once again to provide valuable input into TSA's proposed rules, security directives and aviation security programs which help protect airports, airlines and their passengers.

Again, thank you for your continued support of airport operators and on recognizing the value of having stakeholder input into aviation security programs and TSA regulations. We look forward to working with you on the passage of H.R. 1204.

Sincerely,

DEBORAH MCELROY,
Interim President, Airports Council International—North America.

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I have no further Members to speak on this bill and will close once the gentleman from Louisiana closes.

I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, I thank again the chairman of the full committee, Mr. MCCAUL; the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. HUDSON; and the ranking member of the full committee, Mr. THOMPSON, for moving this legislation, and thank Mr. THOMPSON for introducing it.

I once again urge my colleagues to support this legislation to codify the Aviation Security Advisory Committee so stakeholders have a permanent seat at the table when TSA develops policies that have a direct impact on our security and their operations.

Simply what it does is guarantees that policies won't be implemented solely by people relying on theory, but ensures that the stakeholders are at the table to talk about the reality of the policies that they implement.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I again urge my colleagues to support the legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this bipartisan bill.

I want to thank Chairman HUDSON, ranking member of the full committee, Mr. THOMPSON, and Ranking Member RICHMOND.

I am proud to report to this House that this committee has passed several bills, all of which have passed unanimously out of our committee. I am not sure if there is any committee in Congress that can say that. I am very proud of that effort. I hope that we can continue in that spirit with more complex legislation that we face in the future. I know that with the ranking member and his spirit of cooperation we will be able to get it done.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1204, ''Aviation Security Stakeholder Participation Act of 2013.'' Ranking Member THOMPSON's steady and long term work on improving airport security is recognized and respected by members on both sides of the aisle.

The Aviation Security Stakeholder Participation Act, introduced by Ranking Member THOMPSON, establishes in law the critical Aviation Security Advisory Committee.

The bill states that the Security Advisory Committee shall be consulted by and advise the Assistant Security on aviation security matters, including the development and implementation of policies, programs, rulemaking,

and security directives pertaining to aviation security.

Since just after 9/11, the Aviation Security Advisory Committee has played the critical role of being industry's voice before TSA, helping to develop policies that make sense operationally, and more importantly, work for the American people.

When Congress established TSA in the wake of the tragic terrorist attack on 9/11, we granted TSA broad latitude to implement policies stakeholders are required to comply with and, in some cases, implement.

The Aviation Security Advisory Committee ensures that the security directives TSA develops are not created in a vacuum.

Establishing the Aviation Security Advisory Committee in law will ensure that the Committee never again becomes inactive, as was the case during the previous Administration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1204, as amended.

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. MCCAUL. 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.

EXTENSION OF UNDETECTABLE FIREARMS ACT OF 1988 FOR 10 YEARS

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3626) to extend the Undetectable Firearms Act of 1988 for 10 years.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3626

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

SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF UNDETECTABLE FIREARMS ACT OF 1988 FOR 10 YEARS.

Section 2(f)(2) of the Undetectable Firearms Act of 1988 (18 U.S.C. 922 note) is amended by striking ''25'' and inserting ''35''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

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

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of H.R. 3626, a bill to extend the Undetectable Firearms Act of 1988 for 10 years. In 1988, Congress passed the original law that makes it illegal to manufacture, import, sell, ship, deliver, possess, transfer, or receive any firearm that is not detectable by walk-through metal detection, or any firearm with major components that do not generate an accurate image before standard airport imaging technology.

The original act passed in 1988, Mr. Speaker, and had a 10-year sunset clause which expired November 10, 1998. Congress renewed the law for 5 years in 1998 and for 10 years in 2003. The law will sunset on December 9, 2013, if it is not reauthorized again.

The original law received overwhelming bipartisan support, and so did each subsequent renewal.

I urge my colleagues to support this extension, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3626, which will extend by 10 years the authorization of the Undetectable Firearms Act, a statute which is in effect through December 9 of this year.

The Undetectable Firearms Act prohibits the import, manufacture, sale, transport, or possession of firearms that are undetectable by metal detectors or x ray machines. Signed into law by President Reagan in 1988, this statute remains critical to public safety.

□ 1315

The law helps protect us from firearms that are undetectable by some of the most conventional means of firearms detection. The law prevents the commercial production and proliferation of such weapons that could be used either by individuals or organized terrorist groups seeking to commit crimes in secure areas, such as courthouses or airplanes. Unfortunately, the need for such protection has grown in recent years.

This statute was originally authorized for 10 years, and subsequently reauthorized for periods of 5 and then another 10 years. The authorization of this prohibition has been incremental because Congress recognized that technology would evolve, and that we may need to update the statute to maintain its effectiveness. In fact, this is what has transpired.

The current law has a critical loophole that may enable and encourage the production of firearms that may escape detection. Under the statute, someone may produce a plastic firearm which is detectable only because it has as metal component—which is not essential for the operation of the firearm—but is easily removable by a firearm user seeking to avoid detection.

In fact, some designs made available on the Internet to assist the manufacture of such guns using 3–D printers include just such a feature. We need to strengthen the law to address this obvious problem, and we should adopt the Undetectable Firearms Act modernization proposal sponsored by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL).

He is proposing that the statute be updated to require that the metal which makes a firearm detectable be included in the essential components of the firearm so that, if removed, the gun would not operate. This is a simple and effective means of addressing the problem.

While I support the reauthorization of the Undetectable Firearms Act for 10 years, a 10-year extension should not be interpreted as an agreement that the statute should remain unchanged for that entire term. We need to work quickly to update the law, but it does not appear that we will be able to do that in the time left before the statute's expiration. However, we cannot allow the law to expire and the existing—even if imperfect—protections to lapse.

Finally, with the continued toll of gun violence on our communities, Congress must act immediately on other measures to strengthen our gun laws. We are nearing the first anniversary of the killing of 20 students and six teachers at Sandy Hook Elementary School in Newtown, Connecticut. While such tragic mass shootings bring increased attention to the problem of gun violence, we must recognize that the scope of the problem is much greater; an average of over 30 people a day are murdered with firearms in America.

However, during this Congress, the House has taken no steps to address the problem. The Judiciary Committee has held no hearings, and has not even considered any of the other measures which have been proposed to make us safer from gun violence. For example, we must make a priority of extending the Brady Act to keep firearms out of the hands of criminals, and we should take action on H.R. 1565, the Public Safety and Second Amendment Rights Protection Act, which would expand the Brady background check requirement to firearms sold at gun shows and through commercial advertisements.

We should also consider bills such as H.R. 1318, the Youth PROMISE Act, designed to promote proven crime prevention strategies. With respect to the bill before us today, I commend the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) for introducing the measure to extend the term of the current statute. The Undetectable Firearms Act continues to help protect public safety, and we should reauthorize it while also working to update and improve it without delay. I, therefore, urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3626.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL).

Mr. ISRAEL. I thank the gentleman from Virginia, who serves ably as ranking member of the Subcommittee on Crime. I also want to thank my friend, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE), who truly is a gentleman and who will be missed, for his bipartisan work on this bill. We have worked well together, and I am deeply grateful to the gentleman for that partnership.

Mr. Speaker, in 1988 when we passed the Undetectable Firearms Act, the notion of a 3–D printed plastic firearm

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

would put it to productive use for reservation housing, use fully compatible with adjacent land usage. Indeed, by doing so, the tribe will be removing a major risk for both the reservation and the nearby community. Access would be through the existing reservation to avoid any impact on the existing neighborhood, and the tribe is committed to working with the nearby homeowners association to assure that it doesn't affect the rural nature of the community.

The property is on unincorporated county land, and the County Board of Supervisors, which is the land use planning agency with jurisdiction over this land, fully supports the transfer.

The administration supports my bill. I urge adoption of the legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians is a federally recognized Indian tribe with a reservation located 40 miles east of Sacramento. The band is currently in need of housing to accommodate its growing membership and identified approximately 41 acres of land currently managed by the Bureau of Land Management for placement into trust. The band anticipates designing a residential community with community buildings and recreational facilities within that community and will also consider nongaming economic development, as well.

H.R. 2388 would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to take the land into trust and would explicitly prohibit class 2 and class 3 gaming activities on these lands once they are placed into trust.

The County of El Dorado supports the band's efforts to secure the BLM property in trust and has entered into a memorandum of understanding with the band.

We support H.R. 2388 and these efforts, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman for yielding, and let me rise to indicate my recognition of the importance of this legislation and to support it.

I want to make a point simply on this bill dealing with the Secretary of the Interior, that it is to study the issue of large parks, urban parks in our respective urban areas as being in the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior, the Interior Department, because we are losing that park land because of the inability to collaborate with the Federal Government on the resources that are so necessary.

I recognize that we are in sequestration, but I believe that it is important that we collaborate. I wanted to make sure that I put that on the record.

Let me also put on the record, as a member of the Homeland Security Committee, my support for the TSA Loose Change Act, H.R. 1095; my support for H.R. 2719, the Transportation Acquisition Security Reform Act; and my special support for H.R. 1204, the Aviation Security Stakeholder Participation Act of 2013 because, in fact, that stakeholder committee is going to help provide more security for our TSA officers and have stakeholders dealing with issues like phones on airplanes and knives on airplanes. Certainly, guns are only held by the pilots in the pilot program. But it is going to be able to allow stakeholders to be able to have a real say in aviation security, and I think that is crucially important.

Let me also acknowledge my support for the Undetectable Firearms Act of 1988 and its extension. I would hope that that bipartisan support, along with Mr. COBLE, whom we have so much great respect for, will lead us to universal background checks and the passage of Federal legislation that would require all of us to store our guns. It is not difficult to provide or buy a simple safe to store your guns and to protect those from undue harm.

I thank my colleague for yielding to me.

My understanding is that we are here on the floor of the House to do work. Some people find it humorous when Members rise to the floor and add additional commentary dealing with their constituency and their work. And since I believe in working and I believe in working on behalf of my constituents, I am very grateful to the gentleman from Arizona recognizing the seriousness of which I make these points and allowing me to have this time on this legislation. I think all of us can recognize that when the floor is open, it is open for Members to come and make serious commentary about the work that they would hope this Congress would be able to do.

I close by thanking the gentleman. He has many capacities, such as the co-chair of the Progressive Caucus. I want to thank him for his leadership on immigration reform. And for those of us who were down with the Fast for Families, I again say that we pray for them. We pray that the hearts of this Congress will be touched, that we will be able to finish and complete comprehensive immigration reform, something my constituency is also now praying for on the steps of the city hall.

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues on the other side of the aisle for their support of this legislation, 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. 2388, as amended.

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

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: ''A bill 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.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION CONDUIT HYDROPOWER DEVELOPMENT EQUITY AND JOBS ACT

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1963) to amend the Water Conservation and Utilization Act to authorize the development of non-Federal hydropower and issuance of leases of power privileges at projects constructed pursuant to the authority of the Water Conservation and Utilization Act, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1963

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 ''Bureau of Reclamation Conduit Hydropower Development Equity and Jobs Act''.

SEC. 2. AMENDMENT.

Section 9 of the Act entitled ''An Act authorizing construction of water conservation and utilization projects in the Great Plains and arid semiarid areas of the United States'', approved August 11, 1939 (16 U.S.C. 590z–7; commonly known as the ''Water Conservation and Utilization Act''), is amended—

(1) by striking ''In connection with'' and inserting ''(a) In connection with''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(b) Notwithstanding subsection (a), the Secretary is authorized to enter into leases of power privileges for electric power generation in connection with any project constructed under this Act, and shall have authority in addition to and alternative to any authority in existing laws relating to particular projects, including small conduit hydropower development.

''(c) When entering into leases of power privileges under subsection (b), the Secretary shall use the processes applicable to such leases under section 9(c) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (43 U.S.C. 485h(c)).

''(d) Lease of power privilege contracts shall be at such rates as, in the Secretary's judgment, will produce revenues at least sufficient to cover the appropriate share of the annual operation and maintenance cost of the project and such fixed charges, including interest, as the Secretary deems proper. Lease of power privilege contracts shall be for periods not to exceed 40 years.

''(e) No findings under section 3 shall be required for a lease under subsection (b).

''(f) All right, title, and interest to installed power facilities constructed by non-Federal entities pursuant to a lease of power privilege, and direct revenues derived therefrom, shall remain with the lessee unless otherwise required under subsection (g).

''(g) Notwithstanding section 8, lease revenues and fixed charges, if any, shall be covered into the Reclamation Fund to be credited to the project from which those revenues or charges were derived.

''(h) When carrying out this section, the Secretary shall first offer the lease of power privilege to an irrigation district or water users association operating the applicable transferred conduit, or to the irrigation district or water users association receiving water from the applicable reserved conduit. The Secretary shall determine a reasonable timeframe for the irrigation district or water users association to accept or reject a lease of power privilege offer. If the irrigation district or water users association elects not to accept a lease of power privilege offer under subsection (b), the Secretary shall offer the lease of power privilege to other parties using the processes applicable to such leases under section 9(c) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (43 U.S.C. 485h(c)).

''(i) The Bureau of Reclamation shall apply its categorical exclusion process under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) to small conduit hydropower development under this section, excluding siting of associated transmission facilities on Federal lands.

''(j) Nothing in this section shall obligate the Western Area Power Administration or the Bonneville Power Administration to purchase or market any of the power produced by the facilities covered under this section and none of the costs associated with production or delivery of such power shall be assigned to project purposes for inclusion in project rates.

''(k) Nothing in this section shall alter or impede the delivery and management of water by Bureau of Reclamation facilities, as water used for conduit hydropower generation shall be deemed incidental to use of water for the original project purposes. Lease of power privilege shall be made only when, in the judgment of the Secretary, the exercise of the lease will not be incompatible with the purposes of the project or division involved and shall not create any unmitigated financial or physical impacts to the project or division involved. The Secretary shall notify and consult with the irrigation district or legally organized water users association operating the transferred conduit in advance of offering the lease of power privilege and shall prescribe such terms and conditions necessary to adequately protect the planning, design, construction, operation, maintenance, and other interests of the United States and the project or division involved.

''(l) Nothing in this section shall alter or affect any agreements in effect on the date of the enactment of the Bureau of Reclamation Conduit Hydropower Development Equity and Jobs Act for the development of conduit hydropower projects or disposition of revenues.

''(m) In this section:

''(1) The term 'conduit' means any Bureau of Reclamation tunnel, canal, pipeline, aqueduct, flume, ditch, or similar manmade water conveyance that is operated for the distribution of water for agricultural, municipal, or industrial consumption and not primarily for the generation of electricity.

''(2) The term 'irrigation district' means any irrigation, water conservation or conservancy, multi-county water conservation or conservancy district, or any separate public entity composed of two or more such districts and jointly exercising powers of its member districts.

''(3) The term 'reserved conduit' means any conduit that is included in project works the care, operation, and maintenance of which has been reserved by the Secretary, through the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation.

''(4) The term 'transferred conduit' means any conduit that is included in project works the care, operation, and maintenance of which has been transferred to a legally organized water users association or irrigation district.

''(5) The term 'small conduit hydropower' means a facility capable of producing 5 megawatts or less of electric capacity.''.

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 Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials 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.

H.R. 1963 by Congressman DAINES of Montana seeks to jump-start conduit hydropower development at 11 Bureau of Reclamation projects. The bill specifically removes statutory impediments by authorizing non-Federal hydropower development at these conduits and provides administrative and regulatory reforms necessary to foster such development.

Earlier this year, the House passed H.R. 678 by Congressman TIPTON and Congressman COSTA by a 416–7 vote to promote conduit hydropower development at reclamation facilities. H.R. 678 applied to hundreds of reclamation facilities that are covered under the authorities of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939. This measure applies to the remaining reclamation facilities, all of which are governed under the different and more complex authorities of the Water Conservation and Utilization Act of 1939.

The Tipton bill provided for a streamlined regulatory process in part by providing a categorical exemption for redundant environmental reviews. The WCUA actually forbids the installation of small hydroelectric generators in the projects regulated under this act, and thus the need for this separate legislation.

The arguments in favor of getting the Federal Government out of the way so that private contractors can lease existing Federal pipelines and canals for the purpose of installing small hydroelectric generators are well known to the House, as evidenced by the overwhelming bipartisan vote accorded the Tipton bill earlier this year. That bill was signed into law a few months ago, and I am told it has already produced a flood of new applications for clean and cheap small hydroelectric generators.

Not only has a new source of absolutely clean and inexpensive hydroelectricity been made available, the Federal Treasury benefits from the revenues that these leases produce in addition to the added economic activity that they enable. Mr. DAINES' measure completes that work by applying the same policy to the remaining reclamation facilities that fell under the WCUA.

I commend the gentleman from Montana for his leadership on this issue, and I reserve the balance of my time

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

We concur with Mr. MCCLINTOCK's description of the legislation, and we have no objections to H.R. 1963.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I am now pleased to yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. DAINES), the author of this measure,

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my bill, H.R. 1963, the Bureau of Reclamation Conduit Hydropower Development Equity and Jobs Act.

In Congress, one of our top priorities is to secure American energy independence, and as we all see in this institution, we don't always agree on how best to meet that goal. However, hydropower is a clean, renewable source of energy, and finding innovative ways to develop this resource is an area where most of us can agree. I am grateful that Chairman MCCLINTOCK and Ranking Member GRIJALVA support this bill, and I was pleased to see the bipartisan spirit behind this legislation.

Bureau of Reclamation projects, such as canals, pipelines, and dams, play an important role in supplying water for our communities. Agriculture is the primary economic driver in my home State of Montana, and having a sound and strong irrigation system is critically important to us back home.

H.R. 1963 will amend the Water Conservation and Utilization Act to allow for conduit hydropower development on 11 Bureau of Reclamation projects governed under this act. That includes some in my home State of Montana, including the Buffalo Rapids near Miles City, the intake project by Glendive, the Milk River Project, as well as the Missoula Valley Project. With this legislation, our irrigation systems can also power our homes and our businesses. Additionally, this bill will help provide revenues to improve critical infrastructure for farmers and ranchers who rely on these systems.

In Montana, balancing energy development with responsible stewardship of our resources is the way we do business in Montana. Our livelihoods, our access to recreation, and the future of our State for our kids rely on a robust, balanced energy plan that also protects our unique landscapes, and that is what keeps us Montanans loving the place we call home. A diverse energy portfolio helps keep electric prices low for Montana families and creates jobs. Hydropower is an important part of that puzzle, and my bill will help us get there.

H.R. 1963 has received strong bipartisan support in committee, and I urge the same here today.

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I again commend the gentleman from Montana for his work on this issue. It is one of the most important achievements in power development that we have had recently, the jump-starting of these small hydropower generators.

I thank the gentleman from the other side of the aisle for his support of the measure and urge its adoption.

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. 1963, 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.

SPECIAL RULES FOR INYO NATIONAL FOREST LAND EXCHANGE

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1241) to facilitate a land exchange involving certain National Forest System lands in the Inyo National Forest, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1241

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

SECTION 1. SPECIAL RULES FOR INYO NATIONAL FOREST LAND EXCHANGE.

(a) AUTHORITY TO ACCEPT LANDS OUTSIDE BOUNDARIES OF INYO NATIONAL FOREST.—In any land exchange involving the conveyance of certain National Forest System land located within the boundaries of Inyo National Forest in California, as shown on the map titled ''Federal Parcel'' and dated June 2011, the Secretary of Agriculture may accept for acquisition in the exchange certain non-Federal lands in California lying outside the boundaries of Inyo National Forest, as shown on the maps titled ''DWP Parcel – Interagency Visitor Center Parcel'' and ''DWP Parcel – Town of Bishop Parcel'' and dated June 2011, if the Secretary determines that acquisition of the non-Federal lands is desirable for National Forest System purposes.

(b) CASH EQUALIZATION PAYMENT; USE.—In an exchange described in subsection (a), the Secretary of Agriculture may accept a cash equalization payment in excess of 25 percent. Any such cash equalization payment shall be deposited into the account in the Treasury of the United States established by Public Law 90–171 (commonly known as the Sisk Act; 16 U.S.C. 484a) and shall be made available to the Secretary for the acquisition of land for addition to the National Forest System.

(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to grant the Secretary of Agriculture new land exchange authority. This section modifies the use of land exchange authorities already available to the Secretary as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

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 to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials 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.

H.R. 1241 authorizes the Forest Service to acquire two parcels of land outside the boundary of the Inyo National Forest in exchange for a parcel of national forest land conveyed to the Mammoth Mountain Ski Area.

□ 1345

The ski area has been operating its main base under a special-use permit. However, acquiring ownership of that parcel under this legislation would allow the ski area to conduct desperately needed renovations to its facilities. At the same time, the Forest Service would be able to acquire land that it currently leases to operate the facilities outside the boundary of the Inyo National Forest.

I urge adoption of this sensible measure authored by Congressman PAUL COOK and reserve the balance of my time.

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

H.R. 1241 would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to accept lands outside the boundaries of the Inyo National Forest in the Eastern Sierra in exchange for non-Federal lands desirable for the National Forest System purposes. If completed, the land exchange could result in significant revenue for the Federal Government.

The bill has bipartisan support, including the Department of Agriculture. I urge its passage in the House, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I am now pleased to yield such time as he may consume to my colleague from California, Congressman PAUL COOK, the author of this bill.

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1241, obviously, would facilitate a land exchange in Mono County, California. It would allow the Mammoth Mountain Ski Area to obtain the 21 acres surrounding the Mammoth Mountain Inn that it currently leases from the National Forest Service. In return, Mammoth Mountain would transfer 1,500 acres of land along with a cash equalization payment to the National Forest Service. This would allow Mammoth Mountain to replace and rebuild the Mammoth Mountain Inn. After more than 50 years of use, the Inn suffers from poor, deteriorated construction, and its replacement would allow Mammoth Mountain to continue operating California's premier ski area.

This bill is a jobs bill. Mammoth Mountain's employment fluctuates between a high of 2,500 employees during the winter to down to 650 in the summer. Mono County has a population of only 14,000 people. Thus, this area is by far and above the largest employer in the country. This would help facilitate and would create new construction jobs, but it would also allow the ski area to expand, creating more permanent jobs.

It's also an environmental bill. The 1,500 acres that Mammoth Mountain would be transferring to the Forest Service has long been desired for protection by local environmentalists and the Forest Service. It will end what the Inyo National Forest supervisor described as a ''very, very imminent threat to the scenic basin.''

The legislation is supported by the Mono County Board of Supervisors, the town council, the various chambers of commerce and the Eastern Sierra Land Trust.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this vital local bill.

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, again, I thank the gentleman for his support of the measure and urge its adoption. 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. 1241.

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.

LOWER EAST SIDE TENEMENT NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE AMENDMENTS ACT

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1846) to amend the Act establishing the Lower East Side Tenement National Historic Site, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1846

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 ''Lower East Side Tenement National Historic Site Amendments Act''.

SEC. 2. AMENDMENTS.

Public Law 105–378 is amended—

(1) in section 101(a)—

(A) in paragraph (4), by striking ''the Lower East Side Tenement at 97 Orchard Street in New

York City is an outstanding survivor'' and inserting ''the Lower East Side Tenements at 97 and 103 Orchard Street in New York City are outstanding survivors''; and

(B) in paragraph (5), by striking ''the Lower East Side Tenement is'' and inserting ''the Lower East Side Tenements are'';

(2) in section 102—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''Lower East Side Tenement found at 97 Orchard Street'' and inserting ''Lower East Side Tenements found at 97 and 103 Orchard Street''; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking ''which owns and operates the tenement building at 97 Orchard Street'' and inserting ''which owns and operates the tenement buildings at 97 and 103 Orchard Street'';

(3) in section 103(a), by striking ''the Lower East Side Tenement at 97 Orchard Street, in the City of New York, State of New York, is designated'' and inserting ''the Lower East Side Tenements at 97 and 103 Orchard Street, in the City of New York, State of New York, are designated''; and

(4) in section 104(d), by striking ''the property at 97 Orchard Street'' and inserting ''the properties at 97 and 103 Orchard Street''.

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 to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials 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. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1846 expands the boundaries of the Lower East Side Tenement Historic Site to include an additional building purchased in 2007. This Manhattan museum is a National Park Service affiliated site, and therefore, it carries no cost to the taxpayers because it's owned and operated by a private foundation.

I urge its adoption and reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, the Tenement Museum was founded in 1988 and has preserved the history of immigration in Manhattan's Lower East Side for the last 25 years. Through the personal experiences of the generations of migrants that have called 91 Orchard Street home, over 200,000 annual visitors are able to hear the stories of real families that lived in the building between 1863 and 1935.

H.R. 1846 would expand the boundaries of the current National Park Service affiliated site at 91 Orchard Street to include a recently purchased building two doors away and will allow the Tenement Museum to expand the stories they tell. This new building holds an array of untold stories from a family of Holocaust survivors who were allowed in the United States under the first refugee act, and Puerto Rican and Chinese families that were part of the foundation in making New York home to the largest Puerto Rican community on the American mainland and the largest Chinatown in the Western Hemisphere.

The ranking member of the Small Business Committee, Representative VELÁZQUEZ, is to be commended for her legislation on behalf of this important cultural and historic resource. We support H.R. 1846 and urge its passage by the House today. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlelady from New York, Representative VELÁZQUEZ, the ranking member of the Small Business Committee, the sponsor of this legislation.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman and the ranking member, and especially the ranking member for yielding.

I rise in support of this critical legislation and urge my colleagues to support its passage. Throughout our Nation, in every city and town, immigrants have been critical to strengthening our communities. For centuries, people from every corner of the globe have traveled to the United States to start a new life, work hard, build a future for their children, and pursue their share of the American Dream.

In New York especially, immigrants have long been an important part of the cultural fabric. Whether it is Chinatown, Little Italy, or our burgeoning Latino population, immigrants have made our city a stronger, more vibrant place offering invaluable economic and cultural contributions while shaping the city's identity.

There are numerous ways we pay tribute to immigrants' role in American society. The Statue of Liberty on Ellis Island honors the thousands who arrived in New York's ports seeking a greater opportunity and freedom. This past week, we celebrated Thanksgiving—a holiday that originated with some of our earliest immigrants. In short, symbols of immigration's importance are woven throughout our society in physical landmarks, holidays—even our family histories.

In my district, the Lower East Side Tenement Museum reminds New York residents and visitors alike of the challenges faced by some of our city's earliest immigrants. For 25 years, this valuable local institution has offered interactive exhibits recounting the story of the 7,000 working class families who inhabited these buildings.

Just as the Lower East Side tenement communities evolved with each successive wave of newly arrived immigrants, the museum tells a wide range of stories reflecting the diversity of this storied neighborhood.

Whether it was Asian, Irish, or German immigrants or Eastern European Jews, the Lower East Side's tenements housed generation after generation of new arrivals to our cities and our country.

This body has previously recognized the museum as significant to our Nation's history. In 1998, I worked with my colleagues to pass legislation designating 97 Orchard Street as an affiliated site of the National Park System.

Over the years, interest in the museum has grown steadily. Today, the museum serves 200,000 visitors every year, including 40,000 schoolchildren. This growth in popularity has resulted in demand for additional space. The bill I authored and that we are debating today would help address this need. By making the museum's valuable educational tools available to a wider audience, the bill further honors immigrants' role in our Nation's past, present, and future. The additional space will also allow the museum to explore more immigrant stories, including the history of Holocaust survivors rebuilding their lives in America.

Mr. Speaker, the immigrant story is the American story. The Tenement Museum honors the men, women, and children who came here to carve out a better life and, in the process, improved our country by an infusion of new cultures and ideas.

H.R. 1846 will ensure the Lower East Side Tenement Museum continues telling this uniquely American story to future generations. I urge my colleagues to support its passage. I thank both gentlemen.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlelady from New York, Representative MALONEY, the ranking member of the Joint Economic Committee.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership on this legislation and so many other important areas before our country.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bill, H.R. 1846, the Lower East Side Tenement National Historic Site Amendments Act, which was authored and introduced by my good friend and colleague, NYDIA VELÁZQUEZ from New York.

This legislation will expand the boundaries of the Lower East Side Tenement National Historic Site to include 103 Orchard Street, which is located just two doors down from the original museum location. Because of this, it will be able to expand its educational programs and allow more people to learn about our Nation's immigrant history.

I had the privilege of representing the Tenement Museum in Congress prior to this year, when new congressional boundaries were implemented, and I still serve as an honorary trustee of this important institution. I can say without hesitation that the Lower East Side Tenement Museum is one of our Nation's most important historic and

cultural institutions. In recognition of the important work that they do, the National Endowment for the Humanities just recently awarded them a $500,000 matching grant.

Founded 25 years ago, the museum brings to life the experiences of those immigrant families who settled in one of our Nation's most iconic and important neighborhoods—the Lower East Side. Through these stories, the museum tells the story of our great country, a nation of immigrants, and how our national identity is constantly evolving and changing thanks to immigration.

Over 200,000 people visit the museum each year to learn about these stories—and that's not by accident. The Tenement Museum has found a unique way to personalize and bring to life history through the stories of individual families who actually lived in these buildings. They take rooms, and they make one for the Irish, one for the Greek, one for the Jews. They have all these stories, and you learn not only the history, but the stories of the particular families who lived there.

The original museum building at 97 Orchard Street tells the progression of our country through the stories of immigrant families from Italy, Ireland, Poland, Greece, Austria, Russia, Germany, and Lithuania through 1935.

The bill before us will allow the museum to expand to a new site so it can tell the stories of Jewish Holocaust survivors, post-1965 Chinese families, and Puerto Rican families in the 1950s—bringing immigrant history to the present day.

I commend the Natural Resources Committee for reporting out this legislation, the House leadership for bringing it to the floor, and my colleague and friend NYDIA for authoring it, and I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1846.

□ 1400

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

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

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1846, to amend the Act establishing the Lower East Side Tenement National Historic Site. This piece of legislation would extend the boundaries of the Lower East Side Tenement National Historic Site in New York City to the Lower East Side Tenement Museum's 103 Orchard Street location. This bill would at no additional cost to taxpayers ensure the preservation of a site that embodies the struggles and resilience of immigrant families and the essence of who we are as Americans. I urge my colleagues to ensure that this important chapter in the American story will remain for future generations by supporting H.R. 1846.

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. 1846, 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.

FOND DU LAC BAND OF LAKE SUPERIOR CHIPPEWA NON-INTERCOURSE ACT OF 2013

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2650) to allow the Fond du Lac Band of Lake Superior Chippewa in the State of Minnesota to lease or transfer certain land, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2650

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

SECTION 1. CONGRESSIONAL APPROVAL OF CERTAIN LAND TRANSACTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law (including regulations), and without further approval, ratification, or authorization by the United States, the Fond du Lac Band of Lake Superior Chippewa in the State of Minnesota (referred to in this Act as the ''Band'') may lease, sell, convey, warrant, or otherwise transfer all or any portion of the interest of the Band in any real property that is not held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Band.

(b) NO EFFECT ON TRUST LAND.—Nothing in this Act—

(1) authorizes the Band to lease, sell, convey, warrant, or otherwise transfer all or any portion of any interest in any real property that is held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Band; or

(2) affects any Federal law (including regulations) relating to leasing, selling, conveying, warranting, or otherwise transferring any interest in the real property described in paragraph (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 to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials 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, this legislation would ensure that the Non-Intercourse Act, which limits legal transactions by tribes, does not interfere with the Fond du Lac Band of Lake Superior Chippewa tribe's ability to lease, buy, or sell fee land owned by the tribe. The bill also clearly states that it does not authorize the tribe to sell, transfer, lease, convey, or warrant all or any portion of land held in trust by the Federal Government. There is precedent for tribes to seek legislation in Congress to waive the Non-Intercourse Act for transactions of nontrust land because of an overabundance of caution by both tribal and nontribal parties.

I would ask for adoption of the bill and reserve the balance of my time.

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

The Fond Du Lac Band of Lake Superior Chippewa and the county of Carlton, Minnesota, have proposed a land exchange involving 1,451 acres of tribal fee land located outside the Band's reservation. Those lands would be exchanged for tax-forfeited State lands of equivalent value that are administered by Carlton County but located within the Band's reservation.

H.R. 2650 would authorize the land exchange and would allow future land exchanges between the county and the Band which have been identified as candidates for similar land exchanges. I support H.R. 2650 and urge its passage by the House today.

Representative NOLAN is to be commended for his leadership and persistence on behalf of his constituents and his district.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN), the sponsor of the legislation.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague from Arizona, Congressman GRIJALVA, for his leadership on this committee and his management of this bill here, in particular.

And thanks to all those who have worked together in a bipartisan manner to bring this important legislation to the floor of the House here today. In particular, I want to thank Natural Resources Committee Chairman DOC HASTINGS; former ranking member and now United States Senator ED MARKEY; current Ranking Member PETER DEFAZIO; as well as my old friend Chairman DON YOUNG, the chairman of the Natural Resources Subcommittee on Indian and Alaska Native Affairs; Ranking Member COLLEEN HANABUSA; and, of course, a thank you to Senator AL FRANKEN of Minnesota, who shepherded the companion bill in the Senate.

I also want to thank Karen Diver, the chairwoman of the Fond Du Lac Band, her colleagues on the Reservation Business Committee, as well as their natural resources management team of Reggie DeFoe, Steve Olson, and Jack Bassett. And, finally, a thank you to Gregory Bernu, the Carlton County land commissioner, and the entire Carlton County Board of Commissioners and their staff for their diligence and good faith in negotiating the agreement we are prepared to ratify today. And, of course, last, but not least, I thank my legislative staff assistant Will Mitchell.

Mr. Speaker, this bill, H.R. 2650, provides the legally required approval by the Congress for an exchange of land between the Fond Du Lac Band and Carlton County in the Eighth Congressional District of Minnesota.

By way of a brief background, Federal land allotment policies in the early 20th century played havoc with an 1854 treaty that set aside 101,000 acres of reservation land exclusively for the Fond Du Lac Band.

I would like to point out to my colleagues that as they enter the Chamber over here from the west front, there is a bust of Chief Buffalo, the great Chippewa chief from the Minnesota Territory who negotiated this treaty in 1854. He and fellow Band members got in a canoe; and they canoed, starting in Lake Superior, all the way through the Great Lakes out to New York City, and then took a train from there down to Washington to negotiate this treaty. And then, of course, they took the train back to New York and canoed all the way back through the St. Lawrence Seaway, the Great Lakes, and then back to the Chippewa Nation in the Minnesota Territory.

As I enter this Chamber myself each day, I am reminded sometimes of the long, hard travel that is required to do the right thing representing our people, as I know all the Members of this Congress are committed to doing. So each day when I enter this Chamber, I say ''hi'' to Buffalo, and I recommend that each of my colleagues do the same.

And I am not sure, but when I walked by Chief Buffalo today, I thought I saw a pleasant look of approval, if not a little nod, that the Congress was going to work here today to take care of this legislation, because, unfortunately, after that treaty was negotiated, homesteaders and others were wrongly permitted to settle on this tribal land, much of which was later forfeited to the county for nonpayment of taxes. The result today is a checkerboard of ownership that significantly limits both the Fond Du Lac Band and the county's ability to effectively use these lands that they control.

Under this agreement, which meets all requirements of Minnesota law, the Fond Du Lac Band will transfer 1,451 acres of land they own outside the Fond du Lac reservation to Carlton County. In return, Carlton County will transfer approximately 3,200 acres of land of equal value, I must point out, that they now administer within the boundaries of the Fond du Lac reservation back to the Fond Du Lac Band.

It is a sensible agreement that provides space for the Band to construct much-needed housing for its 6,700 members, as well as provide more area for hunting, gathering, and native activities. Additionally, the agreement provides Carlton County with valuable new timber and forestry resources.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, I would point out that H.R. 2650 is modeled on statutes that were passed in this body in 2000 and 2004, allowing the Lower Sioux Indian community in Minnesota and the Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux community in Minnesota to accomplish similar transactions. It is also my understanding that passage of this bill will greatly help facilitate possible similar transactions between the Fond Du Lac Band and Carlton County in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully ask my colleagues to approve this legislation; and, again, I thank all those who have worked to pass this legislation in a bipartisan effort.

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

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the legislation and 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. 2650, 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 255, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 2719, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 1204, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

CLARIFYING CERTAIN PROPERTY DESCRIPTIONS IN PROVO RIVER PROJECT TRANSFER ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion 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, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 406, nays 0, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 615]

YEAS—406

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Andrews
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Higgins
Himes
Holding
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.

Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—25

Bass
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Campbell
Culberson
Enyart
Graves (MO)
Grimm
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Jackson Lee
Lee (CA)
Lummis
McCarthy (NY)
McMorris Rodgers
Meeks
Neal
Radel
Rush
Sanchez, Loretta
Schwartz
Sires
Thompson (PA)
Velázquez
Yoho

□ 1434

Messrs. FLEMING and BARTON changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 615, I was here to vote—voted but it did not register. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 615, had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

TRANSPORTATION SECURITY ACQUISITION REFORM ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARCHANT). The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2719) to require the Transportation Security Administration to implement best practices and improve transparency with regard to technology acquisition programs, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 416, nays 0, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 616]

YEAS—416

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Andrews
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—15

Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Campbell
Culberson
Enyart
Graves (MO)
Herrera Beutler
Lummis
McCarthy (NY)
McMorris Rodgers
Radel
Rush
Sanchez, Loretta
Schwartz
Sires

□ 1442

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AVIATION SECURITY STAKEHOLDER PARTICIPATION ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1204) to amend title 49, United States Code, to direct the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security (Transportation Security Administration) to establish an Aviation Security Advisory Committee, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 411, nays 3, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 617]

YEAS—411

Aderholt
Amodei
Andrews
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—3

Amash
Labrador
Massie

NOT VOTING—17

Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Campbell
Cole
Culberson
Enyart
Graves (MO)
Herrera Beutler
Lummis
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McMorris Rodgers
Radel
Rush
Sanchez, Loretta
Schwartz
Sires

□ 1450

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 615 on H.R. 255, on Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass, "to amend certain definitions contained in the Provo River Project Transfer Act for purposes of clarifying certain property descriptions", I am not recorded because I was absent due to the birth of my daughter. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 616 on H.R. 2719, on Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass, "the Transportation Acquisition Security Reform Act", I am not recorded because I was absent due to the birth of my daughter. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 617 on H.R. 1204, on Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass, "Aviation Security Stakeholder Participation Act of 2013", I am not recorded because I was absent due to the birth of my daughter. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

MOMENT OF SILENCE FOR VICTIMS OF NEW YORK'S DERAILMENT ON METRO-NORTH

(Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, tonight on Forest Lane in Cold Spring, my friend Jim Lovell won't be coming home. His children, Brooke and Jack and Finn and Hudson, the youngest who goes to school with my little girls in Cold Spring and who has played in my house, will be missing the father they love and a beloved member of the community because he was one of the four victims on the Metro-North train that derailed on Sunday.

We all are saddened and heartbroken by this tragic event. I stand here with my colleagues from New York to honor the four victims and the dozens of injured. New York lost a devoted father in Jim Lovell; but, of course, we also lost a loving sister in Donna Smith from Newburgh, a caring nurse from Queens named Kisook Ahn, and James Ferrari, a hardworking husband from Montrose.

I know my colleagues, NITA LOWEY who represents Montrose and JIM CROWLEY who represents Queens and ELIOT ENGEL who represents the district where the accident occurred, and I who represent two of the victims join with all of you in standing to offer a moment of silence in honor of those killed and of those injured. I ask that we do so now.

REMEMBERING VICTIMS OF NEW YORK'S DERAILMENT ON METRO-NORTH

(Mrs. LOWEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the memory of my constituent, James Ferrari of Montrose, New York, one of the four individuals who lost their lives in Sunday morning's tragedy. Mr. Ferrari leaves behind a wife, a 20-year-old daughter, and extended family. My thoughts and prayers are with them during this time of pain and grief.

For the last 10 years, Mr. Ferrari commuted 6 days a week into the city to his job as a building supervisor. He was a hardworking New Yorker, totally devoted to his family.

His friend and neighbor told me that he did everything for his family. Now his wife, who is still in shock, and daughter are trying to put all the pieces of their lives together.

Now Congress must do its part to honor all the crash victims by advancing solutions that prevent tragedies like this one from ever happening again.

REMEMBERING VICTIMS OF NEW YORK'S DERAILMENT ON METRO-NORTH

(Mr. ENGEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, this horrific tragedy, unfortunately, happened in my district about half a mile from where I live.

When a tragedy like this happens, senseless tragedy, we as Americans all pull together wherever tragedies occur. That is what we are doing here this afternoon. We are pulling together in the face of a terrible, terrible tragedy.

I know that an investigation is going on from the National Transportation Safety Board. I hope that in a short time we will know what happened and, perhaps, we will be able to take steps to ensure that it doesn't happen again, whether it be by legislation or other types of ways we can ensure that this doesn't happen again.

My heart goes out to all the victims and their families of this senseless, senseless tragedy. We as New Yorkers and as Americans in times of tragedy always pull together. New York pulled together after 9/11, and we are pulling together after this horrific tragedy as well.

REMEMBERING VICTIMS OF NEW YORK'S DERAILMENT ON METRO-NORTH

(Mr. CROWLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I too rise to mourn the loss of these four individuals and all those who were injured in this tragic accident.

In particular, I want to recognize the family of Kisook Ahn of Queens. The entire Korean American community in Queens and throughout the city and the tristate region mourn her loss. She was a resident of my hometown of Woodside, Queens. I particularly want to express our sorrow on her loss and all those who lost their lives or were injured, once again, in this tragic event of Sunday. Our thoughts and prayers are with her family and all the victims and their families.

REMEMBERING VICTIMS OF NEW YORK'S DERAILMENT ON METRO-NORTH

(Mr. RANGEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, let me thank Congressman ENGEL for the compassion which he has demonstrated for the families of those that survived, those that are injured, and those that have been lost.

While all of us are anxious to see the results of the investigation, we all have to ask ourselves, could this be avoided and did these people die in vain, and what are we going to do about it?

It would appear to me that the first thing everyone thinks of is the infrastructure: Could this have happened in Japan, in China, or in some other industrialized country? It just stresses how important infrastructure is.

It is not just the question of looking modern and developing commerce. It is human lives we are talking about. Let's not let the people who died die in vain. Let us all collectively look at our bridges, our roads, our tunnels, and our airports all over our great Nation so that we can avoid these types of tragedies.

□ 1500

REMEMBERING VICTIMS OF NEW YORK'S DERAILMENT ON METRO-NORTH

(Mr. GIBSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues for coming forward with these moving tributes. I want to add to those my condolences, and those of my family.

This is a very resilient Nation, and New Yorkers in tough times like these, we come together. Every day I have thousands of my constituents who ride these trains back and forth to provide for their families. I pledge my support and those of our district as we ensure that a tragedy like this is not repeated.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT IS UNAFFORDABLE

(Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, some are trying to create the impression that the only problem with ObamaCare is the Web site, and the experts will soon fix that. Actually, the biggest problem with the so-called Affordable Care Act is that it is unaffordable.

We are already having trouble paying for all of the Federal medical programs we have now. The cost of all of our Federal medical programs have been greatly underestimated at the start.

Now with many millions more losing their coverage than the administration predicted, added to the millions previously uninsured, the cost of ObamaCare is already estimated at possibly four times more than when it was passed, and it is not even fully in place.

Since it took 3½ years to even get a screwed-up Web site partially ready, most people don't believe the Federal Government can run our health care system efficiently in the first place. More bureaucratic, less-humane medical care, and all at much greater cost to taxpayers at both the Federal and State levels.

This plan is a mess that will ultimately lead to shortages, waiting periods, and a great decline in the quality of American medical care.

SAFE CLIMATE CAUCUS

(Mr. CARTWRIGHT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, for far too long, Congress has failed to act while the impacts of climate change threaten our security, our economy, our budget, and the health of our citizens. In fact, the GAO included climate change in its high-risk report this year—meaning the GAO thinks it is critical for the Federal Government to address the financial threat posed by climate change. Whether we are talking about the Federal flood insurance program, whether we are talking about FEMA payments, climate change undeniably threatens our finances as a Nation and as a Federal Government.

We have to put our partisanship aside and deal with the financial effects of climate change.

That's why in the coming months, I intend to release a comprehensive climate adaptation bill that will address the need to protect our Nation's assets and our citizens from the devastation that is now inevitable due to our already changing climate.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come for congressional action for our own good and the good of our children and our grandchildren.

GUN SAFETY LEGISLATION

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand simple, one-page legislation, H.R. 3626, that passed on the floor of the House today by voice vote. Mr. Speaker, it was a gun bill. It was to extend and to ensure that undetectable firearms would be regulated so that plastic guns cannot pose a danger to law enforcement or the police.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder why we cannot come together to stop the kinds of killings at Sandy Hook and Aurora by passing universal background checks, or the bill that I introduced, which is a gun safety and storage bill. For the likes of a young man by the name of Braveon who died in the hands of strangers in my district 2 weeks ago, or the young man, 16 years old, who just was shot this past weekend in a local park, or two teenagers that died 3 or 4 weeks ago while 19 were shot at a house party, all using guns got on the underbelly of life. Not stopping stash houses, or keeping guns from going from one hand to another without a background check.

A simple bill was passed, Mr. Speaker. I ask: Is there any heart in this Congress to pass reasonable gun safety legislation to save the lives of our children and to stand against violence, gun violence? Enough is enough.

THE AMERICAN DREAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MESSER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, we have an opportunity today to talk about some things that are really important to America. I want to start really with this quote by Franklin Delano Roosevelt which kind of talks about where I am coming from and where I think we ought to be going as a Nation right now. I will try to explain this in a few moments, and then move on to really deal with this problem that we have in our Nation of income inequality, lost opportunity, or the absence of opportunity.

FDR said:

> The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much, it is rather whether we provide enough for those who have too little.

In America today, there are many, many Americans that have far too little. One out of four children in America goes to bed hungry at night. Unemployment remains at a peak level, somewhere north of 7–8 percent. Real unemployment, that is, the unemployment of people who would like to work more, would like to have a full-time job, remains very, very high. What can we do about it?

Well, we can think about the great American ideal, the American Dream. This gentleman pretty well laid it out. This is Bill Clinton talking about the American Dream. He said:

> If you work hard and play by the rules, you have the freedom and the opportunity to pursue your dreams and leave your kids a country where they can chase theirs.

So between these two Presidents, I think we lay out a philosophy that is well worth our attention: make sure those who have little have an opportunity, that we pay attention to their needs, and that we make sure that the American Dream is always in place.

Let's talk about that dream. How about the dream of going to college, college education. The ideal is college education is open to everyone. In reality, in 2007, one-half of the children from wealthy households completed college. Only 9 percent of the children from low-income households completed college. This gap is widening and has continued to widen since 2007, and obviously since 1989. The American Dream.

How about this dream: FDR also talked about the four freedoms and one of them had to do with freedom from want. Part of the American Dream, it has been denied. As a result of the Great Recession, in 2010, a total of 46.2 million Americans were below the poverty level, the highest number of 52 years. The American Dream denied.

When we talk about the American Dream and we talk about what Roosevelt said about those who have much versus those who have little, so what is going on in America? In America today, income inequality is growing. The ideal is you work hard, you will do okay. In reality, the U.S. ranks 93 in the world in income inequality, behind Great Britain, Australia, Nigeria, Argentina, and Japan. The American Dream: you work hard, you will do okay. The reality: income inequality in the United States is greater than the income inequality in Nigeria. Yes, it is.

So what are we going to do?

Well, here is what we are doing. Since the Great Recession, the recovery has been slow. We Democrats have some answers on what to do about that recovery, and we will get to that in a few moments, but I think we need to understand what has happened in the last 5 years.

We have seen the economy grow. Every quarter since 2009, the economy has grown. The private sector economy has grown. Where did that wealth go? Where did the wealth of this Nation go? Well, 95 percent of the wealth generated in this Nation since 2009 has gone to the top 1 percent of Americans. The remaining 99 percent have had to split what was left. During the Clinton economy, it was reversed. The top 1 percent took 45 percent, and the bottom 99 percent took the remaining. So 1 percent took 95 percent, 99 percent were left with 5 percent.

Income inequality: What do we do about it? How do we achieve the goals of President Clinton when he talked about the American Dream? How do we achieve the goals of FDR when he talked about our purpose, not to provide more for those who have great but to provide for those who have little? How can we do it?

Well, one way we can do it is a long American tradition dating back to George Washington. In his first year in office, George Washington called upon Alexander Hamilton, his Treasury Secretary, to figure out how to grow the American economy. They were interested in manufacturing. The United States was basically exporting raw materials to Great Britain. George Washington wanted to build the American economy. So he said, Alex, give me a plan. So Alexander Hamilton came back a few months later with a plan, an economic development plan, based on manufacturing, and in that economic development plan, he said we need to do about a dozen things.

□ 1515

He said we need to build the infrastructure of the United States. He said we need to build the canals, the roads, and the ports. He said we needed to protect American manufacturing, so make sure that there are proper duties and tariffs on imported goods so that they would not overcome American manufacturers but, rather, level the playing field so that American manufacturers would have a shot. He said we needed to also make sure that we had good international trade agreements and use the American taxpayer money to buy American manufactured goods. It is all there. So for those who want to pay attention to the Founding Fathers, they ought to pay attention to what George Washington and Alexander Hamilton talked about in the first days of the first administration of this wonderful democracy we call America.

Let's talk for a moment about infrastructure. Let's talk about those roads that George Washington described, Alexander Hamilton talked and wrote about in his report. Where are we with our infrastructure today?

Joining me today is my colleague from Oregon, who has been working on the infrastructure issue now for more than a decade. He understands the problems that we have in our transportation systems and has a proposal.

I now yield to EARL BLUMENAUER of Oregon.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I deeply appreciate the gentleman from California yielding time to me, and I appreciate his leadership in focusing on where the economy is and where it needs to go.

I think it is important to look back in time because you are absolutely right, that from the founding of the Republic, infrastructure loomed large. In the Constitution, there is a provision for postal roads. And 8 years after the plan that was developed by Alexander Hamilton for President Washington, there was the Gallatin plan that was developed for President Jefferson by his Secretary of the Treasury, Albert Gallatin. It had a vision for what would happen for that next American century.

Throughout that time, infrastructure has been one thing that has brought Americans together. It is something that really didn't have a partisan tinge. Yes, Theodore Roosevelt, a Republican President, actually, on the anniversary, the centennial of the Gallatin plan, had his own vision for what we would do with inland waterways and reforestation, redeveloping America. His cousin, Franklin Roosevelt, a Democrat, likewise helped plant the seeds that ultimately grew into the Interstate Freeway Act, signed into law and funded by President Eisenhower. And 150 years ago, there was the Transcontinental Railroad Act with a Republican President, Abraham Lincoln.

This infrastructure agenda is something that has made America great. It produced the finest infrastructure in the world. Until the last quarter century, America had the best airlines, roads, freeways, bridges, passenger and freight rail systems anywhere in the world. Unfortunately, we have not kept pace with our responsibility. We have not raised the gas tax for the last 20 years. That was part of the Clinton

plan in 1993 that helped kick off an unparalleled 8 years of economic prosperity.

We face a situation now where the bottom is about to fall out of transportation funding. We have not heeded the call of other bipartisan commissions for Republican and Democratic Presidents alike to provide the transportation resources that would enable us to have a robust reauthorization of the transportation bill. In fact, the best the last Congress could do was a short-term 27-month extension that was kind of kept together by chewing gum and bailing wire, and that funding runs out in less than 10 months. What that means is that, by October 1 next year, transportation funding for roads will drop 92 percent if we just rely on the cash flow that goes into the depleted highway trust fund. Transit funding is eliminated. Over the course of the next 10 years, we will see a 30 percent reduction in already inadequate funding for the Federal partnership.

We kept this afloat by transferring $55 billion of general fund borrowed money. We were able to get a little bit of infrastructure in the Recovery Act. And the last Congress did a little budget magic in terms of changing some provisions for pension funds that resulted in an uptick in general fund revenue that we used, transferred, to sort of get us through the next 10 months. But it is not adequate. It is not the signal the private sector needs. It is not the signal that our partners in State and local government need to be able to undertake the significant projects that will make a difference.

If we really care about putting people to work, the fastest way to create hundreds of thousands of family-wage jobs is to adequately fund our infrastructure, family-wage jobs in every State in the Union that will start in a matter of months.

If we care about American competitiveness, we will invest in infrastructure so that we can compete with the developments that are taking place around the world. If we care about the health of our communities, we will invest to deal with problems of deteriorating roads and bridges, problems of fraying infrastructure, inadequate transit, not having safe conditions for our children to bike and walk safely to school.

While the discussion takes place about the budget deficit and this fiscal cliff or another, I think it is time that we ought to look at the infrastructure deficit and the transportation cliff that we face in less than 10 months. Tomorrow, I will be introducing some legislation, and I am pleased that I will be joined by leaders from labor, the Chamber of Commerce, construction, the professions of engineering, local government, a wide array of people who are willing to step up and join Congress to try and more realistically solve this problem.

I can't say how much, Mr. GARAMENDI, I appreciate your tireless advocacy for rebuilding and renewing America, for dealing with manufacturing here, for putting Americans back to work at a time of, sadly, too persistent long-term unemployment, and particularly in the building and construction trades and with regard to architects and engineers where we have seen people just literally decimated. I appreciate your strong voice and advocacy and look forward to working with you as we go forward, hopefully, in this Congress, that we don't dodge our responsibility any further.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. BLUMENAUER, there is no doubt that you are taking up the responsibility. You have been a leader for many years on this issue of transportation, how we can fund it, what we must do.

I guess I knew, but I didn't realize it was coming so quickly, that we would fall off the transportation cliff, that the next fiscal year, 10 months from now, the transportation programs funded by the Federal Government simply run out of money. Isn't it 90 percent or more of the funding that will be gone? Did I understand that correctly?

Mr. BLUMENAUER. If we rely simply on current cash flow in the next fiscal year, we will see a 92 percent reduction in highway funding, and the transit budget will be zeroed out. And over the next 10 years, with the current revenue level, we will see a 30 percent reduction below the current inadequate levels.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Just before we came on the floor to talk about this issue of inequality in America and how we might deal with it, we heard our colleagues from the State of New York talk about the tragic transit accident that occurred. In listening to them, a couple of the Members talked about the need for rail improvement, upgrading the rail system in New York. If I am to hear you correctly, unless we provide additional revenue in the transportation funding program, there will be no money to upgrade the rail systems in New York or anywhere else around the United States.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. We do not have a current revenue stream that is adequate for rail modernization. Simple. We had some additional money, again, in the Recovery Act. Although modest by international standards, it was a significant shot in the arm; but as you pointed out, that is running out.

What is interesting is that I had an opportunity, a few years ago on a trip to China, to ride their high-speed trains. In 2009, there were no high-speed trains in China. Next year, they will carry more passenger traffic than the entire American aviation system.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Amazing.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. This can be done. Other countries are doing it. I was referring here just to the surface transportation fees, but there are certainly needs for rail modernization and safety. And, frankly, what is underground is in worse condition than what we see on the surface. We leak more water in America than we drink. Every day, it is the equivalent of 6 billion gallons of water, enough to fill Olympic-sized swimming pools, 9,000 of them, from Washington, D.C., to Pittsburgh.

I deeply appreciate your courtesy in permitting me to share a few minutes with you on the floor this evening. I deeply appreciate your unstinting advocacy for making it in America, for doing it right, putting our families back to work, strengthening the economy, and making our communities more livable, our families safer, healthier, and more economically sound.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. BLUMENAUER, you are bringing about a very important piece of legislation that will help us finance the systems that we need to build.

We talk about immediate jobs. In talking about those immediate jobs, for every dollar that we would invest in transportation infrastructure, you get $1.59 of economic growth immediately back.

Mr. BLUMENAUER, I know you have to go. You have another meeting. Thank you very much for bringing this critical issue to our attention.

Now let me carry on for a few seconds about the infrastructure issue.

If we make that critical investment, if we follow the leadership of Mr. BLUMENAUER, where we actually collect the money that is needed for our systems and put those dollars to work in America, several very important things will happen in the American economy.

First of all, you lay down the foundation for immediate and future economic growth. You cannot grow the economy if you cannot move goods, services, and people across the Nation. In my State of California, we understand what gridlock is. We have got gridlock here in Congress. That is political gridlock. In California, when you are talking about gridlock, you are talking about sitting on a freeway and going nowhere; you are talking about the shipments of goods in and out of the ports that are delayed because they cannot get to the rail systems. They cannot get to the highways of America because of gridlock at the ports. We have an enormous necessity to lay in place the transportation infrastructure that can then allow the American economy to grow. That is point one.

Point two is, in doing that infrastructure improvement, if we use the American taxpayer dollars—in this case, collected from the excise tax on gasoline and fuel—if we use that money to buy American-made equipment, we generate an additional economic growth model, and that is the reestablishment of the American manufacturing system.

□ 1530

Twenty years ago we had about somewhere between 19 and 20 million Americans in manufacturing making all kind of things, from Caterpillar

bulldozers and graders and loaders, to farm equipment, to airplanes, and technology systems from computers and the like. That was 20 years ago.

Today there is just over 11 million in the manufacturing sector. We have lost 9 million manufacturing jobs in America. Those are the heart and soul of the American middle class. That is where a mother or a father could get a job, provide the income for their family, buy a home, buy the car, the boat, take the vacation, send their kids to college.

That was where the American middle class found its foundation. It has been decimated by a number of policies that were enacted by previous Congresses and by a lack of attention all across this Nation to the foundational imperative of manufacturing.

So we have been talking here for more than 2½ years now about a Make It In America agenda. If we are going to finance our transportation systems, then add to that a clause that says, the material, the bridges, the steel, the concrete, the equipment, will be American-made. It will be made in America.

In doing so, we can go right back to Alexander Hamilton and George Washington, who wrote the first economic development plan for this Nation, and said use the American taxpayer money to support American industries.

Hey, I am with Alex and George. They were correct. Use our taxpayer money to support American businesses, buy American, make it in America.

It works. Let me give you an example. In Sacramento, California, near my district, is a manufacturing plant that was expanded, actually doubled in size in the last 2 years. It was doubled in size to build electric locomotives for Amtrak on the east coast corridor, between Washington, DC, and Boston.

About 80 new locomotives are going to be built in Sacramento, California because, in the stimulus bill, the Recovery Act, somebody, probably a staffer, maybe a Senator, maybe a Member of Congress, wrote in one sentence and said, this 700-plus million dollars for the locomotives will be spent on American-made equipment, 100 percent American-made.

American companies looked at that, shrugged their shoulders. A German company, Siemens, said, oh, $700 million contract, we can do it.

Siemens took their light rail manufacturing plant in Sacramento, took that contract, doubled the size of their plant, doubled the size of their workforce, and is now building 100 percent American-made locomotives in Sacramento, California. Where 100 years ago they used to build locomotives, now they are doing it again.

Why?

Because somebody went all the way back to the very first President, took something that he said, and it was, we are going to spend American taxpayer money on American-made goods, in this case, American-made locomotives.

Think about it. Think about the potential. Think about the potential if we were to really invest in infrastructure, if we were to follow Mr. BLUMENAUER's piece of legislation, take the money, invest in the roads, invest in our freeways, rebuild the bridges, of which more than 6,000 are about to fall down or could fall down in the United States.

Repair, rebuild, expand, allow the foundation of economic growth to grow, and use that taxpayer money for American jobs, buying American-made equipment.

Think of the possibilities. Think of the possibilities. Think back to where we started this conversation, about Franklin Delano Roosevelt, that it is our task not to add more to those who have much, but, rather, to add to those who have little.

Those men and women in the construction trades that have lost their job, where unemployment is well over 30, 40 percent, think about them being able to get that middle class job building the infrastructure.

Think about the manufacturers out there, the small businesses, the large businesses, the supply train that Siemens has set up all across this Nation to provide the electronics, to provide the electric motors and all of the steel, that huge supply train.

Think about what could be done if we put in place policies today, here in the United States Congress, to build our infrastructure, to use our taxpayer money for American jobs; that unemployed individual that is now on food stamps, perhaps on a welfare check, getting a job in that manufacturing sector that is providing that tool that is going to be used on that locomotive.

Think about that unemployed family, that construction worker, the operating engineer who has been sitting on the sidelines, surviving on food stamps and on assistance, able to go back to work, sitting on that Caterpillar tractor that is manufactured in America, providing the income necessary for his family and providing the taxes necessary for the growth of this Nation's ability to reduce its deficit.

It is possible. We can do this. We can rebuild America. We can compete with anybody. There is no other culture in the world that is so entrepreneurial, so driven to succeed.

But here we are, 435 of us, caught up in a gridlock where we can't do anything, where the transportation bill languishes, where the farm bill languishes, so that our farmers don't know what to plant next year. This has got to end. We have got to stop this.

We need to think back on those giants of America's past. George Washington told Alexander Hamilton, give me a manufacturing program for the United States, an economic development program.

Alexander Hamilton came back; we need to build ports, roads, canals. We need to protect American industry with wise laws and trade laws. We need to have a tax policy that encourages investment, and we need to make sure that we are using the tax money to buy American-made.

Think back on Jefferson, who told his Treasury Secretary, give me a plan for the next century, the 1800s, an economic development plan.

Teddy Roosevelt, and then Franklin Roosevelt, Eisenhower, men of vision, leaders of vision that were willing to step forward, willing to use the resources of this Nation, collecting those resources and dispensing those resources across the Nation to build the foundation for economic growth.

The Make It In America agenda is available to us today. That agenda is a trade policy that protects American industry, not a free trade that gives it away, but a fair trade policy that protects American industry; a tax policy that encourages economic growth here in the United States, that rewards corporations for bringing it home, and ends tax breaks for corporations that ship the jobs offshore, an energy policy that utilizes the great energy capacity of this Nation, everything from conservation and wind and solar and, indeed, the petroleum products.

We need that energy policy in place today so that the wind industry in the United States, which is a huge industry in my district, can count on tomorrow's tax policy, which will end in less than a year, so they are not building.

When we give a tax credit for solar, and when we give a tax credit for wind, or to the oil industry, we tell them, you only get that tax credit when you buy American-made solar panels, wind turbines and the like, because, after all, you are using American taxpayer money.

We need a labor policy so that we can re-educate those men and women who will no longer have a job in an industry that is no longer in existence. We need to make sure that labor has a fair shot, and in the labor policy we absolutely must raise the minimum wage. That holds up the floor, and deals with the issue of poverty in America.

Education, research, infrastructure. This is the Make It In America agenda. This is the agenda that we can grow jobs in America. This is the agenda that can address the American Dream.

This is the agenda that goes back to what Franklin Delano Roosevelt said when he talked about freedom from want. Freedom from want means that you must be able to get a decent job in America to support yourself and your family, so that the working men and women of America have a shot at the generation of wealth that this country can produce.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt said it is our task not to provide more for those who have much, but to provide for those who have little. So when you find that the policies of America have allowed this kind of wealth distribution to take place over the last 5 years, you know that those policies need to change. Those policies have to change.

When 1 percent of the American population is able to gather 95 percent of

the wealth generated in this Nation between 2009 and 2012, something is terribly wrong with the policies of this Nation. That is what happened.

That is what Americans have labored for, so that 95 percent of the wealth generated by the men and women who work in America winds up in the hands of 1 percent of this population.

We have got some policy problems. We have to deal with this.

If you believe what Bill Clinton said about the American Dream, being able to provide for your family, being able to provide that education, being able to make things better not only for yourself but for the next generation, then this kind of issue has to be dealt with.

This is a fundamental economic problem. The growth of this economy is dependent upon the ability of the American workers to have an income so that they can pursue their dream, and when the wealth winds up with this kind of a skewed situation, the 95 percent are not able to become the consumers to buy the home, to buy the car, to develop the opportunities that they need for their family.

How can we deal with this?

Well, one way we heard about today. We heard from Mr. BLUMENAUER about the necessity of building our transportation system so that the foundation for economic growth is in place, the transportation system. We need to do that, and doing so will put Americans back to work with those good, middle class jobs for working American families.

We need to put in place a Make It In America policy. Trade, taxes, energy, labor, education, research infrastructure, that is our agenda. That is our agenda for growth in America.

It is also our agenda for dealing with the deficit. You want to deal with the deficit, put Americans back to work. Watch that tax money come into the coffers of this Nation's treasury. It will happen.

But you keep a large percentage of Americans out of work, you keep them at low wages, and you keep them unemployed, you are not going to able to deal with the deficit. Go back to work Americans—and you deal with the deficit.

□ 1545

How do you do that? Infrastructure, trade policy, make sure your tax policy is in place that encourages economic growth and investment and all the rest.

We can do this. We can do this. We are America. We have done this in the past. We have had leaders in the past that have talked about these things and done them. We have had a Congress in the past that has listened to their own leadership, to those among their caucuses that said, Let's get on with it. Let's build for the future. Those leaders are here—not at this moment, but they are here on this floor day after day. They know. They understand, If you want to deal with the deficit, put Americans back to work. If you want to deal with the American Dream, give them a good job. Raise the minimum wage so that every working person at least can provide food on their table and shelter for themselves and their families. It is all possible.

This isn't something new to America. This is what America has done before. And this is our job. This is our job. The Congress of the United States, the Senate, the administration, that is what we are here for. That is our job.

Mr. Speaker, before I yield back, first I have got to talk about one other thing, and that is another challenge that we face, and that challenge is about climate change. This is real, folks. This is not something that a bunch of scientists have dreamed up. This is a very, very real issue for this world. Many of the policies we talk about here can directly go to the issue of climate change.

I represent 200 miles of the Sacramento River Valley, from the very beginning of the Sacramento River at the beginning of the San Francisco Bay, 200 miles up, past the city of Sacramento, past the cities of Yuba City, Marysville, all the way to Chico. It is an area that is one of the most flood-prone areas in America.

Climate change is going to increase rainfall—maybe not the total rainfall throughout the year, but the incidence of extraordinary, heavy downpours will increase.

Not too many people want to ascribe the recent typhoon in the Philippines to climate change, but there is ever-increasing evidence that extreme storms are a result of climate change. And it figures: more heat, more moisture, more storms, more precipitation—it is all there.

So as we go forward, dealing with these issues of economic development, of infrastructure, we need to keep in mind the issue of climate change and its immediate effect: droughts in some areas, where there weren't droughts before; floods in other areas, where there is a need to put in the infrastructure.

In the case of my district, the infrastructure of levees. My constituents are at risk. My constituents need the Federal Government to pass a Water Resources Development Act that provides the foundation and the authorization for levee improvements, and they need the appropriations. They need the money.

It is our task to keep America safe, whether that is from some military threat from somewhere in the world or from some natural threat, for example, extreme storms, extreme flooding, making sure the infrastructure, the levees, and the protections for our citizens are in place.

I want us to deal with that; and as we put together the Water Resources Development Act, where I have the privilege of being on the conference committee, we intend to do our best to make sure that the authorization for those projects necessary for water development, as well as flood protection, are in place. And then we must go about the task of finding a way to pay for it.

Mr. BLUMENAUER is introducing a bill tomorrow to find a way to pay for the transportation systems. We need to do the same for the water infrastructure systems. We cannot neglect this task. It is our job.

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

OBAMACARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the recognition, for this time to spend talking to my colleagues on behalf of the Republican majority in the House of Representatives about the continued problem with ObamaCare and with the www.healthcare.gov Web site.

The promise to Congress and to the American people was that by the end of November, November 30, the Web site would be fixed and that people would not have any problems whatsoever getting enrolled for ObamaCare on the government-created www.healthcare.gov Web site.

Well, the administration has said, Mr. Speaker, that the problems that people had been faced with for the last 2 months—of course the rollout was October 1—had been essentially solved, that 80 percent of folks now could get health care, could complete their application, and would not get kicked off the system with an error message.

But what they don't say is it is 80 percent of what. They go on to admit that 40 percent of the Web site, Mr. Speaker, has yet to be developed, and the law was signed into effect—and my colleagues all know this—was signed into effect on March 23, 2010. Well, today is, what, December 3, 2013. They have had over 3 years, 3½ years, essentially, to get this done. And it wasn't ready. The rollout was a colossal failure on October 1, even though $600 million, Mr. Speaker, had been spent to create this Web site; and that is what you get when you have a massive 2,600-page bill that was rushed through almost in the dark of night at the 11th hour in December of 2009 when the bill was not ready for prime time, and obviously this Web site was not ready for prime time.

So it is incredibly concerning that the Obama administration has continued, Mr. Speaker, full speed ahead on the rollout of the system even after numerous warnings from vendors and from Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle in both Chambers—the House and the Senate.

The Web site has led to confusion in the insurance marketplace as well as putting customers and consumers—patients, really. I say that as a practicing

physician for over 30 years in the great State of Georgia. The Web site has led to confusion and has put consumers' personal information at risk due also to lax security protocols. It is not just this health care information, which is sacrosanct under HIPAA law, but also the security of the information—financial information, as an example.

So I am still extremely concerned about the security risk inherent with this Web site that is 80 percent fixed; but 80 percent of 60 percent is 48 percent. So it is 52 percent not fixed after 3½ years.

In last month's House Energy and Commerce Committee www.healthcare.gov data security hearing—I am a member of that committee, Mr. Speaker, the Health Subcommittee—other members and I heard testimony on the Obama administration's efforts to protect private citizens' sensitive health care data in the online marketplace. Hearing recent concerns that the site would become a central target for these so-called genius hackers and online thieves, we must make the protection of personal data one of the top priorities going forward.

Www.healthcare.gov's rollout has been completely unacceptable, and we must work to ensure that the site's data security operations aren't fumbled, as well. It would be an even bigger disaster for the American people already faced with the other consequences of the law, including higher premiums and the likelihood that they will be unable to see the doctors who they are accustomed to, the hospitals they are accustomed to going to.

This disruption is unbelievable, Mr. Speaker. And it is probably why Senator ORRIN HATCH from Utah, back when this bill was signed into law by President Obama, said that, in his experience—and he has got lots of experience; he has been in both Chambers for years—that it was probably the worst bill that he had ever seen in his lifetime as a Member of Congress and as a Senator. And I definitely agree with him.

The Obama administration claimed just this past Sunday that it had ''met the goal'' for www.healthcare.gov, and the online exchange would work smoothly for the vast majority of users.'' But upon closer examination, Mr. Speaker, this is not the case. In fact, ''meeting the goal'' checked a political box, rather than fully repair the faulty Web site.

These are a few of the problems that still remain, Mr. Speaker. Get this: site engineers have created a disguised gimmick for these error messages that were frustrating people so much. Consumers will now be placed in what they call a queuing system, a line—queuing up—rather than receive an error message if the site is unavailable. That, supposedly, would make people less frustrated if they know they have got a place in line, rather than seeing this big old error message that I just saw probably 30 minutes ago, Mr. Speaker, when I tried to go online to www.healthcare.gov. I put in all the information that they asked me to put in.

And as you know, all Members of Congress have to go into the District of Columbia Health Benefit Exchange. We have to. As of January 1, we are no longer eligible to be on the Federal Employee Health Benefits plan. I don't really mind that because I thought from the very beginning what is good for the goose is good for the gander. I think the President, himself, will go on the D.C. Health Benefit Exchange Web site; and I had recommended that with an amendment back when the bill was first being debated.

But as I said, the White House claims that the site can now handle—all of the site—a 50,000-person capacity limit. But the number is untested, and it is still far short of the volume needed to be on track to reach President Obama's 1-year 7 million people sign-up goal—7 million people that, heretofore, have not had health insurance or maybe they got kicked off their health insurance plan because the promise of, If you like your health plan, you can keep it, has not been kept. Unfortunately, there are very many people—something like 5 million—who have already been notified that they are not going to be able to keep their health care insurance even though they like it.

Many health insurance professionals and public officials have gone public. They have reported that the site isn't anywhere near ready for prime time; and as much as 40 percent, as I said earlier, of the site has yet to be built.

My hometown newspaper in Atlanta, Georgia, the Atlanta Journal-Constitution, included a headline today: ''New and improved? Not so much, some Georgians find.'' And they went on to highlight three of the most glaring examples. Mr. Speaker, I am going to give you just a couple of examples in the interest of time.

Robert Shlora from Alpharetta, Georgia, in Fulton County: shopping online and over the phone, Shlora has faced roadblock after roadblock in his quest to sign up for coverage through the marketplace. Shlora is paying nearly $2,800 a month for health insurance for himself, his wife, and their son—three people—and hasn't been able to shop around for years because he has a preexisting condition. The health law was expected to offer him much more affordable options.

The Atlanta Journal-Constitution has been closely following Shlora's experience since the marketplace opened on October 1.

□ 1600

Colleagues, you are not going to believe what I am going to tell you. Just listen to this. It is a comedy of errors, Mr. Speaker.

On Saturday, the marketplace Web site still failed him—just this past Saturday—but he believed he had a breakthrough after a telephone operator said she could process the application that he had been working on for 2 months and sent his information over to Humana. He could call Humana Monday to arrange payment, she said.

And this is a quote from him: ''They told me, 'You're good—you're all set,''' Shlora said. When he called Humana Monday morning, however, the insurer said it had no record of his application. The insurer's phone rep said she had researched the issue and called him back. She did call him back, but with bad news. After further research, she still found no record of his application.

Shlora called healthcare.gov back and the telephone rep, Mr. Speaker, insisted he was enrolled with Humana, but could offer him no way to prove it. ''Humana said to check with them by the end of the week and maybe it will mysteriously appear,'' Shlora said.

Let me give you another one, colleagues.

Greg Paulauskis from my hometown of Marietta, Georgia. Paulauskis, an early retiree who buys his own health insurance, has also been trying to shop for coverage for himself and his wife since the day the health insurance marketplace opened. Again, October 1. What is it today? December 3.

I thank the Atlanta Journal Constitution for their due diligence. They have been closely following his experience.

Like Shlora, he has run into a series of frustrating obstacles. On Monday, he noticed that the Web site was quicker. They said that it was quicker. It is now handling 50,000 people at a time, and its appearance has changed. Its icons looked different.

He tried to access his application that had been completed over the phone with a representative so that he could finally get to the step of actually selecting a plan, but the application wasn't visible on the site.

Now this was just Monday. What is today? Tuesday. That was yesterday.

He called and went through another lengthy process, to be told again what he has heard before. He can't see the plans on the site, but the operator could read plan information to him. Paulauskis isn't comfortable making a decision without seeing all the options in writing. The supervisor handling his call told him she could put in a work order and someone would call him back. She put in a work order. Paulauskis said he has made such a request five times since the marketplace opened and has yet, Mr. Speaker, to get a response.

Now, who is Mr. PAULauskis? Well, he is a former college professor and he has a doctorate degree. He is a Ph.D. Paulauskis said he has probably spent more than 80 hours on the ObamaCare application process without being able to actually shop for a plan.

That didn't change on Monday with the improvements to the marketplace Web site that you are hearing this administration, President Obama and

Secretary Sebelius, saying: We're there. We have spent $600 million. It didn't work. So we brought in new, bright gurus, and they have been working 24/7 over the last 3 or 4 weeks, and now we have got it fixed.

And we don't have it fixed. Forty percent of it hasn't even been built. Twenty percent absolutely are going to be in a terrible bind come January 1 if they have lost their health insurance coverage that they previously had and they don't have any coverage; in other words, they are just going bare.

They don't intend to do that. They wanted to keep the insurance they had because they liked it. They found out that that was not true. I will be kind and use the word ''mendacity,'' rather than a lie. But it was pure mendacity. They weren't able to keep it.

And so if you can't sign up during that 5-week period, which is over Monday, this coming Monday, you can't get signed up and have coverage by January 1. My goodness gracious, what if your child gets run over by a car or you have a heart attack in the week or month or however much time it takes after January 1, if you are in that 20 percent group, to finally get coverage? By that time, you are truly, if you survive, bankrupt because of medical expenses that are not covered.

These stories were printed in the AJC, Mr. Speaker. There are plenty of others that have not been published.

Let me share with you a few other stories from my constituents back in the 11th Congressional District of Georgia about the lack of affordable options ObamaCare offers them.

Mike told me that ObamaCare ''has been a financial disaster for his family.'' It used to cost him just under $300 a month to cover his wife and daughter on their insurance plan. Under ObamaCare, that lowest level plan is the bronze plan. There are four choices. Gold, I guess, is the most expensive and covers the most things. It probably has the highest deductible. But under that bronze plan, instead of $300 a month, now he is going to pay, Mr. Speaker, $700 a month. And guess what? His deductible is $5,000. So he has to pay $5,000 out of pocket before insurance kicks in. He is paying $400 more a month. That is $4,800 plus the $5,000. His new plan under ObamaCare, because he is not eligible for any subsidy, is costing him about $10,000 more a year.

Teresa and her husband from Cartersville, Bartow County, one of the great counties in the 11th Congressional District, told me that their premium is increasing from $550 to more than $900 per month. That is almost, Mr. Speaker, a 40 percent increase.

Robert from metro Atlanta told me that, even though they were underwritten in June, his wife's policy has increased from $387 to $557 a month. And that increase is 30 percent. It is getting a little better, but, gee, a 30 percent increase?

When President Obama talked about his great new health care plan, the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, he said that, on average, families would see a $2,500 per year reduction in what they are paying for health care. Mr. Speaker, let's go back to the word ''mendacity.'' Nothing could be further from the truth. The average increase is probably $2,500 a year, not a decrease. This is truly unacceptable that with new mandates in insurance markets concerning essential health benefits premiums have to increase.

And now we finally find out that Ms. PELOSI was absolutely right. Wait until you read it and find out what is in it. Where she was wrong is when she said then you would like it. I think the latest statistics that I read, Mr. Speaker, show that 61 percent of people today are opposed to ObamaCare—61 percent. That is a lot. That means 39 percent either don't have an opinion either way or are not sure or maybe they approve of it. But those are dismal, dismal numbers.

We have seen more insurance policies canceled than created as consumers are faced with this sticker shock, all in the name of a bill that was sold to the American people as a way to lower the uninsured rate.

Another statistic that I read just recently, and this is verifiable, when this bill was being talked about—again, back in 2009, shortly after Mr. Obama became our 44th President—it was estimated that there were something like 47 million people in this country, Mr. Speaker, who, through no fault of their own except couldn't afford it, didn't have health insurance.

Well, go through those numbers. And I have a book with me that I am going to reference, and I want to give proper attribution. The name of the book is, ''The Top Ten Myths of American Health Care: A Citizen's Guide.'' Maybe it could be ''A Patient's Guide,'' and this is written by Sally Pipes.

She talks in this book about that 47 million. Something like 15 million of those 47 million make more than $50,000 a year. Indeed, some make more than $75,000 a year, Mr. Speaker. They have just decided that they don't want health insurance; they will pay as they go. And there is nothing wrong with that. I don't advise it. I think everybody should at least have catastrophic coverage. But be that as it may, this is America. We have to insist on enjoying our liberties to do what we want to do with our hard-earned tax dollars and our own money.

There are probably 10 million, maybe, of these that don't have health insurance that are in this country illegally. There may be another 6, 8, maybe even 10 million of that 47 million who are eligible for a safety net program like Medicaid and they just have not gotten the proper information or not bothered to go find out if they were eligible. A lot of the people that are signing up now are those individuals.

So when you get right down to it, there will probably be not 47 million, but about 15 million that were falling through the cracks.

What we have done has thrown out a market-driven health care system that is not perfect. I guarantee you, I agree with that. It is too expensive. And yes, indeed, we Republicans have some other ideas.

I am going to yield in just a minute, Mr. Speaker, to my colleague, the cochair with me of the House GOP Doctors Caucus, the gentleman from Tennessee, fellow OB/GYN, Dr. PHIL ROE, and he is going to talk about some of those Republican alternatives, or maybe even Democratic alternatives, because I think that is what it is going to come to.

We have to repeal this law and not be embarrassed about it. If you made a mistake, you made a mistake. Own up to the American people that this is a bad law and repeal it and start over. But I am saying start over in a bipartisan way, and we can do that.

We have got some thoughts on that, and I am going to, at this point, yield to Dr. ROE for his comments.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I appreciate the opportunity to be down here on the House floor today to discuss, Mr. Speaker, this extremely important issue of health care. One of the reasons that it is so important is that it affects every single American citizen in a personal way.

As Dr. GINGREY said, I spent 31 years practicing medicine and teaching in medical school in Johnson City, Tennessee. I know the thing that I saw as the biggest issue and problem in health care—and Dr. GINGREY did also—was the cost of care. I saw the cost going up, and I saw more and more people that didn't have access to affordable health insurance coverage.

And I say this as a joke, but it is true. I have never seen a Republican or Democrat heart attack in my life. I have never operated on a Republic or Democrat cancer in my life, and I have operated on many of them. These are people issues. And why in the world we passed a partisan health care bill makes no sense to me whatsoever, Mr. Speaker. I never understood that for now going on 5 years later.

□ 1615

We should have sat down in that bipartisan way and talked about, as Dr. GINGREY so eloquently explained, taking care of those 15 or 20 million people, whatever the number is. We could do that. Let me just give you some data from my own State.

In 2011, we had 2½ percent of our children in our State who didn't have health insurance coverage. We are not a wealthy State, and about 10 percent of the population—1 in 10 Tennesseans—didn't have access to coverage. Not everybody had a Cadillac plan, but they had basic health coverage. We did this massive, 2,700-page bill, which I have read. I almost hate to admit that I have read it all, but I

have. We did this with now tens of thousands of pages of rules that add absolutely no value for patients whatsoever. It doesn't pay for anybody's prescriptions. It doesn't pay for operations, hospitalizations, immunizations, and so on—none of those things.

So, Mr. Speaker, I certainly see the need for health care reform—I totally agree with that—but on the premise that if we repeal the Affordable Care Act we will go back to where we were is not true at all.

Again, let me say this—and I believe this to the core of what I did for 30-plus years, and I believe it today. It is that health care decisions should be made between a patient, that patient's family, and his doctor. They shouldn't be made by an insurance company. They shouldn't be made by a clerk at the insurance company. They shouldn't be made by the Federal Government.

I think one of the problems with the rollout of the Affordable Care Act—and it was absolutely predictable what would happen when you listed the Essential Health Benefits. Mr. Speaker, if you had read the bill and if you had ever run a business, as I had, you would know that you make some changes in your health insurance. Every year, we did this. It was, maybe, the copay or the out-of-pocket or something that changed in that bill. Maybe it was a new procedure. If you the read the bill, it said, if those things changed in any significant way, you lost your grandfathered status.

I apologize if Dr. GINGREY has already done this, but I want to read the Essential Health Benefits that are required for you to buy and purchase. There are 10 categories: ambulatory patient services; emergency services; hospitalization; maternity and newborn services.

Let me just point out that one of my friends who is a sheriff—Sheriff Seals in Sevier County, Tennessee—came to me the other day when I was visiting there. He said he had a friend who had just lost her insurance because she is 55 years of age and has had a hysterectomy. Her insurance plan, which met all of her needs, did not include maternity coverage, so she lost her health insurance, as almost 90,000 Tennesseans have done.

Mental health and substance abuse disorder services, including behavioral health treatment; prescription drugs; rehabilitative and habilitative services; devices; laboratory services; preventative and wellness services; chronic disease management; pediatric services, including oral and dental and vision care.

Those are things that you have to have in a plan or you lose your coverage.

Remember now that this is only affecting about 18 or 20 million people. Next year, when the employer mandate kicks in—the employer reporting requirement kicks in—many people on ERISA, or if you get health insurance through your job, through your work—if you don't hit these benchmarks, guess what? You're going to lose grandfathered status. That is why these staggering numbers are 50 to 100 million people, because, right now, Mr. Speaker, about 160 million people and their families in our country get insurance through their employment. So that is what we are facing.

Now, we mentioned what the Affordable Care Act promised it would do, and Dr. GINGREY has pointed this out very well. He has pointed out the promises that were made:

Universal coverage, that we are going to cover everybody. It didn't do that;

No new taxes on the middle class. Boy, is that ever something that wasn't true;

An annual savings of $2,500. We have heard the President say that on numerous occasions. That is not true;

No increase in the deficit. We already know that this bill is going to cost some two or three times what it was purported to cost;

Then I think the most famous one we have all heard now enough times is that, if you like your doctor, you can keep him. If you like your health insurance plan, you can keep it. Not true.

We were tasked on the Republican Study Committee, the health committee, to come up with a market-centered approach to health care, which would include no new taxes, no mandates, and would maintain the doctor-patient relationship. It is a very short bill of 180 pages. It had been reviewed, back during the Bush administration, to increase by 9 to 11 million people who would have health insurance and, we think, far more than that. There are six titles to this bill, and they are very simple to understand:

One is to overturn the Affordable Care Act. That is No. 1.

No. 2 is to equalize the tax treatment between an individual and a company. What does that mean? I will use myself as an example. When I worked for my medical group, my health insurance was deductible. I then retired from that group to run for Congress, and when I then had to go buy health insurance, I had to pay first dollar. I couldn't deduct it. This simply says, if you are an individual out there or a farmer or a small business person, you get to deduct your health expenses just exactly like a huge company like Dow Chemical can do. So it treats you the same as an individual. That is a mistake that was made 60 years ago in the tax law that we correct.

We massively expand health savings accounts. I use a health savings account. What is that? It is when you put pretax dollars away in your own account, and if you don't spend them on health care, you get to keep them. I will use myself as an example again. We had a health savings account for 2 years that we started 7 years ago. I still have $6,000 in that account that I can use for preventative services, for buying prescription drugs—for lots of things that my insurance doesn't cover. If it is above a $5,000 deductible, my insurance is 100 percent covered—all the costs.

Guess who would have had that $6,000 if I didn't have it? The insurance company would have had it as a profit. This allows you and your doctor to make those decisions. We expand those to veterans, to seniors.

We also do medical liability reform. Dr. GINGREY has a wonderful bill that we do that for.

We also allow you to buy across State lines. The only insurance you cannot purchase is health insurance across a State line. You can buy life, fire. I, personally, have never seen an insurance agent. I have always used the Web, and have bought my insurance across State lines. You can do that, and you can form association health plans. Let's say large church groups want to get together. Instead of small churches at which there is one pastor or two, you can join with larger churches and groups across, maybe, an entire region of the country and get thousands of people. That helps take care of preexisting conditions, and we also have a high-risk pool for preexisting conditions.

Lastly, there is no funding for abortion services.

So it is a very simple bill. It is patient-centered and market-oriented, and it will work.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Tennessee for being with us during this hour.

I want to hold up this card so our colleagues can see. Basically, this is the bill that Dr. ROE—Representative ROE from Tennessee—is the author of, and I am a proud cosponsor. It is called the American Health Care Reform Act. Dr. ROE described many of the aspects of this, I think, 180-page bill. It is not a 2,700-page bill but a 180-page bill.

As he points out—and I said this a little earlier, Mr. Speaker—this bill, the American Health Care Reform Act, a Republican alternative—and we do have alternatives—first and foremost fully repeals the President's health care law, ObamaCare. It ends billions in taxes. It eliminates thousands of pages of unworkable mandates and regulations that literally—and I am not kidding you—are 8-feet high. I am not barely 6-feet tall, so just imagine that. It forces millions of Americans to lose access to their health plans and gets Federal bureaucrats, like IRS agents, out of health care decisions.

What do they know about doctor-patient relationships? They don't know a thing about that.

There are just seven bullet points on here, but they are good, commonsense, market-driven reforms.

Dr. ROE talked about tax reform, which allows families to deduct health care costs. If they are sole proprietors—somebody who is a craftsman, who makes furniture in his or her basement, and maybe it is a husband and

wife team—they don't get this break on their health insurance that Dr. ROE said was kind of artificially created back in World War II, back in 1942 or 1943. When wage and price controls were put in place and when companies, big companies, couldn't attract new workers because they couldn't pay them enough—they couldn't give them a decent raise—they started providing free health care, but the individual didn't get that break.

So that is just one of the seven. I won't read all of them because we have been joined also by a great member of the House GOP Doctors Caucus, the gentlewoman from North Carolina. Her husband is a general surgeon, and she was a surgical nurse before Congress, and is, as I say, a member of the House GOP Doctors Caucus. She knows of what she speaks.

I yield to Representative RENEE ELLMERS.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Thank you so much for this opportunity to speak here with the Doctors Caucus on these very important issues.

You were bringing up a very important piece to this puzzle. As far as the American people are concerned with their health care, they want Washington bureaucrats out of the examining room and not between them and their doctors. Patients want to be able to have that relationship with their doctors.

Do you know what? I am sorry. If anything has played out over this very short period of time since October 1 with the failure of the Web site rollout, we have seen that Washington has absolutely no business in health care. This is only going to continue to play out, so I just want to take a few moments and speak on some of the issues that continue to remain in these failures of the Web site.

I think the administration has spent over $630 million now, with 50 contractors, fixing this Web site—this Web site that we were promised for so long was going to be ready: online, on time, working great for the American people. We know that that is simply not the case. Once again, it is the tip of the iceberg when it comes to the failures that we will learn about in the future on health care.

I am here today to talk about how this is affecting American families and those who are reaching out to me in my district, the Second District of North Carolina.

ObamaCare is turning family budgets upside down and is inflicting unnecessary pain on millions of Americans. Millions of Americans now have learned that their health care policies have been canceled, and it clearly states: due to the Affordable Care Act. Nationwide, women in this country make the health care decisions. Over 80 percent of the health care decisions that are made are made by women. That means that wives, mothers, or single women who are choosing health care coverage for themselves have now been told by the President and the Democrats who voted for this bill, and who knew full well that you wouldn't be able to keep your health care plan if you liked it: Do you know what? What you chose for you and your family—what was affordable to you—is not adequate, and we know better than you do for your family.

I think that is an incredible problem, and that it has been overlooked by this administration and our Democrat friends.

How many times do we hear that Republicans don't understand women's issues? How many times do we hear about the war on women that continues to be displayed by our friends across the aisle? This is truly the war on women. Taking away health care coverage for millions of women in this country is truly the war on women.

That is why we as Republicans have been working so hard to do everything we can to stop this process of ObamaCare's moving forward. Yes, we have voted over and over again to repeal it, and for good reason, and we are seeing how it is being played out now—for these very reasons. This is not patient-centered reform. This is not about good patient care. This is not only going to completely and totally—disastrously—affect the health care coverage in this country but also health care, itself, because, as you know, one plays into the other.

I am worried about what is going to happen to our physicians over time. We know that that part of the Web site hasn't even been built yet. Physicians aren't even sure what they are going to be paid, and patients aren't even sure what coverage they will be able to receive, what treatments they will be able to receive and which doctors they will be able to go to.

□ 1630

Think about the women in this country, the moms who are going to find out over the next couple of months that the pediatricians that they have come to know and trust they are no longer able to bring their children to. Think about our parents, the seniors who are receiving treatment right now at a different hospital system, in a different health care system that are going to find out they can no longer receive their treatment there because the networks have been narrowed so incredibly. This is what is going to play out over the next couple of months.

On the front page of today's Washington Post, it reads: ''Healthcare.gov Makes Frequent Enrollment Errors.'' Right there. After, again, all the millions of dollars that have been spent and we still have errors.

This isn't what we have come to know in America. We know that 3-year-old children can get online and get on their iPads and go to town and understand computer systems and what-not, and we can't even build a Web site that will allow patients in this country, families in this country to navigate to get basic health care coverage. That is a problem.

But there, again, that is why the Federal Government should not be in health care. That is why government bureaucrats should not be standing in between patients and their doctors.

This comes only days after the Obama administration claimed victory for fixing the disaster-prone Web site and rebranding the error messages that continue to pop up as a ''queuing system.'' Since day one, ObamaCare has been a complete disaster, and it is only getting worse.

As The Washington Post points out, those who have enrolled through the online marketplace may soon discover that their application contains errors. These errors have been generated by the computer system, which means even if they were one of the few to successfully enroll, they can still find themselves without coverage over the next few months.

There, again, think about what is going to happen January 1 when there are patients that think they have health care coverage and they are going to go to the doctor only to find out that they are not even within the system. Those failures include the notification of insurers about new customers, duplicate enrollment and cancelations, and incorrect information about family members and the States involving Federal subsidies.

I thank my dear colleague for, again, allowing us to speak out on these issues because it cannot be stated enough how important it is that we be pointing out the inefficiencies that are created with ObamaCare—the Affordable Care Act—which we all know now is completely and totally unaffordable.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady from North Carolina.

It is now my pleasure to yield time to the gentleman from Indiana, Representative and Dr. LARRY BUCSHON, a cardiothoracic surgeon, and also a member of the House GOP Doctors Caucus.

Mr. BUCSHON. Thank you, Dr. GINGREY, and thanks again for having this time for the Doctors Caucus to talk about health care reform.

What I want to focus on in my brief time is the Republican alternatives that we have had all along. When the Affordable Care Act was brought to the floor, there was only one amendment allowed, and that was a ''motion to recommit'' amendment, and guess what, the Republicans had an alternative health care plan which we put forth.

Since that time, we have had multiple plans, almost 200 other proposals from Republicans, to reform the health care system in a patient-centered way. As a physician, that is what we want. We want this to be focused around the patient, not around Washington bureaucrats, not around decisions made here in Washington. We want patients to have access to quality affordable care. We want everyone to have that,

just like the Democrats say that they do, even though with their plan, the Affordable Care Act, in 2023 the CBO says 31 million people will still be uninsured, which is a fact that not a lot of people are looking at in the media at this point. But we have had all kinds of alternatives.

Dr. TOM PRICE has had a bill that he has put up many times, H.R. 2300, in this Congress. The Republican Study Committee in this Congress, led by Dr. ROE, has a very good health care reform proposal, and, again, along with almost 200 other proposals to reform health care.

So I want to dispel this myth that Republicans don't have alternatives to a near-government takeover of the health care system. As Congresswoman ELLMERS just stated, that is the plan here. The plan is to have the government nearly control the system, and we can't have the government in health care because it doesn't work.

We are finding that out now with what is happening with the Affordable Care Act. Access is actually going to be inhibited by the Affordable Care Act. In some States, 80 to 90 percent of the people signing up for the Affordable Care Act are in the Medicaid program, a program already underfunded, a program already that is poor insurance that limits the very access to health care that we are all fighting for.

The exchanges, which are going to be overly costly, look at the deductibles you are seeing in some plans across the country, look at the price you are seeing on the monthly payments across the country. Again, over 5 million people had health care that they liked, but they have lost it. We may see 50 million people or so next year when the delayed employer mandate comes into place that was unilaterally delayed by the administration, I would argue, against the will of Congress because it was in the law and is in the law.

So I want to just focus on the fact that Republicans have alternatives. The GOP Doctors Caucus has been involved in all of these. I don't recall, but you probably can tell me, were you consulted in 2009, the doctors in Congress, when the health care law was passed? From what everybody tells me, no. The answer to that question is, no. If you were going to talk to anyone about what might be good health care reform, wouldn't you think you would actually consult with people that have been in the field practicing medicine for years—the doctors, the nurses, the other health care providers in Congress that could give you that firsthand experience that they have had in the health care system as part of the equation if you are going to do this right?

So, again, Republicans are for patient-centered health care reform. We realize that people were uninsured; we realize that the cost is too high. We want to bend the cost curve, get people insured by getting the cost of health care down and making sure that all of our patients have access to quality, affordable health care in a timely manner without Washington, D.C., government bureaucrats telling them what is a good policy, what is a bad policy and, I will argue, in the future telling them what is good health care and what isn't.

With that, Dr. GINGREY, I yield back.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank Dr. BUCSHON, the gentleman from Indiana, for those remarks.

I want to read a little bit from one chapter in Sally Pipes' book ''The Top Ten Myths of American Health Care.'' The title of this chapter, Mr. Speaker, is ''Solutions: Markets, Consumer Choice, and Innovation.'' That is really what Dr. ROE's bill is all about, the American Health Care Reform Act.

Listen to this. Listen to what Sally Pipes says:

> None of the preceding chapters is meant to suggest that America's health care system is perfect. It is not. Costs are high, and too many Americans get left behind. Reform is desperately needed.
>
> But true reform of the health care system requires less government interference—not more. Only with a freer market can we lower costs and achieve quality universal health care. If we have universal choice in health care, we will reach universal coverage—a goal supported by all of us.

Republicans and Democrats.

Now, consider this: Mr. Speaker, I know you are familiar with LASIK corrective eye surgery. Most insurance providers, including government programs, won't cover the procedure. The market isn't distorted by excessive regulations. Providers operate in a free market where technology is constantly advancing, price competition is fierce, and the consumer is the king. Companies rise and fall according to their ability to provide customer satisfaction.

In the past decade, more than 3 million LASIK procedures have been performed. During that time, the average price of LASIK eye surgery has dropped nearly 40 percent from $2,200 per eye to $1,350 per eye. Unfortunately, LASIK is a rare exception to the general rule.

In just about every other area of health care, the government is heavily—heavily—involved. So the key to lowering cost and expanding coverage is to expand the LASIK model. That means encouraging competition by decreasing the government's role in the health care marketplace, not increasing it.

Again, she goes on to mention many of these bullet points in Dr. ROE's bill, the American Health Care Reform Act—a better way, indeed a better way.

At this point, I have just a few more minutes remaining, and I want to yield back to Dr. ROE.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Just a couple of points I would like to make, Dr. GINGREY.

This bill is not perfect, and it is open for amendment, as opposed to the Affordable Care Act that was not open for amendment. As I recall—you and I were both here then; that was my first term—when we had that debate, some 80 amendments were brought to the Rules Committee here and none of them—none, zero—was ruled germane to the bill.

As Dr. BUCSHON was speaking, there were nine of us physicians in the Doctors Caucus 5 years ago. Not one of us was consulted about the health care bill. Really rather astonishing, I thought.

And to Congresswoman ELLMERS—she made a point a minute ago and wasn't as passionate about it as I am—I think one of the most arrogant things I have heard stated in this town was that what you have bought that you like is no good. I still find that amazing that somebody—a talking head—could be on television and say with a straight face, not knowing what I purchased that I am perfectly happy with, that it is no good. That is beyond arrogance. We have heard people over and over in this town say that very thing.

That is why people are turning against this. When you tell me when I have sat down with my family and worked out what I can buy, and it seems to work for me just fine, that it is no good, that I know what is better because I have got it right here that you have to buy, that is the height of arrogance. I just was a little more passionate about it.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Well, reclaiming my time and yielding it back to Representative ELLMERS, let's hear some more passion from the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Thank you to my kind doctor colleagues on that issue.

Dr. ROE, you hit on one of the very important parts, again, which is if you had something that works for you, if a mom was buying health care coverage for her family, she was the one that did the research, she was the one that did the time, she picked the appropriate plan. Maybe it was offered through an employer; maybe it was an individual plan. But she sat down at her kitchen table and decided what was working for her, and guess what, now the Obama administration says no.

And I agree with some of the talking heads that are out there on the 24-hour news cycles telling everyone that these plans were subpar, that they weren't adequate. The constituents who are reaching out to me are saying, I liked my plan.

I was having my hair done the other day and my hair stylist, Cindy, and her husband, Lee, they have a health care plan. She said, RENEE, I don't understand this. I had a health care plan that Lee and I picked. We have had this plan, we like our plan, it is affordable to us, it is providing the health care coverage that we need, and now I am being told that it is not adequate and the cost of my premiums every month are going to go up and my deductible is going up. For what?

Well, I will point out to you one of the issues. One of the flaws that the Obama administration and our President himself has made over time is saying that as people learn about this

thing—because if you remember when it was passed, and you were here, you both were here, they said, oh, well, let's just get it passed and then we are all going to find out what is in it. Some of our esteemed colleagues across the aisle had made that comment; and now when the American people are finding out what is in it, they don't like it. Things are changing. They are finding out what is in it, they don't like it, and they are rejecting it.

One of the reasons that those costs have gone up is the essential health benefits that have to be covered. For every American, there are 10 essential health benefits. My friend Cindy, she and her husband do not have children, and yet they are forced to purchase maternity coverage; they are forced to purchase pediatric coverage.

Now, these are wonderful things for families, young families, growing families; but they are not appropriate for every American. So what is lacking here in ObamaCare is choice, the ability to choose your plan. I am all for getting health care coverage for every American. I want every American to be able to have affordable health care coverage; but you can't do it by forcing individuals to buy something that they will never use, they will never need, paying a premium price, and costs out of pocket. I am sorry, it is just not affordable for American families.

□ 1645

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Reclaiming my time, as we draw to a close, I said earlier, 61 percent of the American people are opposed even today, 3½ years after passage of this law, and they can't even get on the Web site. They can't get signed up. Wait until they get signed up and find out what they are going to have to pay and the amount of the deductible. I guess I would call that sticker shock. I think instead of 61 percent, it will be 80 percent will be opposed to it.

I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Just one comment. I tried today for the sixth time to get signed up, and I couldn't. So I am going back Thursday for the seventh time.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Reclaiming my time as I close, I tried to get on today. I couldn't. I got the error message. I didn't even get put in the queue to make it a little softer. I got the error message and got kicked offline—and Monday is the last day. So I am going back to my office to try to get on once again. I am really feeling for the patients, the American people, the seniors who are in one heck of a mess because of this not well-thought-out, rushed bill that was totally partisan. You just can't do that in this Congress with a bill this important. We are talking about human lives here; life and death, and that is not the way to do it.

We will come back with a solution, and I hope we will do that in a bipartisan way. I love the American Health Care Reform Act. I am a cosponsor.

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

DON'T REPEAT NORTH KOREA MISTAKE WITH IRAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, well, we got a notice: All House Member briefing: Iran, Wednesday, December 4, 9 a.m. The briefing team, right at the top of the list, Ambassador Wendy Sherman, Under Secretary of Political Affairs.

So that was thrilling. I recognize that name, Wendy Sherman, who is going to give the House a briefing in the morning at 9 a.m. on how good things have gone in the dealings with Iran.

As The Wall Street Journal article from November 20 points out, the Clinton administration's policy coordinator for North America, Wendy Sherman, is now the Obama administration's lead negotiator for the Iran nuclear talks.

In a 2001 New York Times op-ed, Ms. Sherman urged President Bush to cut a deal, writing that Kim Jong Il ''appears ready to make landmark commitments because to ensure the survival of his regime, he has to improve the country's disastrous economy by reducing the burden of a vast missile program and opening the doors to trade.''

Well, Ms. Sherman was wrong about that in her op-ed she wrote in 2001. Kim Jong Il needed to help his economy, she was right about that, but she thought it meant that he was ready to get rid of his ballistic missile program and open the doors more to trade. Well, certainly they were willing to open the doors to trade. But just as she had been wrong in 1994 when she helped the Clinton administration work out an amazing deal with North Korea, and to recap the highlights of that deal with North Korea, Korea was believed to be pursuing nuclear weapons so Ms. Sherman was the policy coordinator for North Korea involved in this process. She, Madeleine Albright and President Clinton thought, what a great thing, we will give you nuclear reactors, nuclear power plants, give you some fuel, and in return, you have to renounce nuclear weapons and you have to promise not to pursue nuclear weapons.

Wow. Oh, there was one other thing. The Clinton administration, Wendy Sherman, Madeleine Albright agreed to a provision which would have prevented them and did prevent them from inspecting the North Korean nuclear facilities for at least 5 or so years, which ended up being enough time for them to pursue their nuclear weapons. I mean for President Clinton, Madeleine Albright and Wendy Sherman kind of remind me of the repossession guy that Jeff Foxworthy talked about coming to his house when he was poor telling him he hadn't made his payment in months and so he had to take his car, and Foxworthy begging him not to take the car, and he has to have it to make a living. He said the guy said I have to leave with the car or cash or a check, to which Foxworthy said he replied, ''You'll take a check. Well, why didn't you say you will take a check. Sure, I can write you a check.''

Well, that is what the North Koreans did. Oh, you mean in return for new, sophisticated nuclear power plants and fuel, you will take just a promise from us that we won't pursue nuclear weapons? Well, why didn't you say that. Sure, we will promise anything you want in return for nuclear weapon fuel and nuclear power plants that we can use for our own benefit. Sure, we will make those promises. Any other promises you want?

I mean, how gullible does an administration have to be to believe that a promise from a rogue regime is worth basing the future safety of your citizens upon? Well, we don't have an answer to how gullible you have to be because this administration is now doing the same thing. It wasn't enough that Wendy Sherman was wrong in 1994 and wrong in 2001 in her op-ed; now she is the lead negotiator with Iran, and she is going to brief Members of the House here tomorrow.

How gullible are we? There is no requirement that we have to be as gullible as this administration. I mean, sure maybe you believe an administration when they say if you like your insurance, you can keep it. Maybe you believe that administration when they say if you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor, period. Maybe the House is gullible enough, or maybe the majority at one time was gullible enough to believe that, and did. In fact, people in this room actually repeated those promises, making them themselves. But how many times do you have to be shown that people making the promises are wrong before you get skeptical?

Now on top of all of the broken promises about ObamaCare, we have an administration promising us that we can trust Iran, that we have made a great deal. They have made us some promises, just like North Korea did, and we know we can trust them because the only thing at stake is the existence of the nation of Israel and the existence of the United States without nuclear weapons going off in it. That is all that is at stake. Or perhaps an EMP caused by a nuclear weapon that is shot off from an intercontinental ballistic missile. It doesn't even have to be that accurate. If it goes off near the middle of the United States, certain range of elevation, then it will fry most every computer chip, and we are going to be in trouble. Grocery stores cannot operate appropriately without their computer systems. Wal-Mart. There are all kinds of places that won't be able to

operate appropriately. Most everybody's cars now rely on computer chips. Our military is very reliant on computer chips. Yet this administration says now Iran is somebody we can trust.

I keep coming back to what some allied leaders said back in September in the Middle East: Do you guys not realize that you are now helping the people that attacked you, the organizations that attacked you on 9/11? That make up the Taliban, Muslim Brotherhood background; al Qaeda, Muslim Brotherhood background. I mean, what do you not realize that allows you to now help the people you are at war with or supposed to be at war with? I say the word ''war,'' and of course this administration has made clear, we are not at war with anybody. According to this administration, we are trying to counter violent extremism, but we don't talk about terrorism. We don't talk about radical Islam. We have stripped that from our training manuals because it may offend and does offend radical Islamists that want to destroy us and kill us. So we don't want to do anything that might offend the people who want to kill us. You know, there was a time in this country when if another group declared war on us, then we fought them. We weren't going to let them win that war against us.

This administration thinks you can make a great deal with Iran just like the Clinton administration did with North Korea and stop their nuclear proliferation right in its tracks. I would humbly submit, Mr. Speaker, it will be just as effective, less so, than the deal with North Korea was.

Iran has been crippled by sanctions, but sanctions were not going to stop Iran from developing nuclear weapons. They have consulted with, they have learned from North Korea how you game the system. All you have to do is enter into talks with a Democratic administration like the Clinton administration or the Obama administration, and they will cut you a deal. They will even help you get nuclear material. All you have to do is write them a check, and on that check say we promise not to pursue nuclear weapons. Heck, the United States under the Clinton administration, they have shown they will even agree not to inspect your nuclear facility, which will allow you to finish your nuclear weapons.

Well, Israel understands what a tremendous mistake this is because they are too close. Their existence rides on not making a mistake of the calamitous nature that this will be, and this is.

So it is amazing, though. You know, people stood up and made America all kinds of promises about ObamaCare, and it turns out, at the time promises were made about ObamaCare, they had already had the discussion and knew that people wouldn't be able to keep their insurance if they wanted it, and knew they wouldn't be able to keep their doctor if they wanted it. So what did they do? They said, we have a Presidential election coming up and it won't sound good to use words like ''if you like your doctor, there is a chance you might can keep your doctor.'' That won't sell good in the election. ''If you like your insurance, there is a chance you might can keep your insurance,'' that won't sell, so we have to go out and tell what is not true so we can win the next election.

How about that Benghazi? Let's keep that under wraps. We know it was an attack by an al Qaeda-affiliated group. Of course, there might have been some concerns that they used the very weapons that this administration supplied to the al Qaeda-infused rebels that may have been turned on our State Department personnel, our Ambassador, and they didn't send anybody to help them. They did not send anybody to help them.

□ 1700

We had planes, we had personnel that could have gotten to Benghazi and at least saved the last two of the four, could have saved Dave Ubben's leg, could have saved a lot of damage, could have saved a lot of the classified material being out there for a month or so for anybody who wanted to get it. It could have saved all of that, but no one was sent.

People want to believe promises that are made by their own government, especially when it pertains to something as important as their own health, their own health care, or the defense of their Nation when it is at risk. Well, it is at risk. There are people who are at war with us. They have been at war with us since 1979. We didn't really fully appreciate it until 2001 on 9/11.

And now we have an administration that has completely failed to realize that the people who declared war on us in 1979, who want shari'a law to govern the world, who want a worldwide caliphate over which the 12th imam will rule the world—some of them believe Jesus will come and fight at his side—this administration does not understand they have never given up on their goals.

Thank God that most Muslims do not believe the radical Islamist approach to Islam. I am grateful. But it is crazy not to realize that there are radical Islamists that want to destroy our way of life.

As the Obama administration was bragging over their great deal with Iran, we got word yesterday that Iran announces—this is an article from the Washington Free Beacon—a second nuclear reactor. And the leader, Rouhani, says, ''Our enrichment will never stop.'' So much for this administration's misplaced belief in Iran honesty.

These leaders are at war with us. They want to destroy us. They want to destroy Israel. How can we get someone in this administration to take notice?

Mr. Speaker, I have the answer. It is when people in the United States Senate and enough people here in the House say, Mr. President, you can't do this kind of damage. We know it is innocent. We know you think this is the way to go. But we know you can't trust Iran, you can't trust the Ayatollah Khamenei, you could not trust the Ayatollah Khomeini, you could not trust Ahmadinejad. Just because they have got a different President, they have still got the different leader.

By the way, we didn't used to call the Ayatollah Khomeini the ''supreme leader,'' just like U.S. leaders didn't used to call Hitler ''mein fuhrer.'' He was not entitled to that title. He was an evil man. I personally don't think it is appropriate for any United States leader to call someone who hates Israel and hates America and wants them wiped off the map and thinks that the 12th imam is coming and will one day rule over the area in which Israel is, the area in which the United States is, that we should not be calling that man ''supreme leader.'' It is the same thing as calling him ''mein fuhrer.'' You don't do it. This administration has not learned that lesson.

So Iran announced that they are still not going to comply with what the Obama administration says they have agreed to do, yet this administration is still sending the former Clinton North Korean policy director, a former Democrat who was advising President Bush in an op-ed to cut a deal with Kim Jong Il, that he really wants to make a deal, kind of like North Korea did in 1994. She was wrong in 1994. She was wrong in 2001. She is wrong now about Iran.

We are told that those who refuse to learn from history are destined to repeat it. When there is enough arrogance that anyone, any leader thinks that they are smarter, wiser, and better than anyone who has gone before, therefore, they can make a better deal with corrupt and evil people like no one else has made, then their name goes down in history just as Neville Chamberlain's has. He waived his peace agreement, which he agreed to give away part of Europe to his fuhrer thinking it meant peace in his time. What it meant was his ignorance and naivete was going to cost millions of people their lives.

History is there for people who are willing to study and learn from it. I shutter for the people in Israel. I shutter for people in the United States that think we are invulnerable. The only way the United States could possibly stay invulnerable for a while longer is if its leaders realized we are vulnerable and we have to stay prepared, we have to stay vigilant, and we have to stay on the lookout for people that want to destroy our country. Yet they would rather make a deal with the lying cutthroats who lead Iran than they would sit down and work out an agreement with Republicans in the House of Representatives.

We were willing the night of the shutdown. We were willing the day before the shutdown. We compromised

three different times, and HARRY REID refused to even allow negotiators to be appointed. We appointed ours. People say Republicans shut down the House, shut down the government. We didn't do that. HARRY REID did that. He refused to even negotiate. It was his way completely.

He asked a question when the press was there. Not many of them reported on how ridiculous the question was. But he asked the question of, basically, what right do they, the House of Representatives, have to say what government programs get funded and which do not?

Well, I asked that exact question to four constitutional experts that testified before our Judiciary Committee today. One clearly was a defender of the Obama administration, yet all four of the witnesses—brilliant, constitutional scholars, even though we have our disagreements. These were brilliant people, and every one of them had the same answer for HARRY REID's question. The answer is the United States Constitution, article I, section 8. It gave Congress control of the purse strings, and it gave the House a little more control than the Senate. The Senate has got to go along with whatever legislation is going to become law.

But he asked the question, and I put this question to our experts: Suppose you were in a town hall meeting with constituents back in a congressional district and an elementary schoolchild asked the question, What right does the House of Representatives have to decide which government programs get funded and which do not? They unhesitatingly said the answer is our Constitution, article I, section 8. They all agreed. They all knew immediately.

So I have asked that the chairman of the Judiciary Committee make that testimony available to our dear friend, the Senate majority leader down the hall, so he won't have to ask that question to reporters who are not familiar with the answer. We can get it to him straight from some of the greatest constitutional minds on both sides of any aisle, and he will understand it is the Constitution that gives us the right to have a say.

For HARRY REID to shut down the government by saying you are either going to give us every dime that we demand or the government will be shut down is really outrageous. They shut the government down. We even gave them an out.

There is a wise Chinese saying that says, it is good to give your adversary a graceful way to exit. We gave the Senate majority Democrats a graceful way to exit by saying, Look, you don't want to completely defund ObamaCare; we get it. We think that is the best idea for America. Here is a compromise. Let's just suspend the whole bill for a year.

HARRY REID could have taken that and said, We don't want to do this, but the Republicans in the House are making us hold off on all of ObamaCare for a year. Gosh, golly gee, we didn't want to, but they are making us.

That was a graceful way that they could have exited. But they were so determined to shut the government down that, when we came back with another compromise passed out of this body, we said, How about if we do this? The President acted unconstitutionally. That became very clear in our hearing. For the President to say he wasn't going to enforce the business mandate in ObamaCare is unconstitutional. Not only is it unconstitutional, the President is directly violating his oath of office. He is required to faithfully defend the laws, see that the laws are carried out, and he announced he wasn't going to do it for a year. He doesn't have that kind of luxury.

Even in a spirit of extreme compromise, I didn't vote for it. I thought we shouldn't be compromising against ourselves. But a majority in here voted to send the bill, and we sent it down to HARRY REID and the Senate that said the President has decided to suspend the business mandate for a year. If businesses deserve a mandate for a year, let's do it for every individual in the country for a year. That gave HARRY REID another out. He was so determined to shut down the government, he wouldn't even bring that to a vote.

Then our final ultimate compromise in compromising against ourselves, without any Senate offer of compromise whatsoever, was to say here are our negotiators we are appointing. We voted for it. We sent the list of negotiators; you appoint yours. We will probably have a deal by 8 a.m., and we will not even have to have a real shutdown. But HARRY REID was determined to have a shutdown, and so he got a shutdown. Now there is no graceful escape because we have got to repeal ObamaCare. That is very clear, and I hope that we do that.

I see my friend from California. Actually, he is a very dear friend. We have been in some interesting situations worldwide as we stand up for our country and for the people of the United States of America, for truth, justice, and the American way. As my time is about to expire, let me say that I didn't vote for the patent bill in the Judiciary Committee. I have some real concerns about it, as I did the last one that I voted against.

□ 1715

I still believe in my heart we should not have changed 200 years of patent law from the first to invent being right, changing it to the first to file being right. I think the law was appropriate the way it was. We needed to make some reforms, but I think we made a glaring error.

Many people came to this floor and said we have got to pass that bill to deal with the issue of patent trolls, and now we have another bill that we are told will likely come to the floor tomorrow that this time it will really deal with patent trolls. There are some things in there that I like, and I am glad we are trying to deal with them, to help people that need to be helped.

You know, where a bank is utilizing a procedure that they paid for, they are not infringing on anybody's patents intentionally, and so to hold up people, you know, a small community bank that doesn't have a million bucks to spend on patent litigation, when they are innocent stakeholders, it just seems grossly unfair.

There are things we ought to do. But I am very concerned that we ought to be spending more time, let America help us get this bill right, and I am still hoping that we will wait, get more input so that we don't mess up the patent system any more than we already have.

My time is expired, or is about to, so I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from improper personal references toward the President.

THE CONGRESS THAT KILLED THE PATENT SYSTEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MULLIN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, let me thank my good friend, Mr. GOHMERT, for that heartfelt expression.

Yeah, there are problems at whatever area of government we look at. There are ways that we can improve it, but there are also problems in government that can be used as an excuse, as a cover for a power grab by very special interest groups in our country to change the law in the name of dealing with a serious problem.

Then what comes out of it has something to do with the interest of that special interest, rather than curing the problem. That is what is going on today when we deal, when we hear all of this talk about the patent system.

We must all ask ourselves: Do we want to be known as the Congress that killed the U.S. patent system which has served the American people well for 225 years?

Let's note that there are very powerful interests in this country. Mr. GOHMERT and I have been fighting them on a number of fronts. We call them globalists because what they are interested in is making sure that our economy and our rules and our rights are based in a global system that eventually will be run by the United Nations or whoever.

We have got multinational corporations trying to break down things like the patent law that have been unique to the United States and granted the American people many more rights than are granted to the people of other countries.

So, once again, we are talking about reforming the patent system. After 20

years of fighting on these issues, again, we have a salami approach by people, a lot of people who don't even believe in the patent system, who are trying to change the fundamentals of our system.

Well, just last year we passed the American Inventors Act, and it just went into effect earlier this year. Now we have patent lawyers, the courts, and inventors trying to figure out the implications of the changes of that last law from last year, and that was one of the most sweeping changes to the present American patent system that we ever had.

Why are we rushing into it now before we even know what the results are from the patent bill that was passed last year?

Well, even before we are able to judge the America Invents Act, this other patent bill is now being rammed through this House. Let me repeat that. It is being rammed through at breakneck speed, not giving the people on the outside—there are powerful interest groups that are pushing for these changes, because it will permit them, basically it will permit the big guys to steal from the little guys.

Yeah, okay. These big, multinational electronics companies want to steal from America's independent inventors. They are ramming their changes in the patent system through this House at breakneck speed so that people on the outside are not going to be able to notice what is going on and how it will impact them.

Well, the word is getting out. It is spreading out throughout America, whether it is our universities, or whether it is people in biotech or the pharmaceutical industries or the American Bar Association or small inventors throughout the country, people are beginning to notice the danger that we are in by this rapid movement of legislation through the system.

I wish I could simply focus on the bad provisions of this new bill, as I say, the Innovation Act, H.R. 3309, I call it the Anti-Innovation Act. That bill is expected to be on the floor in the next couple of days.

If the bill is bad, okay, the process now being used to get that bill through the system is—they are stifling debate. They are having such limited time that people aren't able to really go in and see what is involved in this bill.

Remember the last time when we actually looked at, we tried to pass a significant piece of legislation before people had really had a chance to examine it and look at it?

Well, having this bill rammed down our throats at such breakneck speed is even worse than the bill itself. In the one Judiciary Committee hearing—they only had one on this particular bill—witness after witness strongly recommended moving slowly, and warned of unintended consequences.

While it takes a few minutes to consider each provision of this bill, it takes only a few minutes to see that they are aimed—give them the benefit of the doubt that they are single, that there is a single thorn in the side of the mega-electronics companies that are behind this bill, and that is that you have small inventors who will come up and say you have violated my patent, long after they have just ignored the patent and went and used it anyway without the inventor's permission.

Well, that one thorn in the side of these mega-electronic companies, to get rid of that, they are willing to create much more pain in other industries, in our educational institutions, in researchers, especially pain for America's individual, yes, independent inventors.

In the rush to get H.R. 3309 on to the floor so quickly, there has not been a single full day, legislative day, that is, between the time this legislation passed the Judiciary Committee, which means that when it passes the Judiciary Committee, that is when it is available to House Members to consider and to submit amendments to the Rules Committee.

Well, there has not been one legislative day. This happened right before the vacation, right before we went off for Thanksgiving and, thus, we didn't have time, and everybody is off for Thanksgiving.

When are we going to get our amendments put together?

We were rushed into our amendments. I came down here 15 minutes ago because I was up in the Rules Committee, finally, where we put together some amendments to try to deal with the dark side of patent law and this patent bill that is going through.

So it is, as I say, going to create a lot more, a lot more pain for other industries, because we won't have had a chance to look at it and amend it, than it will do good for the electronics industry.

By the way, the electronics industry should be treating the small inventor fairly, and if someone has a legitimate patent and they have ignored it, they should pay that person damages because that person owns what he created.

Instead, what we have had is a society where these mega-companies are faced by an inventor and they just say, well, sue us; go sue me and see what you think.

What this bill does, of course, is make it much more difficult for the small inventor, the small inventor, to be able to sue because it creates much more, a much heavier burden on the small inventor.

So it seems that we have, if we have to pass this bill with such a rapid bill, we are going to have to pass the bill before we realize everything that is in the bill.

Well, that shouldn't be happening again, after the last debacle of ObamaCare, which now has turned into a disaster for our country. That is what is going to happen to the patent system, and the confusion that is going to happen when we rush in to passing legislation.

I am calling on my friends and colleagues who haven't had time to fully understand the implications of this legislation to join me in demanding a postponement, just a postponement of the vote to pass the bill until after this holiday season is over. That will give us time to consult with our own constituents, with experts, with inventors, and other people from other industries, rather than just these big electronics Google industry gang.

So we need to know what the real implications of the legislation are. So we need to what?

Postpone the vote. If you can't postpone the vote, kill this bill and start writing a new one and give everybody a chance to have their say, their input into the bill.

We are told that this bill is aimed at the threat of so-called patent trolls. You will hear that over and over again. These so-called villainous trolls are patent holders. That is what they are. A patent troll is someone who owns a patent, or a company that represents patent holders. They are engaged in defending their rights against infringement of those patents they own.

There are all of these implications that we are talking about invalid patents. No; we are talking about legitimate rights that were granted to the American people to own a patent that is in our Constitution, and these are legitimate patents.

But there is this aura, oh, the innuendo that these are abusive patents. What is an abusive patent?

It is when somebody like Google is using your patent and refusing to acknowledge that it is yours, and you have got to take them to court, and you are a little guy, and they will do anything to stop the little guys from taking them to court and winning.

These patents that we are talking about are just as valid as any other patent that is granted by the Patent Office, and these huge corporations—we are talking about people who have, quite often, intentionally infringed on a patent.

What that means is they have intentionally stolen the patent from a little guy who they don't think has the power, financially and otherwise, to enforce his patents through the court.

These huge infringers would have us believe that the patents that we are talking about are questionable, they are invalid or unworthy of being patented. Well, that is not the case. That is not what this bill does.

What this bill does is make it more difficult for honest and forthright people who are patent owners or independent inventors to enforce their constitutional rights of ownership.

The patents that are being targeted by the multinational electronics firms are legitimate, by and large, but they were the projects, these patents were the projects of small inventors who don't have the means to defend themselves.

Oh, but what makes these vilified patents different, by the way, than the good patents that are owned by these large corporations themselves?

Well, it is the so-called patent troll again. That happens to be a lawyer—and this is defined. A patent troll is a lawyer who takes on a case specifically to defend the little guy from theft. But the lawyer didn't invent it; he is only there for the money.

How shocking that we have lawyers who are defending clients only because the lawyer is going to make money on it. That is how our system works. That is what happens. You get lawyers to argue your case before a judge and get a fair hearing.

There is nothing wrong with having a lawyer decide that he is going to get involved and help a guy for a percentage of what the case results in and what the decision will be.

□ 1730

Being out for profit, even though the person did not invent the technology, is not in any way something that is disgraceful or bad. In fact, these lawyers have become a champion of little guys who don't have the resources to enforce their own patent, or they could be an individual or a company, or they could buy the rights from these small inventors.

And let me just say if the inventor is being cheated out of her or his rightful compensation, it is a good thing that there is a lawyer there or anyone else there who wants to invest in that to make sure that that inventor gets just and rightful compensation.

Now, I happen to have been very concerned about these changes in the patent law, and I have had meetings over the last couple of months; and I happen to have had a meeting with a very prominent businessman who was in the meeting when the term ''patent troll'' was originated. Surprise, surprise that the term patent troll was thought of by a group of business executives of how they could demonize those people who were suing their companies for infringement on the patent rights.

How were they going to do that? They knew they couldn't demonize the independent inventor, the small inventor. Americans think too highly of that. So they decided they would demonize the lawyers and try to divert the attention of the American people away from the issues at hand to try to undermine the ability of the little guy to make his case before the courts and thus demonize the lawyer who was representing him or the lawyer that had helped by taking on the case.

So that discussion took place. How cynical can you be. And the person who I was talking to said, And I suggested that we use the term ''patent pirate,'' but that wasn't sinister enough. So every time you hear the term patent troll, remember, it is a way to try to get you to think of a person that they are vilifying rather than the actual issues at hand. And the issues at hand are talking about theft by the big guys of the little guys, of the little guys' patents who can't afford to defend their own constitutional patent rights.

Now, I have spoken with independent inventors, conservative political organizations, the American Bar Association, industry groups like PhRMA and biotech. We have major universities today, an organization representing 2,000 universities, that have research projects within those universities, all of whom affirmed that H.R. 3309, the so-called Innovation Act, basically is a bad bill for them.

They understand that what we have got is big multinational, again, electronics companies behind us. But it may help those companies. I have no doubt about that. It will help shield them when they infringe on somebody's intellectual property, but it will hurt the rest of these people and the economy. Whether it is other industries or whether it is our educational institutions, I suggest that Members of Congress go back to their districts, give them a chance to go back to their districts, talk to their small inventors. Talk to the small inventors in your districts to see what they think about this poison patent legislation. See what the educators think about it. See about what the universities think. Think about people in major industries that employ hundreds of thousands of people like biotech and pharmaceuticals. Think about those things. Talk to those people, and you will find that there is a very limited number of people who are being helped by this bill, but a tremendous swath across our economy of people who are being hurt by it, not to mention the small independent inventors, the source of our competitiveness, the source that has made America secure, made the American people prosperous because now we can outcompete others because we are technologically superior.

No, the patent system has been too valuable for us to let one industry ram that through Congress with a flood of campaign donations that have been going on here for the last several years.

Proponents of this legislation, as I say, have demonized the patent lawyers just to draw attention away from the fact that these large companies have stolen someone else's patent-protected technology. So it is the big guys versus the little guys. And guess what, in order to beat the little guys, the big guys are now changing the rules of the game. That will hurt all kinds of people throughout the American economy.

H.R. 3309 should be called the Anti-Innovation Act. It is an aggressive attack on the ability of inventors to defend their ownership right to technology that they have invented. This is not about frivolous lawsuits, although you will hear that all the time—frivolous lawsuits and trolls. This is about all lawsuits. This is about all inventors, no matter how absolutely pure their motives are and their rights are clear. No, this will limit each and every independent inventor. This entire bill, every provision diminishes the ability of the small inventor to defend his or her creation. It is a cynical cover for creating for the big guys a license to steal from the little guys.

Former Patent Office Director Kappos and other former directors of the Patent Office have made it clear that we should move slowly and with great care in making such changes to the patent law. This legislation is too broad, its implications too unclear, and its effects unknowable. That is what witnesses and experts have indicated. That is what we hear from all around the United States from very significant players in our economy.

But that is not what is happening here in Congress. In Congress, this bill is being railroaded into passing; and this is right on top of the passage of last year's legislation, as I say.

So what is going on here? This is a heavy-handed attempt by mega-multinational corporations to diminish the viability of America's patent system. This has been going on by these very same multinational corporations to try to diminish patent protection in America. This has been going on for 25 years, and I have seen it over and over again. We have to fight this back.

They want to harmonize America's patent system with Japan and Europe, who have weak systems that do not protect the individual inventor. For example, they tried to foist off—we defeated this one—they have been trying to make it so if someone applies for a patent, after 18 months—this is what they do in Japan and in Europe—after 18 months, the patent application would be published, even though the patent hasn't been granted. I call that the Steal American Technologies Act. The same gang who tried to foist that on us years ago—every year they come up with a new change like that to diminish patent protection for the American people. That would have been the Steal American Technologies Act. Anybody who could have advocated that, it was so blatant that we were able to defeat it outright; and now we face this challenge.

According to the sponsors of H.R. 3309, this is, again, an attempt to combat patent trolls, even though there is a study that was mandated in that last bill that shows that Congress—this much heralded problem of patent trolls really isn't a major driver of lawsuits. And what has caused a new surge in lawsuits, interestingly enough, is that new legislation that was passed last year, while most of the provisions of the legislation will make getting involved in lawsuits more complicated, more costly, and more challenging to bring a lawsuit for a patent infringement.

What does that mean? That means if the little guy needs to fight for his rights in court, we are making it more complicated, costly, and more challenging for the little guy. Of course the big guys, they have got a whole stable of lawyers working for them.

And there you go. These people would restrict lawsuits that are totally legitimate in order to control a very few number of lawsuits that are manipulative of the system and thus are abusive. Rather than making it simpler, cheaper, and easier to defend against baseless accusations and thus reduce spurious lawsuits by strengthening the good guys, this bill is aimed at weakening the small inventors who are the ultimate good guys.

In addition, under the claim of ''technical correction,'' this legislation proposes the removal of the patent system's only judicial review process.

Listen to this: since 1836, every inventor has known that if they are mistreated by the government officials who run the Patent Office, if the decisions on their patents are made on criteria that is not legally established, they can go to court, and they can challenge that. In fact, as late as last year, the Supreme Court in Kappos v. Hyatt reaffirmed the importance of this judicial review. This bill takes that right away from the individual inventor.

The independent inventor who has had this right since 1836 now can't go to the court. He can't have his day in court if he has been treated illegally or wrongly. That is what is in this bill, along with a lot of other things. That is why the American Bar Association is opposed to this bill.

I would like to quote my colleague from Texas, Mr. LAMAR SMITH, former chairman of the Judiciary Committee and primary author of the America Invents Act, which was the last bill. Speaking of the new environmental regulations at the Science Committee just a few weeks ago, he said:

> Our Founders made sure that the Constitution provides a means for the American people to obtain a fair hearing before impartial judges. This may be one of the most underrated rights Americans enjoy today, the right to judicial review. This proposal is an attempt to prevent judicial review. Americans deserve to understand exactly what this proposal would do and retain the right to challenge it.

Let me note that the gentleman from Texas has underscored the importance of having a judicial review of the actions of government employees, especially those in regulatory agencies. This principle applies just as certainly to patent review as it does to environmental regulations that the gentleman was talking about.

Now, Patent Office officials have requested that the judicial review be done away with. They want to do away with it, and that is why it is in the bill because they can say it is too burdensome for them to defend what they did as part of their job on the rare occasions when they are challenged in court. But it is just too burdensome for them.

Never mind that anyone who brings the claim to court is required to cover the costs. If someone is challenging them, they are going to have to cover their own costs. Well, the Patent Office just wants to strip away that right because Americans don't really deserve to have a day in court to challenge what government officials do because it is just too inconvenient for the bureaucracy.

The legislation we expect before the House this week is consistent with a decades-long war raged against America's independent inventors, which I have been talking about, and just this sort of arrogant attitude of the independent inventor is being taken for granted.

Let me tell you what the independent inventors have done. They have made our country secure. They have made our country competitive. They have made the American people—our industry is able to pay our people good wages because we are more competitive with high technology and good technology. Technology has helped save our country, and it created the American way of life. This bill would stifle, would kill American technological genius.

The provisions of the Innovation Act will impact every inventor in a negative way in America. The Innovation Act will create more paperwork when an inventor files for infringement claim, for example, which means somebody stealing and stuff—this will increase the cost to defend those rights and the potential, of course, if you have much more paperwork, then you give the court the ability to dismiss the case on technical requirements: well, you didn't fill out this technicality; you missed that in the law. So it is making it more costly and much more technically complicated.

The Innovation Act will impose rules on the Judicial Conference, meaning on our judges, which run counter to almost 80 years of established rulemaking process, whereby the courts have been establishing their own rules of procedure. Again, this law will dictate how the judges will make their decisions, and it is so definitive that it will complicate the process and could end up with less justice, not more, because the judges will feel compelled not to use their common sense.

If we want to get rid of the burden of litigation that is nonsense, you know, frivolous litigation, let's give the judges some more discretion in determining is this really what is meant to be protected by our law instead of having to dictate the very basis for every one of their decisions.

The Innovation Act will switch us to a ''loser pays'' system so the potential financial downside for a patent holder, meaning the little guy, increases dramatically. Thus we have a situation where the big guy, again, what does he care if he has to pay the legal fees for a little guy filing against him? But if the little guy loses and then has to pay for the legal fees of the big guy, massive, massive expense which will bankrupt him for life.

And the Innovation Act goes even further. It brings other people into that court and into that case.

□ 1745

In fact, people who have an interest in that patent, such as investing in the company or licensing the patent, can be brought into that ''loser pays'' court action and thus they would have to then pay the expenses for this huge corporation if that little guy loses.

Do you know what that means? Nobody is going to stand up for the little guy. They can't afford to take that risk. These big companies will squash them like bugs because they can absorb that kind of cost.

This is the disincentive for people to support the efforts of small inventors whose rights are being denied. Now they will be denied the support of third parties. They can call them trolls if they want. They can say that we are denying them trolls. They are denying somebody else coming in and helping the little guy who can't afford to make sure that these big guys are not stealing his invention and giving him no compensation.

The Innovation Act will create a new requirement that patent holders must, once filing a claim for infringement, provide information about all the parties. That means the infringer—these big guys—are going to get a list of all of their enemies. This is not consistent with American tradition where we believe that people don't have to put themselves at risk in order to help a good cause. This means the elimination of privacy in business dealings. The little guy is totally exposed, as his friends and suppliers will be totally exposed as well.

The Innovation Act, once this requirement has been invoked, will force the patent holder to maintain a new bureaucratic reporting requirement and a fee that goes with that.

Well, what does that mean? That means the little guy now has to keep books that he doesn't have to keep. His life is much more complicated because he has filed an infringement case. These are minor inconveniences to multinational corporations. They have bookkeepers. They have lawyers. This means the little guy is going to be smashed and is going to be smothered under the new requirements of this act.

The Innovation Act will enable large multinational corporations to create nested ''shell companies'' as customers, which have few assets but can infringe on patents for a decade or more, while an inventor, of course, cannot.

Let me just close, Mr. Speaker, by suggesting that we have the support of a multitude of interest groups in our country—educators, businesses, large corporations, and people in our country—who are opposed to this bill, which I will include in the RECORD, and I yield back the balance of my time.

WHO IS OPPOSED TO H.R. 3309?

Universities: Association of American Universities; American Council on Education; Association of American Medical Colleges; Association of Public and Land-grant Universities; Association of University Technology Managers; Council on Government Relations.

Patent Experts, Small Inventors, and Legal experts: Former directors of the U.S. patent office; Patent Office Professional Association; American Intellectual Property Law Association (AIPLA); Intellectual Property Owners Association (IPO); National Association of Patent Practitioners (NAPP); Judicial Conference, Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure; American Bar Association (ABA).

Investors, Professional Organizations, and Business Groups: National Venture Capital Association; Biotechnology Industry Organization (BIO); Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America (PhRMA); Innovation Alliance; Coalition for 21st Century Patent Reform; Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE); U.S. Business & Industry Council; Entrepreneurs for Growth.

Other Organizations: Eagle Forum; Club for Growth; American Conservative Union; Campaign for Liberty; The Weyrich Lunch; CapStand Council for Policy and Ethics.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1853

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SESSIONS) at 6 o'clock and 53 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3309, INNOVATION ACT; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1105, SMALL BUSINESS CAPITAL ACCESS AND JOB PRESERVATION ACT

Mr. NUGENT, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113–283) on the resolution (H. Res. 429) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3309) to amend title 35, United States Code, and the Leahy-Smith America Invents Act to make improvements and technical corrections, and for other purposes; and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1105) to amend the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 to provide a registration exemption for private equity fund advisers, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, December 4, 2013, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3977. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; New Hampshire; Transportation Conformity and Conformity of General Federal Actions [EPA-R01-OAR-2012-0113; A-1-FRL-9903-21-Region 1] received November 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3978. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Information Reporting of Mortgage Insurance Premiums [TD 9642] (RIN: 1545-BL48) received December 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3979. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Proposed Revision of Procedures for Requesting Competent Authority Assistance Under Tax Treaties [Notice 2013-78] received December 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3980. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medicare Program; End-Stage Renal Disease Prospective Payment System, Quality Incentive Program, and Durable Medical Equipment, Prosthetics, Orthotics, and Supplies [CMS-1526-F] (RIN: 0938-AR55) received December 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. NUGENT: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 429. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3309) to amend title 35, United States Code, and the Leahy-Smith America Invents Act to make improvements and technical corrections, and for other purposes; and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1105) to amend the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 to provide a registration exemption for private equity fund advisers, and for other purposes (Rept. 113–283). Referred to the House Calendar.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII, the following action was taken by the Speaker:

(Omitted from the Record of December 2, 2013)

H.R. 2810. Referral to the Committee on Ways and Means extended for a period ending not later than January 10, 2014.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.R. 3633. A bill to clarify that certain recipients of payments from the Federal Government related to the delivery of health care services to individuals shall not be treated as Federal contractors by the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs based on the work performed or actions taken by such individuals that resulted in the receipt of such payments; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. CROWLEY):

H.R. 3634. A bill to make loans and loan guarantees under section 502 of the Railroad Revitalization and Regulatory Reform Act of 1976 available for implementing positive train control systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BENTIVOLIO:

H.R. 3635. A bill to ensure the functionality and security of new Federal websites that collect personally identifiable information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 3636. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the excise tax on gasoline, diesel, and kerosene fuels; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SALMON (for himself, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. PERRY, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, and Mr. GOSAR):

H.R. 3637. A bill to amend the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 to provide whistleblower protection for union employees; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 3638. A bill to establish a Road Usage Fee Pilot Program to study mileage-based fee systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BRIDENSTINE:

H.R. 3639. A bill to eliminate sequestration for the security-related functions, to be offset through reductions in payments under Medicare, agricultural subsidies, federal retirement, and the application of chained CPI, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Energy and Commerce, Agriculture, Oversight and Government Reform, and House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 3640. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase and make permanent the research credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia:

H.R. 3641. A bill to require that the workforce of the Environmental Protection Agency be reduced by 15 percent; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Agriculture, and Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, and Ms. LEE of California):

H.R. 3642. A bill to establish a commission to study employment and economic insecurity in the United States workforce; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ISRAEL (for himself and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 3643. A bill to reauthorize the Undetectable Firearms Act of 1988 for 10 years and to close a loophole in the Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KINGSTON:

H.R. 3644. A bill to rescind funds provided to certain Federal agencies if the improper payment rate for certain agency-administered programs has increased from the previous year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on the Budget, and Appropriations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. KUSTER:

H.R. 3645. A bill to require the Comptroller General of the United States to submit a legislative proposal to Congress to reorganize executive branch agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.R. 3633.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I, section 8, clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 3634.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. BENTIVOLIO:

H.R. 3635.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18, reads: " . . . all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof." This includes the power to regulate the behavior of federal agencies.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 3636.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Title I, section 8.

By Mr. SALMON:

H.R. 3637.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 3638.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Title I, section 8.

By Mr. BRIDENSTINE:

H.R. 3639.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution enumerates power to Congress to "raise and support Armies," to "provide and maintain a Navy," and to "make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing powers". The Provide for the Common Defense Act is a law necessary for executing Congress's power to support our Armed Forces through appropriations.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 3640.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 and Amendment XVI

By Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia:

H.R. 3641.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida:

H.R. 3642.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const., Art. I, §8, cl. 3: Congress shall have the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the various states.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 3643.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the powers granted to the Congress by Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KINGSTON:

H.R. 3644.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7

No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.

By Ms. KUSTER:

H.R. 3645.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 (relating to the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States), and Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes) of the United States Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 24: Mr. GRAYSON.
H.R. 107: Mr. RIBBLE and Mr. GOODLATTE.
H.R. 170: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 184: Mr. HORSFORD.
H.R. 351: Mr. RAHALL.
H.R. 366: Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 503: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. CONYERS, and Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 515: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 610: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania and Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 611: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania and Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 647: Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. HURT, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Ms. CHU.
H.R. 676: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 685: Mr. BERA of California and Mr. TURNER.
H.R. 721: Mr. BOUSTANY and Mr. SHIMKUS.
H.R. 724: Mr. WILLIAMS.
H.R. 875: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H.R. 940: Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 1010: Mr. HECK of Washington.
H.R. 1020: Mr. KEATING.
H.R. 1091: Mr. TERRY.
H.R. 1125: Mr. ENYART and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
H.R. 1150: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 1179: Mr. NADLER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. PIERLUISI, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. ENYART, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SCHRADER, and Mr. KIND.
H.R. 1209: Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. HARPER, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. RAHALL, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. RUSH, Mr. DESANTIS, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. WAXMAN.
H.R. 1239: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H.R. 1250: Mr. ANDREWS.
H.R. 1318: Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 1339: Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, and Mr. MCKINLEY.
H.R. 1414: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
H.R. 1431: Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 1449: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. COBLE, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. MESSER, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. ROONEY, and Mr. MCHENRY.
H.R. 1485: Mr. MCINTYRE.
H.R. 1494: Mr. TIBERI and Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 1507: Mr. DEUTCH and Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 1528: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK and Mr. CRAMER.
H.R. 1563: Mr. SARBANES, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 1761: Mr. BARROW of Georgia.
H.R. 1795: Mr. DOYLE and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 1861: Mr. MASSIE and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H.R. 1869: Mr. GARDNER and Mrs. NOEM.
H.R. 1943: Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 1980: Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 2018: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
H.R. 2101: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 2223: Mr. UPTON.
H.R. 2239: Mr. KING of Iowa.
H.R. 2274: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 2328: Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 2366: Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. YODER, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 2376: Mr. FATTAH.
H.R. 2480: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 2529: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MORAN, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 2536: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 2589: Mr. BENTIVOLIO.
H.R. 2638: Mr. WELCH, Mr. YOHO, Mr. HUELSKAMP, and Mr. SIMPSON.
H.R. 2692: Mr. HONDA and Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 2734: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 2783: Mr. JOYCE.
H.R. 2785: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 2801: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 2818: Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 2866: Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia.
H.R. 2877: Mr. GARCIA.
H.R. 2892: Mr. HURT.
H.R. 2907: Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 2935: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 2983: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 3040: Ms. WILSON of Florida and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 3077: Mr. MEEKS.
H.R. 3118: Mr. DEUTCH and Ms. SCHWARTZ.

H.R. 3121: Mr. POMPEO.
H.R. 3122: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H.R. 3135: Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. FARR.
H.R. 3137: Mr. TAKANO and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 3173: Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.R. 3196: Mr. MATHESON.
H.R. 3211: Mr. CLEAVER.
H.R. 3303: Mr. BERA of California.
H.R. 3308: Mr. BENTIVOLIO.
H.R. 3322: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 3323: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 3327: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. CLARKE, and Ms. CHU.
H.R. 3333: Mr. ISRAEL and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 3334: Mr. GARAMENDI, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
H.R. 3360: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 3361: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. SALMON, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. VELA.
H.R. 3382: Mr. MASSIE.
H.R. 3383: Mr. RUIZ.
H.R. 3407: Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 3413: Mr. LATTA, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. TIPTON, Mrs. BACHMANN, and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
H.R. 3416: Mr. FORBES and Mr. MCINTYRE.
H.R. 3419: Mr. MCCAUL.
H.R. 3435: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 3461: Mr. TONKO, Ms. ESTY, and Mr. GRIMM.
H.R. 3462: Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 3464: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 3465: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 3474: Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 3485: Mr. FINCHER and Mr. DESJARLAIS.
H.R. 3486: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.
H.R. 3490: Ms. ESTY and Mr. LONG.
H.R. 3508: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 3513: Ms. LOFGREN and Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 3516: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 3522: Mr. WESTMORELAND.
H.R. 3546: Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 3556: Mr. GRIMM, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. NADLER, Mr. MORAN, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 3559: Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 3566: Mr. HONDA and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 3573: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 3577: Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 3578: Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. RENACCI, and Mr. HANNA.
H.R. 3584: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 3587: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 3599: Mr. HARPER.
H.R. 3626: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 3627: Mr. HUDSON.
H.R. 3629: Mr. VARGAS and Mr. DESANTIS.
H.J. Res. 34: Ms. MOORE.
H. Con. Res. 64: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H. Con. Res. 67: Mr. LANGEVIN.
H. Res. 109: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California and Mr. WALBERG.
H. Res. 153: Mr. POSEY.
H. Res. 284: Mr. MCCAUL.
H. Res. 356: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
H. Res. 401: Mr. RUIZ.
H. Res. 406: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H. Res. 407: Mr. MCGOVERN and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H. Res. 417: Mr. HIMES, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. KIND.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

The amendment to be offered by Representative MALONEY, or a designee, to H.R. 1105, the Small Business Capital Access and Job Preservation Act, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

The amendment to be offered by Representative GOODLATTE, or a designee, to H.R. 3309, the Innovation Act, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.