

today that it's almost difficult to refute every point that's been brought up.

Look, we heard from the ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee that the FDA had deemed the active pharmaceutical ingredient in Primatene Mist to be dangerous. What is the active ingredient in Primatene Mist? It's racemic epinephrine.

We heard from the gentlelady from Florida that a product manufactured in her district was a good product and was available. What's the active pharmaceutical in Asthmanefrin? Racemic epinephrine. It's exactly the same product. The difference, of course, is the propellant, and that's the object of our discussion here today.

Now, I will tell you, as an asthmatic patient, there are things that I know work better for me than others. I'm willing to go along with a lot of stuff from the EPA, but I will just tell you, the replacement propellant that is available in albuterol inhalers does not work nearly as well as CFC. You don't have to believe me. Go to the Facebook page that has been developed by asthma sufferers who, one after the other, will delineate why CFC worked for them when HFA-containing products do not.

Now, what about Asthmanefrin? There is no propellant. It is delivered because of an ultrasonic nebulizer, a unique approach and one that, quite frankly, I welcome.

But let me stress, Madam Speaker, although this product, Asthmanefrin, is available without a physician's prescription, it's not generally available over the counter, and I know this because of my own experience. Number 1, I had to call several pharmacies back in Texas before I found a Walmart that carried it. After finishing some event late at night in Fort Worth, I stopped by the Walmart near my home that I had already talked to that I knew they had the product there. I went in, but the pharmacy was closed. The pharmacist was gone.

Now, you can buy a vast panoply of almost anything else over the counter in the pharmacy, off the pharmacy shelves at Walmart—in fact, you used to be able to pick up two Primatene Mist inhalers for \$30 before January 1 of this year—but no Asthmanefrin was available. When I questioned why, they said that is something that has to be dispensed by the pharmacist. In other words, it's behind the counter, not over the counter.

What does that mean as a functional issue?

If an asthmatic patient woke up at 2 that morning and said, Oh, my golly, I should have never ridden that horse, I should have never petted that cat, I guess the mountain cedar bloomed down by Waco because now I've got a snoutful and I cannot breathe, and they go down to the Walmart, the Walmart's open, the store's lit up, the shelves are full of product, but Asthmanefrin is

not available to that patient. They'll have to come back at 9 in the morning when the pharmacist is on duty that can dispense the product to them.

Now, I would also point out that there is a cost differential between Asthmanefrin and Primatene Mist. We've heard a lot about costs and profits and who we're helping and who we're not. The cost for the starter kit for Asthmanefrin is right at \$50. At Walmart in my district it was \$49.96. A boxful of the packets of the medicine that is necessary to place into the machine to dispense costs \$27 for a box of 30. And I'm not that good at math, but that's about 92, 93 cents per packet, one packet per treatment.

How many treatments are in this? I don't know. I've never used one completely. I always lose them before I get to the end. But it's advertised to be between 250 and 275 treatments.

The cost differential, a little bit less than 6 cents for this, 93 cents for this per treatment episode. Not a big deal in days you're talking about medicines that might cost \$250, \$280 a month for maintenance therapy for asthma. Yeah, the cost is negligible, but for some people it's not. For some people that represents a significant expenditure.

This, I can carry in my pocket. I can bring it to the House floor. If someone's smoking a cigar in one of the anterooms and I get a puff of that, I'll have this available when I get to the House floor.

This is harder to carry in your pocket, not impossible, but much harder to carry in your pocket.

There is a convenience factor. Dean of the House DINGEL mentioned that when he talked about his efforts to preserve products for patients with asthma. A little less user friendly to go through the multiple steps for Asthmanefrin as opposed to squeezing the Primatene Mist bottle and dispensing the medicine where it needs to go into a patient's chest.

The other over-the-counter products are absolutely not equivalent to Primatene. Primatene tablets are, indeed, still available. But what are Primatene tablets? They're ephedrine. That's the active ingredient in some of the diet pills that the FDA pulled off the market a few months ago. Yeah, ephedrine will help you if you're in a tight spot with your breathing, but it's not instantaneous. It's about 30 minutes away after you take the pill.

□ 1430

And you want to talk about something that makes your heart race, it's not Primatene Mist, but the Primatene tablets will do it every time it's tried.

Madam Speaker, here's the real issue: Should we let elites at the Federal agency dictate to our asthma patients in our districts what they can and can't have?

This is one of those instances where I say the Federal agency has gone too far. Ranking Member WAXMAN said

that the FDA didn't need to ban Primatene Mist because the EPA had already done it. By what authority does the EPA regulate medicines that I prescribe for my patients? There is no such authority, unless I missed something and we gave them authority where none existed before.

This is about common sense. This is about doing the right thing for the American people. We took away their toilets. We took away their lightbulbs. For heaven's sake, let's not take away their asthma inhalers.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 6190.

The question was taken.

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

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam 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 question will be postponed.

NO-HASSLE FLYING ACT OF 2012

Mr. KING of New York. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 3542) to authorize the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security (Transportation Security Administration) to modify screening requirements for checked baggage arriving from preclearance airports, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 3542

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 "No-Hassle Flying Act of 2012".

SEC. 2. PRECLEARANCE AIRPORTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 44901(d) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) PRECLEARANCE AIRPORTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—For a flight or flight segment originating at an airport outside the United States and traveling to the United States with respect to which checked baggage has been screened in accordance with an aviation security preclearance agreement between the United States and the country in which such airport is located, the Assistant Secretary (Transportation Security Administration) may, in coordination with U.S. Customs and Border Protection, determine whether such baggage must be re-screened in the United States by an explosives detection system before such baggage continues on any additional flight or flight segment.

“(B) AVIATION SECURITY PRECLEARANCE AGREEMENT DEFINED.—In this paragraph, the term ‘aviation security preclearance agreement’ means an agreement that delineates and implements security standards and protocols that are determined by the Assistant Secretary, in coordination with U.S. Customs and Border Protection, to be comparable to those of the United States and

therefore sufficiently effective to enable passengers to deplane into sterile areas of airports in the United States.

“(C) REPORT.—The Assistant Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate an annual report on the re-screening of baggage under this paragraph. Each such report shall include the following for the year covered by the report:

“(i) A list of airports outside the United States from which a flight or flight segment traveled to the United States for which the Assistant Secretary determined, in accordance with the authority under subparagraph (A), that checked baggage was not required to be re-screened in the United States by an explosive detection system before such baggage continued on an additional flight or flight segment.

“(ii) The amount of Federal savings generated from the exercise of such authority.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 44901 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking “explosive” each place it appears and inserting “explosives”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KING of New York. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KING of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of S. 3542, the No-Hassle Flying Act of 2012.

At the outset, let me commend the gentleman from Illinois, Congressman WALSH, for introducing the House companion to this important measure. H.R. 6028 passed the House in September by voice vote.

Madam Speaker, this bill gives TSA the discretion to determine if checked luggage arriving from a foreign airport with an aviation security preclearance agreement must be rescreened before it continues on to a connecting flight inside the U.S. The bill explicitly defines such an agreement as one that delineates and implements security standards and protocols that are determined by TSA, in coordination with CBP, to be comparable to those of the U.S. and therefore sufficiently effective to enable passengers to deplane into sterile areas of airports in the United States.

This bill does not diminish aviation security but, rather, streamlines the security process and allows TSA to expend resources on baggage that has not already been screened to U.S. security standards. It also supports TSA's ongoing efforts to implement risk-based, intelligence-driven security initiatives.

TSA Administrator Pistole requested the new authority provided in this bill in order to go beyond our borders in establishing robust security measures and improving efficiency. I commend Administrator Pistole for his leadership and efforts to improve aviation security.

In addition to streamlining security, this bill will incentivize our foreign partners to improve the technology that they use to screen checked baggage, which ultimately should increase the level of security of inbound flights to the United States. The legislation will reduce the number of missed connections and other hassles with redundant baggage screening that can become barriers to international travel and tourism. It's a win-win for passengers, the airline industry, and TSA by shortening the time necessary for transit and transfer.

I urge the adoption of this bipartisan and commonsense bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of S. 3542, the No-Hassle Flying Act of 2012. I support this legislation because it represents a commonsense proposal to make air travel more convenient and has the potential to enhance efficiencies.

Currently, all baggage arriving at U.S. airports must be rescreened prior to being loaded on a connecting flight. This is true even for travelers arriving from designated preclearance airports where the passengers themselves do not need to be screened again because DHS has verified that screening at those airports is at least as effective as our own. This dynamic places an unnecessary burden on TSA screeners, the airlines, and the flying public who, on occasion, arrive at their final destination only to find that their baggage has not.

As I stated when we considered the House companion to S. 3542 in September, where we can eliminate duplicative screening without compromising security, I will lend my support.

I commend Senator KLOBUCHAR for her work on this legislation and thank her for including important provisions I requested that require TSA to coordinate with U.S. Customs and Border Protection when determining what baggage must be rescreened in the United States.

Accordingly, I support this legislation that the Obama administration proposed, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KING of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WALSH). Let me take this opportunity to commend him for the outstanding job he's done during his time of service on the committee.

Mr. WALSH of Illinois. I thank Chairman KING.

Earlier this year, I introduced the No-Hassle Flying Act, legislation

brought to our attention by the Transportation Security Administration. Senators KLOBUCHAR from Minnesota and BLUNT of Missouri introduced my original language in the Senate, and this is the bill we're considering today.

Over the past decade, TSA has classified 14 foreign airports as “precleared” for security purposes. These airports are routinely checked by TSA to ensure their screening procedures for both people and bags meet the high standards of the United States, and, as such, passengers originating from these airports and returning to the United States are not required to go through physical security checks again. Unfortunately, their bags are not excluded and must be rescanned and rechecked. If you've ever had to do this during a layover at Chicago O'Hare; Newark, New Jersey; or even Miami International, you know it's not an easy task, especially in the middle of the night.

The bill before us allows TSA to waive the baggage screening requirements as well. Giving TSA this kind of flexibility will allow them to free up time and resources to focus on higher-risk baggage and passengers and will also make traveling easier for those coming in and out of the United States.

I want to thank my colleagues on the Homeland Security Committee—especially Chairman KING—and their staffs for the work they put into this bill, along with Senators KLOBUCHAR and BLUNT, and, of course, TSA for bringing this bill to our attention.

I urge all Members to vote in favor of this commonsense bipartisan bill.

□ 1440

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Transportation Security of the Committee on Homeland Security, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Let me thank the ranking member of the committee. It's always good to be able to thank him, Madam Speaker, for his leadership and service. I think we are safer because Members of Congress like Congressman THOMPSON, the ranking member, and our chairman, Congressman KING, have, on a number of occasions, come together around the idea of America's security. I want to express my appreciation for having been able to serve on the committee for a number of years.

It gives me also a moment to say to the Speaker, or to acknowledge Congresswoman EMERSON, for her service as well and to thank you so very much for being a person who loves America. I think that should be our litmus test when we rise on this floor for those of us who love this country.

As the ranking member, and having served as the chairwoman of this committee in previous terms, I know how important it is to provide safety in the transportation modes for the United

States of America. This bill, the No-Hassle Flying Act of 2012—and I thank the sponsor both in the House and the Senate—provides a measure of recognition and acceptance of foreign countries that are making efforts to have consistent security procedures and technology to have an easier travel process for passengers who are deplaning in the United States but going on to another domestic destination. So I want to acknowledge the Senator from Minnesota, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, who had this legislation passed in the Senate, and our House sponsor as well.

What the basis of this legislation is, by relieving the need to rescreen every piece of baggage arriving in the United States from countries where we have strong bonds and screening agreements in place, efficiencies will be realized and our screeners can focus more attention on those items we know least about. And the term “screeners,” let me correct that and say the Transportation Security Administration personnel. That is probably the most maligned group of American public servants, those who work in the cause of the United States and the safety and security of the United States. But at their best, when they are trained, as I have worked so hard to insist on, to increase their professional development training—and we have made great strides with Administrator Pistole and previous administrators, so much so that as I travel through airports I can see the sense of pride and respect that this group of Americans have for their job. So when we speak of screening, we’re talking about serious work that has to be done to ensure the safety and security of America.

We want to be able to work with our allies. This is not an immigration reform initiative, but it is similar to the visa waiver programs, where we have a list of countries that we feel confident that their procedures are not only equal to ours, but their policies, their alliance with us goes decades, and we believe that their citizens can come into the United States.

This particular legislation tries to get the personnel of the TSA to focus on race-based screening that many of my fellow members on the committee have been calling for, and of course that the administrator has listened to. This legislation represents the kind of commonsense security measure this Congress must focus on to make both the Department of Homeland Security and its components work more.

It is, of course, my hope that we can look forward to more work being done with transportation security, that we can look to providing, as I introduced legislation dealing with air marshals, both their funding and increased utilization on some of our flights coming into the United States; that we will have the opportunity to do a transportation authorization bill again like the one I joined with Chairman THOMPSON on and we reauthorized in the 111th

Congress that drew bipartisan support. And of course Mr. KING has worked with us on this legislation.

So this particular No Fly for me has merit to it. But as I rise to support the thought behind the legislation passed by the Senate, I also remind our colleagues that air travel is still dangerous. Whether it is the shoe bomber, whether it is the Christmas day bomber, whether it is thwarted incidences that we will never hear about, whether it is the constant reporting of intelligence and classified information that suggests how vulnerable our airlines and airports are, whether it is an accidental or incidental intrusion on the tarmac or the perimeters of the airport, whether it is the accidental entry of a public person, either visitor or traveling public, that goes into an unauthorized area that causes airports to be shut down—incidences that occurred in Newark and other places—we have to realize that we have to be particularly sensitive to this question of securing the traveling public, and particularly Americans. That is why, in the wisdom of the Congress and others, we created the Transportation Security Administration that had a mandated and Federalized workforce of security screeners to inspect airline passengers and their baggage. It gave them broad authority to assess the vulnerabilities in aviation security and take steps to mitigate these risks. I’m glad that they exist.

So I have an acute understanding of TSA’s role in aviation security, and I also appreciate congressional oversight. But I further appreciate that, even with that broad discretion, we have to be keenly aware that in the best of all circumstances some loophole, some misstep can occur.

I represent one of the largest systems, George Bush Intercontinental Airport, the William Hobby system. As I would want for that airport system, I would want a system of security for everyone. So this idea of allowing unfettered transfer of your bags coming from a nation that has been an ally, but that has put into place procedures that we can document that are in fact adequate, accurate, and superior, I’m going to raise it to that level, because adequacy is not a basis for fighting the dangers of terrorism.

I only raise a flag of caution—and maybe a red flag—that it is important that the Department of Homeland Security study this carefully. Make sure that they look at the technology and look at the process that in essence will be put in place. Because, again, all good things are meant for good, but we know what can happen if in some way we are in error. I don’t want this to be a basis for error, I want this to be a basis for good. I want this to be the intention of the bill, which is to ameliorate some of those delays associated with the rescreening of bags transported on commercial flights from international locations.

I want those traveling to the United States to be welcomed with a smile

who are here to do good, and I want them not to miss their connecting flight—and it might be one of us. But our main focus is to secure the homeland.

So to my colleagues, to the chairman and ranking member, I join you in supporting this legislation, but I ask that the Department of Homeland Security, the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security, who is to give this discretion to waiving rescreening pursuant to a preclearance agreement between the United States and a foreign nation, that seeks to ensure this process works, be very keen and careful of reviewing the process, having the resources to ensure that the technology is superior and that we are constantly reviewing how this is working.

I’m sure that we will see many smiles of our traveling public. They will welcome that convenience. In the course of the convenience, I also argue for security. I know that that will be the case.

I will ask my colleagues to support this legislation, and as well, we continue to secure the homeland.

Mr. KING of New York. Madam Speaker, I have no further speakers. If the gentleman from Mississippi also has none, I’m prepared to close once the gentleman does.

□ 1450

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, I have no more speakers, and I am prepared to close.

There are areas where TSA needs to improve its performance. On that we can all agree. Just last week, GAO released a report detailing TSA’s failure to properly oversee privatized screeners and revealing that some airports with their privatized screeners do not perform as well as their federalized counterparts.

I look forward to addressing those issues with my colleagues on the Committee on Homeland Security in the 113th Congress.

Today, we have an opportunity to support legislation supported by industry, the Obama administration, and TSA that has the potential to enhance the efficiency and cost effectiveness of screening baggage.

With that, Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support S. 3542 so it can be sent to the President for his signature and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KING of New York. Madam Speaker, I urge the adoption of this bipartisan, commonsense bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of S. 3542, the “No-Hassle Flying Act of 2012.” This legislation, proposed by the Obama Administration and introduced by the Senator from Minnesota, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, was passed by the Senate with unanimous support and should receive the support of the House today.

By relieving the need to re-screen every piece of baggage arriving in the United States from countries where we have strong bonds

and screening agreements in place, efficiencies will be realized and our screeners can focus more attention on those items we know least about.

That is the kind of risk based screening that I and my fellow members of the Committee on Homeland Security have been calling for. Thankfully, under Administrator Pistole's leadership, are calls are being heeded.

This legislation represents the kind of common sense security measure this Congress must focus on to make both the Department of Homeland Security and its components work more efficiently and effectively.

It is my hope that in the next Congress we will see more proposals on the House floor regarding the Transportation Security Administration that can garner bipartisan support.

During the 111th Congress, during my tenure as Chair of the Committee on Homeland Security's Subcommittee on Transportation Security, the House considered and passed the TSA Authorization bill that I authored with overwhelming bipartisan support.

Unfortunately, no such legislation was produced for consideration by the House this Congress.

I look forward to working with my colleagues on the Committee in the next Congress to ensure we get back to the work of authorizing the critical programs of the TSA.

Our airports are a critical point of entry to our nation, and our airplanes remain vulnerable to terrorist plots as a result of their inherent potential to cause massive destruction and human casualties.

In the aftermath of the September 11, 2001 attacks, which exposed significant vulnerabilities in our airport security, the 107th Congress moved quickly to pass the Aviation and Transportation Security Act.

The Transportation Security Act created the Transportation Security Administration (TSA) and mandated a federalized workforce of security screeners to inspect airline passengers and their baggage. The act gave TSA broad authority to assess vulnerabilities in aviation security and take steps to mitigate these risks.

As Ranking Member of the Subcommittee on Transportation on the Committee on Homeland Security, I have an acute understanding of TSA's role in aviation security, which has been the subject of considerable congressional oversight.

Moreover, this issue is one that impacts my constituents immensely, as my district is home to the Houston Airport System, which is one of North America's largest public airport systems and includes George Bush Intercontinental Airport, William P. Hobby Airport, and Ellington Airport.

In 2010, the Houston Airport System served more than 49.5 million passengers, including more than 8.5 million international travelers.

The American people expect Members of Congress to ensure that when they board a plane for business or pleasure, all passengers and their accompanying baggage have been thoroughly screened so as to prevent terrorists and their tools of destruction from posing a danger to passengers.

This issue is something that we understand as Members of Congress; many of us, including myself, fly on commercial airlines when we travel to and from our respective districts. Like the rest of the public, we expect that when we board a flight, it is secure and that we will safely arrive at our destinations within a reasonable amount of time.

While we should balance the need for thorough screening with the ideals of speed and convenience, we must continue to ensure that we are doing whatever is necessary to protect passengers on commercial flights from the dangers of terrorism. We know that many Americans and others traveling to our country are often frustrated by the time it may take to have themselves and their baggage processed through airports.

This bill intends to ameliorate some of these delays associated with the rescreening of baggage transported on commercial flights originating from international locations.

This would be achieved by giving the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security the discretion to waive rescreening pursuant to a preclearance agreement between the United States and a foreign nation that seeks to ensure that adequate screening procedures were undertaken at the point of origin.

The idea is that baggage that has already been adequately screened by one airport does not need to be screened again once it arrives at one of our airports.

As Members of Congress, we should continue to look for areas in our airport security procedures that we can modify in order to make travel more convenient for passengers that do not compromise their safety.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 3542.

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.

DHS AUDIT REQUIREMENT TARGET ACT OF 2012

Mr. KING of New York. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1998) to obtain an unqualified audit opinion, and improve financial accountability and management at the Department of Homeland Security.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 1998

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 "DHS Audit Requirement Target Act of 2012" or the "DART Act".

SEC. 2. IMPROVING FINANCIAL ACCOUNTABILITY AND MANAGEMENT.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term "Department" means the Department of Homeland Security;

(2) the term "financial management systems" has the meaning given that term under section 806 of the Federal Financial Management Improvement Act of 1996 (31 U.S.C. 3512 note);

(3) the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Homeland Security; and

(4) the term "unqualified opinion" mean an unqualified opinion within the meaning given that term under generally accepted auditing standards.

(b) REACHING AN UNQUALIFIED AUDIT OPINION.—In order to ensure compliance with the

Department of Homeland Security Financial Accountability Act (Public Law 108-330; 118 Stat. 1275) and the amendments made by that Act, the Secretary shall take the necessary steps to ensure that the full set of consolidated financial statements of the Department for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and each fiscal year thereafter, are ready in a timely manner and in preparation for an audit as part of preparing the performance and accountability reports required under section 3516(f) of title 31, United States Code, (including submitting the reports not later than November 15, 2013, and each year thereafter) in order to obtain an unqualified opinion on the full set of financial statements for the fiscal year.

(c) REPORT TO CONGRESS ON PROGRESS OF MEETING AUDIT REQUIREMENTS.—In order to ensure progress in implementing the Department of Homeland Security Financial Accountability Act (Public Law 108-330; 118 Stat. 1275), and the amendments made by that Act, during the period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act and ending on the date on which an unqualified opinion described in subsection (b) is submitted, each report submitted by the Chief Financial Officer of the Department under section 902(a)(6) of title 31, United States Code, shall include a plan—

(1) to obtain an unqualified opinion on the full set of financial statements, which shall discuss plans and resources needed to meet the deadlines under subsection (b);

(2) that addresses how the Department will eliminate material weaknesses and significant deficiencies in internal controls over financial reporting and provides deadlines for the elimination of such weaknesses and deficiencies; and

(3) to modernize the financial management systems of the Department, including timelines, goals, alternatives, and costs of the plan, which shall include consideration of alternative approaches, including modernizing the existing financial management systems and associated financial controls of the Department and establishing new financial management systems and associated financial controls.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KING of New York. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KING of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of S. 1998, the DART Act, introduced by Senator SCOTT BROWN of Massachusetts. This important legislation will improve financial accountability and management at the Department of Homeland Security.

Since the Department opened its doors on March 1, 2003, financial management of all 22 merged agencies has