

need compensation. Medicare and Medicaid recipients need to have their benefits processed. We need clean air and clean water.

The Government of the United States is not frivolous or wasteful. The government is a rainy-day umbrella for those who suffer from all manner of devastation and disaster. I don't know about the thoughts of 21 hours, but I do know that I'm going to stand against a clouded and crowded continuing resolution.

Vote to keep the government open and let's start using ObamaCare on October 1. That's the American way. That's the vote for all of America, and that's the vote for the vulnerable who cannot speak for themselves.

AMERICAN SPIRIT

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

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, for the last few days, I have been in the southern district of New Mexico. I've had the opportunity to visit the devastation caused by the flooding in that area. We've seen houses that have been completely washed off their foundation and completely destroyed. We've had loss of life and livestock, even the ground and certain farms washed away, and the underlying roadbeds washed away 8- and 10-foot deep in some areas.

But in all of that, we see the inspirational actions of our first responders, volunteers, and people who came out and worked around the clock to provide help. In one instance, neighbors knew that a young couple was away from home so they took pickup trucks and unloaded their belongings and moved them to safety before the house washed off its foundation.

These are the things that make America great. These are the things that make New Mexico great. Any time we see calamity, we have the opportunity to see the other side of America, and it shines brightly.

WAITING FOR AN APOLOGY

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

Mr. STOCKMAN. Today, Mr. Speaker, a young man was sentenced because he listened to the propaganda of an organization that I consider a hate group. This group says: If you don't agree with us, if you don't follow the line, you deserve to be on our list. They listed the Family Research Council—godly people that have the sole purpose of reaching out to families.

Reading literature from the Southern Poverty Law Center, this young man took it upon himself to feel that the Family Research Council needed to be punished. He picked up a gun and went there to murder people whose greatest desire was to promote family values.

As he unloaded his gun, someone stopped him.

Today, the man was sentenced. But to this day, we have not heard an apology from the Southern Poverty Law Center. We have not heard any words from them criticizing those actions. To this day, we don't hear any apologies or any cries for what that young man did.

The Southern Poverty Law Center continues to list an enemy list of anybody that disagrees with them politically. I'm waiting for their apology.

□ 1930

HYUNDAI HOPE ON WHEELS WORKING TO END PEDIATRIC CANCER

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

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in the United States, a child is diagnosed with cancer every 36 minutes. Cancer remains the leading cause of death by disease for children under 15.

Now, each September is National Childhood Cancer Awareness Month. I would just like to point out there is a program by Hyundai Motor America and Hyundai dealers. We have raised over \$72 million in the fight against pediatric cancer. We have been able to turn back the clock, and at this time we can say that almost 85 percent of children diagnosed with this dreaded disease survive. So it is with great pride that I'm here this evening.

I would also like to point out that this past July, Hyundai Hope on Wheels awarded a \$75,000 grant to Children's Hospital of Pittsburgh at the University of Pittsburgh, which will help Dr. J. Anthony Graves continue his cancer therapies to treat children from the Third District of Pennsylvania and beyond.

DEFUND OBAMACARE

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, we've had August to hear from our constituents, and most of us have. And what we've been hearing is tragic. For every several hundred people that give us a story of how dramatically and badly their lives have been affected by ObamaCare, there is one or two that says: Hey, my 26-year-old got to be on our family insurance—not realizing Republicans had agreed to do that, would have done that, along with some pre-existing condition fixes.

But ObamaCare is devastating families and individuals across America. It's bad for America. It's bad for people's health. It's going to prevent seniors from getting the help they need. It's time, when you know these things, to stand up and stand for the health and well-being of people and this economy.

Let's defund ObamaCare.

UNITED NATIONS ARMS TRADE TREATY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. 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 subject of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the United Nations Arms Trade Treaty, which Secretary Kerry signed today at a U.N. ceremony on behalf of the United States.

My opposition and my colleagues' opposition is not a Republican agenda. It is the defense of all Americans' right as enshrined in our Constitution and in our Bill of Rights.

The Obama administration's participation in the Arms Trade Treaty has left a trail of broken promises, and all in the form of "red lines" this administration has laid out and later abandoned. I'd like to talk about a few of them right now.

Mr. Speaker, I will submit into the RECORD the State Department's Web page listing "Key U.S. Redlines" for the ATT.

KEY U.S. REDLINES

The Second Amendment to the Constitution must be upheld.

There will be no restrictions on civilian possession or trade of firearms otherwise permitted by law or protected by the U.S. Constitution.

There will be no dilution or diminishing of sovereign control over issues involving the private acquisition, ownership, or possession of firearms, which must remain matters of domestic law.

The U.S. will oppose provisions inconsistent with existing U.S. law or that would unduly interfere with our ability to import, export, or transfer arms in support of our national security and foreign policy interests.

The international arms trade is a legitimate commercial activity, and otherwise lawful commercial trade in arms must not be unduly hindered.

There will be no requirement for reporting on or marking and tracing of ammunition or explosives.

There will be no lowering of current international standards.

Existing nonproliferation and export control regimes must not be undermined.

The ATT negotiations must have consensus decision making to allow us to protect U.S. equities.

There will be no mandate for an international body to enforce an ATT.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Now, one of those red lines says: "The Second Amendment to the Constitution

must be upheld." But the Treaty contains only a weak, nonbinding reference to civilian ownership and fails to uphold the fundamental, individual right to keep and to bear arms that is enshrined in our Second Amendment.

Furthermore, the Treaty encourages nations to collect the identities of owners of imported firearms. It creates the core of a national gun registry. This violates existing U.S. law.

But it doesn't stop there. The Arms Trade Treaty requires nations to report the data they collect to the United Nations. If this data contains information on individual owners, it would constitute a serious, dangerous privacy violation. Now, it sounds like this administration doesn't take this Second Amendment red line very seriously.

Another red line says: "The ATT negotiations must have consensus decisionmaking to allow us to protect U.S. equities." Now, in the U.N., "consensus" means unanimity—all members on board in totality. But when that failed, the Obama administration supported the ATT's adoption by a simple majority rule vote in the United Nations General Assembly. The administration broke its own most important red line.

Now, the U.S. regularly demands that negotiations be conducted by consensus to protect our interests and our sovereignty, which is critical when the U.S. is in the minority or when we are standing alone at the U.N. Now, by breaking their own red line, this administration has seriously reduced U.S. credibility because other countries now know that if they push hard enough, America will accept a majority rule vote.

In February 2010, Under Secretary of State Ellen Tauscher stated if the whole world does not sign on, then the ATT is "less than useless." A number of key nation-states—including such stalwarts of freedom and liberty as Russia, China, and others like India, Indonesia, Iran and North Korea, among many others—do not support the Arms Trade Treaty. Therefore, the United Nations Arms Trade Treaty is less than useless.

Is the ATT less than useless, or is consensus just another red line that the Obama administration doesn't take very seriously.

Today, Secretary Kerry said: "This treaty will not diminish anyone's freedom." Here is yet but another promise. Do we really think it's credible?

Last month, the Obama administration took executive action to ban the import of Korean War-era, vintage, collectible M-1 Garand rifles on spurious public safety grounds. These are collectors' items. This shows how this administration's action can be used to choke off firearms imports.

The United Nations Arms Trade Treaty will only encourage more mischief. It only holds the good accountable and let's the bad do what they want.

In the real world, promises do matter. We have made strategic, moral, and legal commitments to provide arms to key allies such as the Republic of China (Taiwan) and the State of Israel. What do these promises really mean to President Obama? And what message does the ATT send to our allies? And they wonder: Is America really there for us when we need them, or is this just more talk, more empty words?

The American people have had enough of the Obama administration's broken promises and phony, non-existent red lines on ATT. I urge my colleagues to join together to oppose the ATT.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN).

Mr. WALDEN. I thank the gentleman, my friend, a great defender of the United States Constitution, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

This is a very troubling day—very troubling day—for those of us who believe in our freedom in America and our rights under the Constitution and every day defend America's sovereignty.

Oregon's Second Congressional District is nearly 70,000 square miles. That's a lot of ground. It's home to some of the best hunting in the West, including mule deer, elk, cougar, big-horn sheep and antelope, in addition to various waterfowl and upland birds.

Oregonians' proud heritage of hunting and owning firearms for sport, protection and their livelihood dates back to the days of the Oregon Trail—a trail my ancestors crossed in 1845 when they helped settle the West.

As one hunter in Baker City, Oregon, told me earlier this year, he said: Congressman, you know why they call this the Second District? It's because we believe in our Second Amendment rights. And he's right. Yet today, about 10 hours ago, Secretary of State John Kerry signed a very vague U.N. treaty that leaves open the door to international influences trampling on our Second Amendment rights to keep and bear arms. And it encourages signatory nations to collect identities of owners of imported firearms, setting the stage for a potential national gun registry. And that is wrong.

The United States is a sovereign Nation. I strongly believe that our Constitution—including our Second Amendment rights—must never be subjugated by a treaty. Now, what's worse, we understand the administration that signed this treaty may now never send it to the Senate for consideration. I view that as another blatant attempt by the Obama administration to act unilaterally—they seem to do a lot of that these days—without the consent or the approval of Congress.

So I will strongly oppose not only this treaty, but also any funding to implement any policy related to this treaty. And I will continue to uphold the oath of office that each one of us in

this Chamber took to defend our rights and freedoms as enshrined in that great document, the Constitution, and to make sure that our Constitution and our sovereign rights are always above any foreign treaty, including one that never even gets sent to the Senate.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I now yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. Thank you, Congressman KELLY, for hosting this important hour to share with the American people the serious problems with the U.N. Arms Trade Treaty.

Mr. Speaker, as cochairman of the House Sovereignty Caucus, I assure you this ambiguous treaty poses serious threats to American national security, foreign policy, and economic interests, as well as our constitutional rights.

U.S. arms exports are among the safest in the world. The United States should reject the U.N.'s attempt to force us into a system that could jeopardize the safety of our citizens or those of our allies.

This treaty includes small arms and light weapons within its scope, which covers firearms owned by law-abiding Americans. It sets up a broad registration scheme that threatens the individual's firearms rights.

The Arms Trade Treaty also threatens the ability of the U.S. to protect our allies around the world since it contains questionable language that could be misused to prevent America from arming allies such as Israel or Taiwan.

President Obama knows that even members of his own party won't support this treaty in many cases. He must think that gun control must be pursued no matter what.

In my own State of Colorado, voters just recalled two State Senators who pushed gun control against the wishes of their voters. These were historic elections because no Colorado legislator had ever been recalled in the history of the State.

I urge the Members of the Senate to reject this treaty and protect our Second Amendment rights and our national sovereignty.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I thank my friend.

I now yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS).

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I thank my colleague from Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak out against the dangerous U.N. Arms Trade Treaty, which was signed this morning by Secretary Kerry. This treaty will impact the United States' sovereignty, encroach upon Second Amendment rights, and drastically affect U.S. foreign and export policies.

It is common for a treaty of this kind to give definitions directly so member states can understand the treaty's meanings and implications. Instead, this agreement uses vague terms that are open for reinterpretation later. It leaves open the opportunity for current

restrictions to be tightened at a later time. This has the potential of heavily influencing our Nation's future policy without congressional consideration or approval.

Our Second Amendment liberties, articulated in the Bill of Rights, are put at significant risk by this treaty. Approximately one-third of the domestic gun market is composed of imported firearms. The Arms Trade Treaty encourages nations to collect the identities of the owners of imported firearms. This could be the beginning of a national gun registry, which would violate current U.S. law. The treaty would also impose administrative burdens on the import and export of small arms.

This treaty would directly affect how the U.S. handles foreign policy. The United States should be able to look into potential arms sales by weighing the risks, potential outcomes, and goals of each trade. Under the U.N. Arms Trade Treaty, the U.S. would have to complete a checklist of items before exporting arms, regardless of their destination—even if that destination is Israel or Taiwan.

It will come as no surprise that the Arms Trade Treaty is not being backed by Russia, China, India, Iran, North Korea, and numerous other nations—many of whom do not have our best interests in mind.

In February 2010, this was called “less than useless” if not supported by all nations. Why is this administration now locking the United States into a treaty that other world powers have rejected? Their unilateral decision to sign the treaty allows other nations to trade arms knowing that the U.S. will be bound by a specific set of rules.

Like the majority of the folks in Georgia's Ninth District, I cannot understand why this administration would sign a treaty with such drastic implications for our Nation's sovereignty and the right to bear arms at home. The United States should not join treaties outside the constitutionally prescribed process, which involves ratification by the Senate—this is a concept this administration just amazingly seems to not understand, especially from a constitutional law professor.

There is a reason the Constitution dictates the method and manner by which the United States may enter into treaties: it is to ensure that the treaties so harmful to our freedoms, such as this Arms Trade Treaty, are never signed or ratified.

□ 1945

I strongly oppose this administration's endorsement of the U.N. Arms Trade Treaty and will work with my colleagues to prevent this agreement from affecting the rights of our citizens. The executive branch does not and should not possess a blank check to legislate domestically via international treaties.

There is no treaty so important that it should be allowed to restrict the

rights of Americans to exercise those freedoms enshrined in the Constitution. The right to keep and bear arms is not dependent on a global agreement. We don't need Russia and China giving their stamp of approval in order to speak freely in our homes and in our churches. We certainly don't need Iran and North Korea dictating our due process rights.

I strongly oppose the U.N. Arms Trade Treaty and everything it stands for. I do not and will not support the decision made by Secretary Kerry to sign the treaty.

I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his tireless leadership on this issue and hosting this Special Order tonight.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, I now would like to yield to my friend from North Carolina, Mr. RICHARD HUDSON.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to join my colleagues to voice my strongest opposition to the United Nations Arms Trade Treaty currently before the United Nations.

First and foremost, by signing this overreaching treaty, the administration is crippling one of our most fundamental rights: the Second Amendment, the right to keep and bear arms. The Second Amendment is our most fundamental right because it ensures that we can maintain our other rights.

Second, by their own admission, the President and his administration have said this vague treaty is difficult to interpret. Why would we engage in an ambiguous and harmful agreement like this?

Finally, the President's own State Department said this treaty will have international implications for U.S. arms sales to Israel and Taiwan. Why would we engage in an agreement that would damage our relationships with two of our strongest allies and give veto power over decisions to sell arms to our allies to other nations around the world?

Mr. Speaker, I spent the past weekend in a deer stand and cannot imagine allowing the laws of other countries to stop my ability and the ability of other Americans from enjoying this tradition that I've enjoyed my entire life. The people I represent in North Carolina can't understand why this administration is seeking to damage our personal liberty and the sovereignty of our great Nation.

We must oppose this treaty, and I encourage our colleagues in the Senate to do the same.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina. Your comments are very timely and very needed.

At this time, I would like to have Mr. STEVE STOCKMAN from Texas 36 address the situation.

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am appalled. Our friend said Republicans are in the bedroom, but we have a President who is collecting our phone

records, collecting our medical records, and now wants to collect our gun records. Where in the world and when do we say stop? Even our friends in the media, he collected their records. Now we have a treaty, so-called treaty, which stomps on our individual rights, undermines our Constitution, and strips us of any kind of protection.

They said don't worry about it, the Senate will never ratify it. But in a tradition of treaties, once a treaty is signed—once a treaty is signed—our Nation typically follows that treaty. We are seeing before us a President who is not listening to the people. Time and time again, these actions are taken when there is—like a magician, he is over here, focusing over here, and he did this today when a Texas Senator was speaking.

This is all designed for us to be asleep while our rights are being stripped. When are the American people going to wake up and realize that the book “1984” has come about? Your rights are being stripped, and I hear nothing. My friend, Bill Murray, who is an unwilling participant in a lawsuit to take prayer out of schools, said it best. His mother was an atheist who sued. He said the greatest fear that she had was that the American people would rise up, but what happened was nothing. Not a word was said.

Today, your rights were stripped, and we hear silence. It reminds me when Jesus was praying and he turned to his disciples and they fell asleep; there was silence. Go on and sleep, America, go on and sleep. Your rights are being stripped, and you're saying nothing.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

At this time, I would like to yield to JIM BRIDENSTINE, who represents Oklahoma 51.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague, Congressman KELLY from Pennsylvania, for yielding me the time. I would also like to thank my good friend, the senior Senator from Oklahoma, JIM INHOFE, who has been the upper Chamber's fiercest opponent of the United Nations Arms Trade Treaty. I am proud that Senator INHOFE also stands firmly with Senator CRUZ in his fight to defund ObamaCare. There seems to be some confusion about that back in Oklahoma, but he has been standing with Senator CRUZ from the beginning.

Mr. Speaker, already this year, the President tried to ban guns he thinks look scary. They don't operate any differently—they just look scary—so he tried to ban them.

Rejected by Congress, the President tried to create what is effectively a national gun registry. The American people and their representatives rejected that plan as well. In response, President Obama today had his Secretary of State sign what is effectively an international gun control treaty that will ultimately force all of us to register our guns and our names and our information into an international database.

President Obama once again demonstrated his hostility to the Constitution, to the Second Amendment, and to the U.S. sovereignty by signing the U.N. Arms Trade Treaty. This President is fundamentally antagonistic toward both our constitutional right to keep and bear arms and American independence from international bodies.

Why is the U.N. Arms Trade Treaty so dangerous? First, the treaty is ambiguously worded. Its basic terms are not even defined, which permits gun-grabbing U.N. bureaucrats the widest possible interpretive scope. We all know that the U.N. gun-grabbers will interpret this treaty just as loosely as the President interprets the Constitution of the United States.

Second, the Arms Trade Treaty is a direct shot at the Second Amendment of the Constitution. Lawful ownership and use of firearms—including for self-defense—are basic constitutional rights. The treaty does not recognize this. In fact, the Arms Trade Treaty “encourages governments to collect the identities of individual end users of imported firearms at the national level.” This is the core of a national gun registry.

The treaty also creates a national “responsibility” to prevent the “diversion” of firearms to illegal trade. Since illicit trade is not defined, does this mean one American selling a gun to another American counts as illegal? Who is to say? Groups like Amnesty International have already stated that the Arms Trade Treaty is a “start” down the path of control for “domestic internal gun sales.” This is international gun control, plain and simple.

Mr. Speaker, the Arms Trade Treaty is fully consistent with the President's policy of ceding more U.S. sovereignty to international bodies. He's pushed the Senate to ratify treaties that do nothing except diminish U.S. sovereignty. These treaties include the U.N. Conventions on the Rights of Persons With Disabilities, the Rights of Children, and the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women.

Does this mean that the United States finds no morally compelling interest in protecting disabled persons, children, or women? Of course not. In each of these, cases U.S. domestic law imposes far higher standards of protection than many of the countries that have ratified all three of these treaties. For example, such beacons of human freedom as Cuba, China, Nigeria, Russia, and Syria have ratified all three of these treaties. North Korea and Iran have ratified two of the three. Unlike these countries, though, the United States actually upholds its treaty obligations.

Mr. Speaker, the Arms Trade Treaty is a perfect example of a dangerous trend in international legal thinking called “transnationalism.” The goal of transnationalists is to “circumvent resistant legislatures” and “download” so-called “global norms.” We've heard the President talk about global norms ad nauseam. But the idea is to circumvent resistant legislatures and

download global norms into U.S. and other domestic law. Let me say that again: the transnationalists pushing the Arms Trade Treaty, like Amnesty International, want to avoid Congress, they want to avoid us—the people's representatives—and impose international law from foreign bodies.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the pro-Arms Trade Treaty supporters need a lesson in the U.S. Constitution. The Constitution is the supreme law of the land. We choose those that govern us and under which laws we live. We should not give up our God-given rights and liberties to foreign bodies such as the United Nations. The Second Amendment is not up for debate. The individual right of Americans to keep and bear arms is not a matter of discussion for foreigners.

The President will treat the Arms Trade Treaty as binding on America no matter what the Senate does. He can't impose gun control in Congress so he's going to use an international treaty instead. I pray that the Senate rips this treaty to pieces and that our next President removes America's signature and, with it, this hideous assault on our Constitution.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Thank you, Mr. BRIDENSTINE.

At this time, I would like to yield to the Member from Mississippi 1, Mr. ALAN NUNNELEE.

Mr. NUNNELEE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend from Pennsylvania for yielding, but also for his leadership on this important issue.

I rise in strong opposition to the United Nations Arms Trade Treaty.

The Obama administration has a disturbing tendency to favor international regulation over American sovereignty. The Arms Trade Treaty is just the latest example.

The Government of the United States was created by “we the people.” “We the people” established the Constitution in order to limit that government; but as a condition of establishing that Constitution, “we the people” insisted that a Bill of Rights be adopted, a Bill of Rights that would guarantee every citizen of our Nation rights. An important plank in that Bill of Rights includes the right to keep and bear arms, and it's guaranteed by our Constitution.

Under no circumstances should we ever agree to a treaty that undermines that right. This Arms Trade Treaty encourages nations to collect the identities of owners of imported firearms, which constitutes the core of a national gun registry.

The treaty also requires nations to report the data they collect to the United Nations. If that data contains information on individual gun owners, it would be a serious violation of privacy.

The treaty could also restrict the ability of the United States to conduct foreign policy and to sell arms to our allies, such as Israel.

Now, we've seen in recent months what happens when we rely on the

international community to act on America's interests. Russia, China, and the rest of the United Nations should never be given veto authority over American foreign policy; and we should never, ever subject the United States Constitution to the whims of the United Nations. The Second Amendment is sacred. We should always stand up and protect it.

That is why I strongly oppose the United Nations Arms Trade Treaty and urge the United States Senate to reject it forthrightly.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard from a number of Members tonight. I think this is a day that we really have to reflect back and look at mixed messages.

Back in 2009 at a NATO summit in Strasbourg, France, the President said:

I believe in American exceptionalism, just as I suspect that the Brits believe in British exceptionalism and the Greeks believe in Greek exceptionalism.

Yesterday, the President stood in front of the United Nations and said:

Some may disagree, but I believe America is exceptional, in part because we have shown a willingness through the sacrifice of blood and treasure to stand up not only for our own narrow interest, but for the interest of all.

I would just like to suggest to the President that “integrity” is defined by “saying what you mean and meaning what you say.” Taking a moment to express something that may or may not be the true core value of who you are or what you believe is not acceptable. What makes us truly exceptional as Americans is we are there every day in every way to those who we told we would be.

The U.S. has the most sophisticated arms export control system in the world. It has commonly been called the gold standard. That term “gold standard” was used by then-Secretary of State Hillary Clinton. Yet this Arms Trade Treaty does nothing at all to improve our system.

□ 2000

We not only have laws on the export of arms; we actually enforce them. People can and regularly do go to jail for breaking those laws.

Now, the Arms Trade Treaty will not improve the systems in other countries, which, in many cases, actually have no systems at all. There is a lot more to running an effective arms export control system than simply signing a piece of paper and using your signature to express something that is not truly in your heart.

There is so much vagueness with this Arms Trade Treaty. Our regulations describing what we control are the most sophisticated in the world. It is really extremely difficult to evade them with word games. We mean what we say, and we say what we mean. It's just integrity. Simple. The Arms Trade Treaty, by contrast, is so vague that it

offers many opportunities for nations to claim they are complying with the treaty while really carrying on as normal. This has the effect of legitimizing the actions of bad actors.

We have a regular system for actually making the decisions about what we will export and to whom we will export. This system takes many things into account, but it is fundamentally based on upholding the United States' national interest. It is not controlled by exporters, unlike in Europe, where exporter interests actually dominate their policies. This Arms Trade Treaty will do nothing to change that, but it will give exporter-dominated nations a shield to hide behind.

Every nation-state can control the arms trade if it is truly willing to do so—and the United States is ready to help—but few have meaningful laws about the arms trade, and even fewer make any attempt to enforce them. The United States has two major programs to help the serious countries:

First, the Export Control and Related Border Security Assistance—and it goes by the term EXBS—is run from the State Department. The second is the Humanitarian Mine Action Program, HMA, which includes stockpile conventional munitions assistance, intended to assist in the disposal, demilitarization, security, and management of explosive stockpiles, which is run by the Department of Defense.

According to the State Department, the U.S. has contributed over \$2 billion to reduce the harmful effects of illicit, indiscriminately used conventional weapons through the Conventional Weapons Destruction Program, which includes the HMA. In other words, the United States actually backs its words with money and investment, and we have made that attempt throughout the whole world.

Listen, our arms export control system is the gold standard of the world. We are not greedy with our gold. We are willing to share our practical knowledge with nation-states that are serious about arms export controls. Let us not fall for the fool's gold of a treaty that truly overpromises and underdelivers.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my gratitude to the Members of Congress from around the country who joined me tonight in this Special Order to oppose the United Nations Arms Trade Treaty.

I would ask the citizens of the United States, as Mr. STOCKMAN said, to please wake up. We are losing our country day by day in ways that we do not recognize, in ways that we do not know, and, truly, the sacrifice that this Nation has made over the years is of our 1.4 million men and women in uniform who have died to preserve those personal freedoms and liberties.

This is not a good day for the United States. This is a day when the United States lowered its expectations in its exceptionalism to something that does not truly protect the United States and

that has a dire effect on our sovereignty as a Nation.

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

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, as a gun owner and lifetime member of the NRA, I support the Second Amendment and every individual's right to keep and bear arms.

But today, that right is threatened by the United Nations Arms Trade Treaty. I am outraged by the administration's intention to sign this treaty—a treaty that directly attacks our Second Amendment rights through subversion and bureaucratic tricks.

How does the treaty do so, you ask? I'll name two . . .

First, this treaty is purposely ambiguous. It binds the United States to a treaty that has yet to be fully written. That means that only after signing will the treaty's fine points be written. Why are we signing onto a treaty when we don't know what's in it? How many times have the American people endured thousands of regulations written into a law only after it has been signed by the administration?

Second, and most offensive, is the treaty's encouragement to signing governments to collect the identities of the ultimate owners of imported firearms. This treaty appears to give the administration the cover it needs to start a gun registry—a gun registry that I'm sure they will claim is harmless.

For those and other reasons, I am disturbed by the consequences this treaty could have on America's Second Amendment rights. And many of my constituents back home in Texas share this same concern.

No government—be it foreign or domestic—should be allowed to infringe on our constitutional Second Amendment rights.

I remain strongly opposed to the U.N. Arms Trade Treaty. I will continue to work with my like-minded colleagues in the Senate to reject this or any future treaties that would seek to barter away our Second Amendment rights and outsource American sovereignty.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. RUSH (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today through September 29 on account of attending to family acute medical care and hospitalization.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, September 26, 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:

3078. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's March 2013 Semi-Annual Report

providing the progress toward destruction of the U.S. stockpile of lethal chemical agents and munitions by the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC) deadline of April 29, 2012, but not later than December 31, 2017; to the Committee on Armed Services.

3079. A letter from the NACIQI Executive Director, Department of Education, transmitting the annual report of the National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity for Fiscal Year 2012, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1145(e); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

3080. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting report prepared by the Department of State concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3081. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 3(d) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, certification regarding the proposed transfer of major defense equipment (Transmittal No. RSAT-13-3517); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3082. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the semiannual report detailing payments made to Cuba as a result of the provision of telecommunications services pursuant to Department of the Treasury specific licenses as required by section 1705(e)(6) of the Cuban Democracy Act of 1992, as amended by Section 102(g) of the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity (LIBERTAD) Act of 1996, 22 U.S.C. 6004(e)(6), and pursuant to Executive Order 13313 of July 31, 2003; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3083. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), section 505(c) of the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1985, 22 U.S.C. 2349aa-9(c), and pursuant to Executive Order 13313 of July 31, 2003, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Iran that was declared in Executive Order 12957 of March 15, 1995; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3084. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3085. A letter from the Inspector General, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the Board's budget request for fiscal year 2015, in accordance with Section 7(f) of the Railroad Retirement Act; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3086. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's report entitled, "Transforming Today's Vision Into Tomorrow's Reality"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3087. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations; Jacksonville Dragon Boat Festival; St. Johns River; Jacksonville, FL [Docket Number: USCG-2013-0652] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received September 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3088. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulation; Red Bull Flugtag Miami,