

HEALTHCARE.GOV DATA BREACH

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

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, throughout my life, I have learned that the American people are strong and resilient. Throughout our history, we have shown time and time again our unique ability to overcome every obstacle and every adversary that has blocked our path to freedom. This resilience is what has advanced our Nation from being a ragtag rabble of citizens who took up arms in the American Revolution to being the greatest superpower in the world.

Throughout our advancement as a nation, we have not always been perfect. In fact, we have made some grave mistakes. However, our shared dedication to liberty and justice for all people has put us back on course. And though it sometimes takes years, or even generations, the spirit of American exceptionalism overshadows our mistakes and, with the spirit of forgiveness and reconciliation, we move forward.

However, when the government and its leaders purposefully mislead the American people, they are much less willing to forgive and forget, especially when such deception puts the people at risk, threatens their God-given rights or the sovereignty of this Nation. Mr. Speaker, I fear the American people and the Members of this Congress have, once again, been deceived, and I intend to get to the bottom of it.

When the 111th Congress ran through this body the Affordable Care Act, the American people were sold a bill of goods with deceiving statements and deceptive promises, statements such as, “If you like your healthcare plan, you can keep it.” Although this disastrous legislation passed against the will of the people, some Americans trusted that the law would not take away their chosen healthcare plan. Unfortunately, the American people found out the hard way they have been deceived.

Now, Mr. Speaker, new reports give evidence of another deception surrounding ObamaCare. Prior to the launch of the healthcare.gov Web site, officials of this administration assured Congress and the American people that personal information submitted via the ObamaCare Web site would be secure and would not be permanently stored. However, new evidence suggests this may have been just another bait-and-switch tactic.

Contrary to what we have been told, the government is apparently storing American citizens’ personal identifiable information obtained through the healthcare.gov Web site. If this is indeed true, then, this is not only another assault on the good faith of the American people, but, more importantly, it puts them at significant personal risk.

This government has recently shown its inability to secure computer sys-

tems and protect sensitive information. In the past several months, we have been inundated with reports of security breaches of government computer systems, disclosing personal and official information that potentially harms our national security.

With many Americans being forced into the government healthcare exchange, over 11 million people have registered with healthcare.gov. A breach of this system could be larger and potentially more disastrous than any of the previous breaches, which is a serious concern.

Mr. Speaker, the last time I checked, our Founders gave us a government of the people, not a government of elitists, establishment, or executive privilege. We are a nation of laws, not a nation of feelings or good intentions. We are bound by the Constitution, but that Constitution is only as sound as the integrity of those who have sworn to uphold it.

The American people expect their government to operate within the constraints of the Constitution, the limits of the law, and to be transparent and accountable. Unconstrained activity by government agencies has gone on far too long, and now their deceptions and reckless behavior is threatening the safety and the security of the American people. These actions put the future of our Nation at great risk, and they must stop.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Oversight of Science, Space, and Technology, I intend to diligently pursue this issue, to find the truth, expose those who have violated the trust of the American people, and ensure the illegal collection of data by our government is stopped and the previously collected data is permanently removed.

I intend to use the power given to this body through our Constitution and the trust invested in us by the American people to right these wrongs. Our citizens deserve better than this, and I am committed to ensuring that the American people have a nation that is once again free, safe, and full of opportunity.

GUN VIOLENCE

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, last week, nine parishioners were shot and killed inside Emanuel African Methodist Episcopal Church in Charleston, South Carolina, one of the oldest African American churches in the United States.

In the days following the horrific tragedy in Charleston, we paused to reflect and send our prayers to families grieving an unimaginable loss. I wish this tragedy in Charleston were an isolated incident, but it seems to be part of a terrible recurring pattern.

After national tragedies, society should engage in a discussion about how to address and potentially prevent

such tragedies from happening again. Let’s remember that after Katrina, we talked about FEMA and national readiness. But the gun lobby doesn’t want us to have this conversation. They accuse anyone who tries with exploiting the deaths of innocent people.

With that logic, we couldn’t talk about solutions when 13 people were killed and 8 were injured during the shooting in the Washington, D.C., Navy Yard; or after a person opened fire during a midnight screening of a film, “The Dark Knight Rises” in 2012, killing 12 and injuring 58 others; or when 28 people were shot and killed, including 20 innocent children, at Sandy Hook Elementary School; or when a man shot 3 people and killed 7 others at a Sikh temple in Oak Creek, Wisconsin; or when 14 people were shot and 6 were killed in 2011 during a constituent meeting hosted by our colleague, Congresswoman Gabby Giffords, in a supermarket parking lot in Tucson; or when a man opened fire in Fort Hood, Texas, in 2009, killing 13 people, injuring 30 others; or in 2008 when a man opened fire at a lecture hall at Northern Illinois University, shooting 21 students and killing 6; or when a senior at Virginia Tech went on a shooting rampage on campus in 2007, killing 33 people and injuring 23 others; or when 2 seniors at Columbine High School attacked their classmates and teachers, wounding 24 and killing 15; or in Chicago and cities across the country which experience gun tragedies every day.

Yet, since I have come to this Congress nearly 7 years ago, the people’s House has refused to hold even one hearing on the epidemic of gun violence we are facing.

Last Sunday alone, in Chicago, 14 people were shot and 1 man was killed, all within a matter of hours. In May, Chicago saw 300 people shot and 37 people killed in shootings. Every day in America, 297 people are shot and nearly 90 people are killed by guns.

According to Harvard University researchers, the rate of mass shootings has increased threefold since 2011, occurring an average of every 64 days. Let me repeat that. A mass shooting occurs in the U.S. on the average of every 64 days.

□ 1015

When will enough be enough? When will we stand up and say we may not be able to stop every crime, but we can stop some of them and at least minimize the damage of others? When will we realize and acknowledge that this type of mass violence does not happen in other advanced countries? When will we finally be able to have a national discussion about gun violence?

Instead, the gun lobby stymies debate by arguing that no gun regulation can prevent criminals and the mentally ill from killing people with guns, but I don’t buy that. Sure, no single law or set of laws can prevent every act of

senseless violence. Ending the American epidemic of gun violence will require more than a change in law.

It is clear we need a change in our culture; but oftentimes, changing our culture starts with changing our laws. By enacting reasonable reforms, we can make a difference. We can make it more difficult for would-be assassins to access guns. We can ensure every gun in America is purchased after a background check rather than only 60 percent of guns, as is currently the case.

We can crack down on the flow of illegal guns onto our streets by improving gun trafficking data, and we can reduce the fatality rate by banning assault rifles and high-capacity magazines that are designed exclusively for killing dozens of people at once.

Let's face it, when you have an assault rifle with a high-capacity magazine, you are not hunting deer; you are hunting people. The gun lobby tries to argue that any attempt to regulate gun access is an attempt to restrict all gun access, but there is such a thing as commonsense, middle-ground gun reform, and most gun owners support it.

Can we stop every shooting? No. But can we reduce their frequency and deadliness? Absolutely—the first step toward keeping dangerous guns out of the hands of dangerous people is to begin the conversation. Let's break the silence, stop the violence, and start the conversation.

NO DEAL IS BETTER THAN A BAD DEAL

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

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, the Obama administration and Tehran are yet again running up against another deadline. This one comes next Tuesday when the clock expires on reaching a comprehensive nuclear deal.

Mr. Speaker, if you head over to whitehouse.gov, there is a site outlining the current nuclear negotiations. On the front page of this Web site, when discussing what a possible deal with Iran should do, it states: "prevent Iran from using the cover of negotiations to continue advancing its nuclear program as we seek to negotiate a long-term comprehensive solution that addresses all of the international community's concerns."

Mr. Speaker, what have we seen in reality? It is a possible deal that could block international inspectors from having unrestricted access to all of Iran's nuclear sites to verify their compliance. Mr. Speaker, what could Iran possibly have to hide if their nuclear work is solely for peaceful purposes?

We have also seen a deal that doesn't require Iran to disclose all of its previous nuclear work and possible military dimensions. It is a bad deal because, if Iran expects the world to trust them and lift sanctions, why not come clean?

I also see a deal that could lift all sanctions once the ink is dried, which is a bad deal, because what would this instant relief be rewarding? Years of covert work, violations of U.N. resolutions, and the export of terror across the globe—no one in good faith could say that the deal before the world right now prevents Iran from obtaining a pathway to the bomb. If anything, Mr. Speaker, it puts them on a pathway to the bomb.

It has been clear for some time now that this administration has been negotiating not with Iran, but with itself. We have seen them consistently move the goalpost on what they are willing to accept with respect to essential components of a good deal. This ranges from the number of centrifuges to inspections to the dismantling of nuclear infrastructure.

The parameters of what this administration is willing to accept has moved so many times, I don't believe it would surprise anyone if reports emerged before next Tuesday that showed even more concessions have been made.

Mr. Speaker, the administration needs to prevent Iran from having a pathway to the bomb. They need to hold good on their word that no deal is better than a bad deal.

Mr. Speaker, I don't see how anyone right now, with the exception of Iran, could accept the reported deal as a "good deal." Let's not settle for a bad deal; let's not stand for a nuclear Iran.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK REAUTHORIZATION

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to stress the importance of reauthorizing the Export-Import Bank's charter, which has served this Nation well. The Export-Import Bank is an important program used to support our Nation's entrepreneurs—the best in the world—and keep them competitive in today's global economy.

It is a tool. It is a tool that has enjoyed bipartisan support over the years, just like trade agreements are a tool to, in fact, increase jobs here in America, good-paying jobs.

The Bank provides trade financing to solutions to boost U.S. job growth, and it has been successful in increasing exports for American goods and services—American goods that are made here—at no cost—no cost—to the American taxpayer.

This program is set to expire, sadly, tomorrow—tomorrow. Unfortunately, the House Republican leadership is refusing to bring it to the floor for a vote, with thousands of American jobs at risk.

Now, if the Bank charter expires, American workers and American businesses that are trying to sell their products and goods overseas face a completely unnecessary blow to their ability to compete.

In total, the Ex-Im Bank—otherwise known, abbreviated—has created and sustained over 1.5 million jobs in the private sector since 2007 alone—1.5 million jobs since 2007. Last year alone, the Bank sustained over 164,000 export-related American good-paying jobs.

If you want to build it in America, you have got to ensure that American workers and businesses can compete. The Ex-Im Bank represents a vital pillar, therefore, in our ability to be competitive overseas, and it has had significant impacts in the San Joaquin Valley that I represent.

Why? Well, many of the businesses that I talk to that use the Ex-Im Bank tell me: JIM, we have the ability to compete. We make our products better, but when we are sitting at the table with foreign competitors, many of these countries want to know, do you have a financing plan in place?

It is because, contingent upon their ability to choose us or choose our competitors, many of these countries want to know that this can be financially put together in a fashion so that the deal works for everybody, and that is what the Bank does.

In my district alone, the Ex-Im Bank has afforded a number of small business exporters—some of which are minority and women owned—to have exports in places all over the world, places like India, Mexico, Turkey, Hong Kong; and I could go on. These businesses export \$77 million worth of goods, ranging from machinery to manufacturing to crop production of the variety and diversity of agricultural exports that we do in California.

As a matter of fact, in California, the Ex-Im Bank has resulted in increased exports of over \$27 billion. Now, let's put this in perspective. Last year, California exported \$174 billion in products.

The Ex-Im Bank was responsible for helping to finance \$27 billion of that \$174 billion. As a matter of fact, \$19.4 billion of the \$174 billion that was exported last year from California were agricultural products grown in the San Joaquin Valley.

The Bank helps level the playing field, therefore, for American workers and American businesses, allowing them to compete and succeed in the global economy that we live in today. That is just the facts.

In these trying times, the last thing Congress should be doing is jeopardizing the economic health of our Nation by refusing to provide Americans with the tools—the tools, which is what this Bank is—they need to compete effectively in the global marketplace.

It is important to note that there is a vast bipartisan support for renewing the Bank's charter. Let me be clear. Despite attempts to paint this as a partisan issue, I do not believe it is. Sadly, though, there are some of my colleagues on the other side who have decided to play partisan politics with the Bank. That, then, therefore threatens American jobs, halting economic