



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 158

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, APRIL 26, 2012

No. 61

## House of Representatives

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

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,  
April 26, 2012.

I hereby appoint the Honorable BILL FLORES 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 17, 2012, 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 each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

### IMMIGRATION

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, with the unfortunate Arizona State immigration law under review by the Supreme Court, it's an appropriate time to take a step back and look at the big picture. Mexico is exhibiting some of the demographic changes taking place around the world that are seen in the most extreme forms in places like Japan and Italy, where birth rates are falling, their populations are aging,

and dramatic stress is placed upon their economies.

It's not yet to that point in Mexico, but the game has definitely changed. In contrast, the United States has had a growing and vibrant population, in no small measure because we've been energized from people around the world. It's time to consider our immigration policies and practices for the future.

Even though there's been no more contentious issue in American politics than that of immigration, the situation surrounding Mexican immigration has changed profoundly. As I mentioned, the birth rate is falling, and for the first time as many people are leaving the United States for Mexico as are arriving from Mexico in the United States.

Illegal entry is clearly declining. The number of arrests at the border demonstrates that. People are being deported in greater numbers than ever before. It's not that there isn't still a problem. There are still some bad actors coming across the border, no mistake about it.

There are important opportunities to concentrate on what's important, such as people who are dealing with drugs, pose security threats, and who are criminals. Wasting resources on a scattershot effort on people who are here just to work or to be with their families is not particularly a wise use of resources, and it doesn't make us any safer.

It's past time to deal with the millions of people who are already here and part of the fabric of our communities. Often, they are with families that include children who are citizens and other family members who are citizens as part of an extended family. It's not just the members of those extended families that rely on one another; America relies on these millions of people, as the Alabama legislature found out with draconian efforts to try and deal with illegal immigrants—and

legal immigrants, by the way—that ended up almost ruining a number of their farmers, and their legislature had to backtrack.

Immigrants have always been a source of America's strength. Our current policies inflict damage to the realities of those family ties, especially to children who are already citizens.

We also do other dumb things. We deny VISAs to smart people who are educated at great expense at some of the finest institutions in America with important skills that will be valuable to business. We make it hard for them to work here. Unfortunately, if their skills are going to be utilized, too often they end up being hired by foreign overseas competitors, or American companies have to create jobs for them overseas.

There are a half-dozen pieces of legislation in a piecemeal fashion that will make it better. One of the most important is the DREAM Act, which would allow children who were brought here at an early age to be able to earn the right to citizenship if they have done well with their education or serve in the military.

I'm pleased to see all of these different pieces of legislation that would bring a measure of rationality and fairness gaining support. The most important thing we can do is return to that spirit of bipartisan cooperation that was exhibited by the late Ted Kennedy and, by the way, how JOHN MCCAIN used to be, before he ran for reelection in today's Arizona, because they were sponsoring comprehensive immigration reform. They didn't rely on half a dozen pieces of legislation, but really looked at the problem holistically for the people involved, for the community, and for the country. They would have a thoughtful path to citizenship that people could earn, not being granted amnesty but by paying taxes, learning the language, demonstrating a clear commitment to what it takes to

This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g.,  1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H2137

be a constructive part of the community.

Comprehensive immigration reform is what ultimately will help us unwind this problem, save money and heartache, and get about the business of building a stronger American future for all our families.

#### YUCCA MOUNTAIN

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor again, as I have in the past 2 years, to talk about the location of high-level nuclear waste around this country and compare and contrast it with where we have high-level nuclear waste, mostly spent nuclear fuel, but other types defined as waste, and compare it to where it should be based upon a 1982 law, the Nuclear Waste Policy Act and the 1987 amendment to that law which identified Yucca Mountain as the location where we should be storing high-level nuclear waste.

Today we go to the Pennsylvania and West Virginia areas, and we compare Yucca Mountain with a nuclear power plant called Limerick. At Yucca Mountain, currently there is no nuclear waste on site. At Limerick, there are 1,143 metric tons of uranium spent nuclear fuel on the site. At Yucca Mountain, the waste would be stored, if it's there, a thousand feet underground. At Limerick, you can see waste is stored aboveground in pools and casks. That's above ground.

If it was stored in Yucca Mountain, it would be a thousand feet above the water table. Why is that? Well, Yucca Mountain is in a desert, so that's why the water table is very, very low. Well, at Limerick, the waste is stored 20 feet above the groundwater.

Finally, Yucca Mountain is 100 miles from the Colorado River. Limerick is on the Schuylkill River 40 miles from Philadelphia. Yucca is about 100 miles from Las Vegas, Nevada. The importance of this is just to address with Fukushima Daiichi, and nuclear waste, and some difficulties we've had, and public policy being as defined by law. The question is, why do we still have nuclear waste in Pennsylvania right outside Philadelphia, and why don't we have it underneath a mountain in a desert?

The answer is—I know it would shock people—politics here in Washington, especially in the other Chamber, not complying with the law, along with an administration that is in league with those who have blocked a final scientific study for Yucca Mountain. What I have been doing is going around and looking at the senators from the States around the nuclear power plants that I have been addressing.

Where do they stand individually? Well, Senator CASEY, a relatively new Senator, has really been silent on that, although he has said, as a Senator from a State with 9 commercial reactors and

10 million people living within 50 miles of those reactors, I can tell you that nuclear security is extremely important to Pennsylvanians. Obviously the nuclear waste is not that important to him since he has been silent on Yucca Mountain.

Senator TOOMEY is quoted as saying the alternative is what we have now, highly active radio waste located at 131 sites in 39 States, including nuclear power plants close to the Lehigh Valley. That cannot be as safe and secure as burying the waste deep in Yucca Mountain. I would agree with the Senator.

Senator MANCHIN from West Virginia, who is relatively new, has been silent on what we should do with the high-level nuclear waste. Part of this process is to identify that and hopefully have him come out in a statement. Senator ROCKEFELLER voted “no.” His statement is, nuclear energy is touted by its proponents as a carbon-free option that should have its share of the Nation's electricity generation expanded.

□ 1010

Yet we have never figured out what to do about the permanent storage and human health and safety concerns regarding high radioactive waste with a half-life measured in tens of thousands of years. That's where I very much disagree with the Senator, because the Federal Government has spent 20 years and \$9 billion studying Yucca Mountain. Unprecedented 100 million-year projections were completed showing Yucca's safety. There is no safer place in the entire United States for nuclear waste than Yucca Mountain.

So, then, I've been doing a tally across the country of the Senators and where they stand as of today. We have 48 who support Yucca Mountain and high-level nuclear waste; 18, we don't know. Hopefully, they'll get a chance to cast a vote. And we have 20 who are “no.” In the filibuster world that operates in the other Chamber, you know we really need 60. We're very close. In fact, if 12 of these 18 undecideds are “yes,” there should be no reason why we would allow Senator REID and the President of the United States to block further development and movement to take all of our high-level nuclear waste and store it safely in a mountain in a desert.

#### QUALITY OF LIFE ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Yesterday, the guest chaplain asked that the House of Representatives be blessed and that each Member of the House of Representatives be blessed. In our opportunity to be free in our expression of religion, I ask that each of us bless this Nation. For that reason, I set this morning to discuss just a series of

issues, hoping that we can improve the quality of life of not only Americans, but people around the world.

First, we have to clean up our house. And so I express outrage of the actions of two former TSA workers—TSO officers and two present TSO officers.

All of us can fall short because we are human, but the outrage of participating in drug trafficking right here in the United States as an official of the United States Government should be condemned by all of us, and I will call for immediate hearings to ensure that the culture of TSO officers, besides their frontline duty, is to respect the job and the task. As a champion of their work, believing that their work is vital to the security of this Nation and the fact that we have not been attacked on our soil since 9/11, I call for immediate investigation and response.

This morning, as well, we determined that the Secret Service, who finished quickly an investigation of the Colombian debacle dealing with sex workers, prostitutes, we now have discovered through a contractor that, in fact, actions occurred in El Salvador. We thought it might not be the culture. But let's own up and begin, as necessary, to purge those who are reckless in their behavior. Thank you to the men and women of the Secret Service who have always done their duty. But to the dastardly deeds of these who think it's a playground: Get out now. There is no tolerance for this kind of behavior.

Let me move immediately to the work in Syria. I was the first Member to go to the Syrian Embassy to ask for the fall, or the removal, of Dr. Assad, and we have been moving along while others have been slaughtered. Meetings and discussions at the U.N. National Security Council, a special envoy—“do this and do that”—while women and children are being slaughtered, it is time for there to be a stronger statement on the removal of Dr. Assad and the increase in U.N. peacekeepers. The people need your help in Syria. The bloodshed continues and the fear is insurmountable, almost. It is necessary on behalf of their human rights to be able to move quickly in Syria.

As the Supreme Court has discussed the Arizona law, I hope that we can bless America by having comprehensive immigration reform. I hope we can understand that there are laws that work well. Just helping a Korean student who was shot in my jurisdiction whose father was denied entry because of his language and didn't understand, he now has been granted humanitarian parole. Let's have comprehensive immigration reform so that we don't have States who are stopping families who are U.S. citizens in the streets of Arizona, profiling them because of this dastardly law, that we don't have police officers having to become immigration officers while they need to be rescuing people and saving people. Let's do the decent thing. Let's bless America and have comprehensive immigration reform.

Then, of course, the Senate is debating the issue of the Violence Against Women Act, an act that as a new Member of Congress I had the pleasure of both cosponsoring and writing amendments as a member of the House Judiciary Committee, and it is sad that we have a divide on the Violence Against Women Act that has bipartisan support. This House should take up the Leahy bill immediately as it passed the Senate. Do you realize how many women are being killed a day, an hour, because of the domestic violence that this particular act helps to outreach, provide resources, counseling and opportunities to be able to nurture those women and to be able to ensure that they are safe?

As a former board member of the Houston Area Women's Center that has been a living example of protecting women against dastardly violence and, of course, men who are subjected to domestic violence, it is, unfortunately, a form of an epidemic in this country, as we have seen with bullying. We have to be able to bless America and have people turn internally. Let them seek help. But why stall the passage of the Violence Against Women Act which, in fact, will provide the nurture, comfort, and resources and the national statement that we abhor and stand against violence against women and others who are being impacted violently against this Nation.

As a Member who stood along Chairman Hyde many years ago, the late Chairman Hyde, the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, a Republican who stood alongside of us to say he stands with legislation to protect women, get the Senate to do its business and let the House do its business. Let us bless America.

#### HONORING COACH PAT HEAD SUMMITT

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my praise to one of Tennessee's true living legends.

Born in Clarksville, Tennessee, in Tennessee's Seventh Congressional District, Coach Pat Head Summitt paved the way for women athletes at Cheatham County High School and then at the University of Tennessee-Martin. She was an exemplary student athlete, and today the gym at UT-Martin is named in her honor.

She took the reins at the University of Tennessee in 1974, and she has led the Lady Vols to an unprecedented 31 consecutive NCAA Tournament appearances. In her time as a coach, she has coached 12 Olympians, 20 Kodak All-Americans, and 77 All-SEC performers. After 1,098 career wins over 38 seasons, Pat Head Summitt is the all-time winningest coach in NCAA basketball history.

Pushing excellence both on and off the court, Coach Summitt prepared her

players to be successful women when they hang up their jerseys. We will remember her legacy at UT for two things: winning games and, most importantly, graduating players. Every Lady Volunteer—every Lady Volunteer—who finished their eligibility at the University of Tennessee graduated from college. That is a statistic to cheer about. Coach Summitt has dedicated her career and her magnificent journey to the great game of women's basketball and to the student athletes she has championed.

This week, we have welcomed Coach Summitt and her son, Tyler. They've been here in D.C. with us this week as we have saluted her career and as we cheer her as she now coaches millions of volunteers in fighting Alzheimer's and early onset dementia.

Thank you, Coach Summitt, for leading by example both on and off the court.

□ 1020

#### ISRAEL INDEPENDENCE DAY

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

Mr. HOYER. Ladies and gentlemen of the House, 64 years ago, the State of Israel was born out of the hope of a generation and on the heels of history's darkest human tragedy. Notwithstanding the many grave challenges that it has faced since that day and still in our time, Israel has achieved a thriving economy, a strong national defense, and an important role as a member of the family of nations.

Israel's existence itself is a powerful symbol of the Jewish people's resolve never again to permit its sons and daughters to face the threat of persecution or genocide. On my many visits to Israel, I have witnessed the triumph of a dream—a beautiful dream that sustained the Jewish people for 2,000 years and that has been fulfilled through the blossoming of a desert, the emergence of Israel's high-tech economy, and the freedoms of speech, press, and religion for its citizens of every faith.

Israel continues to impress the world with her achievements in business, technology, sports, the arts, and the defense of human rights. They are even more remarkable when considering the very real dangers Israel faces in the form of terrorism, regional instability, and the threat from Iran.

For Americans, Israel's peace and security has always been an important national interest of the United States of America. As President Obama has made very clear, our countries will continue to work closely together to prevent a nuclear-armed Iran. Not only do the United States and Israel share common interests; we also share common values. Democracy, equal opportunity, human rights, and a yearning for peace are the ideals we hold in our hearts, and together we have worked for 64 years to defend them and promote them.

On the anniversary of Israel's independence, Americans continue to stand side by side with Israel as it pursues peace and security for its people and, yes, for its region.

I pray for the peace of Israel and its people and for all the people of that troubled region. And I know the strong bonds between our nations will endure for generations to come. Those futures were what we worked so hard to make possible for thousands and thousands.

#### INTERNATIONAL WOMEN OF COURAGE

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

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, in March, the United States recognized 10 women who were risking their lives to bring about justice in their countries. These women were honored in the United States as the 2012 International Women of Courage and visited Congress to share their stories and give a voice to the people of their countries who have nowhere else to turn.

I had the privilege of meeting with each of these women and listening to their stories and learning more about their fight to end human rights abuses and to make the world a better place. I was impressed with their strength, their courage, and want to share some of their stories with you here today so that we can continue to speak up for those who have no voice.

Maryam Durani is from Afghanistan. At age 27, she is the director of Women's Association for Culture and speaks out for the rights of women and girls in Kandahar province. Her life has been threatened numerous times, and yet she continues to fight for women in Afghanistan and has started the only female-focused radio station in the nation. She received the International Women of Courage Award for "striving to give a voice to women through the power of media, government, and civil society."

Pricilla de Oliveira Azevedo is from Brazil. She is 34 and serves as the General Coordinator for Strategic Programs for the Rio de Janeiro State Secretariat of Public Security. She is one of the most senior officers in the Police Pacification Units in her country and has worked to end drug-dealing operations in Brazil. She arrested a gang of criminals who had once kidnapped her and is working with the state and local governments to improve conditions throughout Brazil. She received this award for "integrating previously marginalized populations into the larger Rio de Janeiro community."

Zin Mar Aung is from Burma. At age 36, she is a democratic activist who was a former political prisoner and was held for 11 years because of her efforts to promote democracy, women's empowerment, and conflict resolution in Burma. She received this award for "championing democracy, strengthening civil society, and empowering individuals to contribute meaningfully

to the political transformation of Burma.”

Jineth Bedoya Lima is from Colombia and at age 38 is an investigative journalist. While on assignment, she was repeatedly raped and left in a Dumpster. She was left in this Dumpster by her attackers and told that they were sending a message to the Colombian press. Since that horrific attack, she has spoken out against sexual violence and has become a role model for women in Colombia. She was given this award for “her unflinching courage, determination, and perseverance fighting for justice” all around the globe.

Hana Elhebshi is a 27-year-old architect from Libya who contributed to the proper documentation of the violence during the revolution in her country. She also is an advocate for women’s rights in her country and received this award for “courageous advancement of the cause of freedom of expression and promotion of women’s rights during times of conflict and transition in Libya.”

Aneesa Ahmed is from Maldives and founded Hope for Women. She advocates for ending gender-based violence in Maldives and has served as the Deputy Minister of Women’s Affairs. She received this award for “courageous advocacy of women’s rights and protection from domestic violence.”

Shad Begum is 33 and is from Pakistan. She is a courageous human rights activist. She provides political training, microcredit information and more to women in her country. There have been numerous attempts to end her life, but she remains committed to advancing women’s rights and even won a local office in her country. She received this award for “fearlessly championing Pakistani women’s political and economic rights.”

Samar Badawi is from Saudi Arabia and at 31 monitors human rights in her country. She is the first woman in Saudi Arabia to file a lawsuit against the government demanding that women have a right to vote. She won this award for “demonstrating significant courage in her activism while becoming a champion in the struggle for women’s suffrage and legal rights in Saudi Arabia.”

Hawa Abdallah Mohammed Salih is from Sudan and is a human rights activist. Forced to flee Darfur, she lived in an internally displaced persons camp and has since spoken out against human rights abuses in these very camps and has advocated for women’s rights in her country. She has been persecuted by the Government of Sudan and forced to flee her country. She received this award for “giving a voice to the women and children of Darfur.”

Safak Pavey is a member of the Parliament in Turkey and is the first disabled woman elected to Parliament in her country. She is working to empower the disabled, women, and minorities in Turkey. She received this award for “her personal dignity and courage.”

Mr. Speaker, I want to just simply say that these women act as a role model for all women across the country, across the world; and we must stand up for women’s rights.

#### SMART SECURITY: A STRATEGY THAT INVESTS IN AFGHANISTAN AND ITS PEOPLE

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, last weekend, the United States Government and Afghanistan reached a strategic agreement to define the terms of the relationship between our two countries in the near-term future.

First of all, this agreement affirms that our combat troops will not leave Afghanistan until 2014, which is far too slow a timetable. Don’t we have enough evidence right here after 10-plus years that we’re not making America safer with this war, we’re not minimizing the terrorist threat, and we’re not bringing stability and security to Afghanistan?

How much more will Americans be asked to sacrifice? How many more tens of billions in taxpayer dollars will be wasted when we have so many needs right here at home? How many more Americans have to come home in a casket? How many more will take their own lives because the mental health distress of serving in a combat zone becomes too much? How many more have to spend the rest of their lives in a wheelchair, or without a limb or limbs, because of injuries suffered in an immoral and unnecessary war?

□ 1030

Believe me, Mr. Speaker, there is not a minute to waste. Now is the moment to end this war and bring our troops home.

The meeting this weekend does, however, show the importance of a plan going forward, a plan that will define the terms of our engagement with Afghanistan after the war is over.

I’ve always said that ending the military occupation does not mean abandoning Afghanistan. The question is, what form will our partnership take? And on that question, the agreement signed this weekend provides very little guidance.

According to The Washington Post, in fact, and I’ll quote them, they say: “The specifics of the U.S. commitment to Afghanistan have yet to be formally outlined.”

Then The Post adds that “the document provides only a vaguely worded reassurance, leaving many to guess at what the U.S. commitment means in practice.”

Well, Mr. Speaker, we need more than a guess. We need a clear strategy for investing in Afghanistan and it’s people. And while a lot of the talk has been about continuing to shore up Afghan security forces, we need a much more comprehensive approach.

In short, we need to implement SMART Security, the strategy that I’ve spoken of from this spot hundreds of times since 2004. SMART Security would replace our military surge with a civilian surge. It would put humanitarian aid in front and center. It would emphasize development and diplomacy instead of invasion and occupation.

It would mean, in place of troops and weapons, we send experts with tools and resources to rebuild Afghan infrastructure, hospitals, and schools. It would mean investing in programs to improve maternal health and child mortality. It would mean a focus on democracy promotion and rebuilding civil society in Afghanistan. It would also mean shifting the emphasis to peace-building, conflict prevention, and human rights education.

This approach would save lives. It would promote peace. It is a superior counterterrorism and national security strategy. It will keep the American people safe. It will advance our values in a way that a decade of war clearly has not.

We can’t wait until 2014, Mr. Speaker. We need a SMART Security approach in Afghanistan, and we need it now. And we need to start by bringing our troops home.

#### HONORING OUR COUNTRY’S VETERANS

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

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of our country’s veterans, and I want to begin briefly by mentioning an organization that helps veterans that was recently brought to my attention, Patriot Outreach, a nonprofit organization to assist our military with getting the help they need to deal with the trauma associated with aspects of military service. You can learn more about that at PatriotOutreach.org, and I think they’re doing a great service for our veterans.

Benjamin Disraeli once said that “the legacy of heroes is the memory of a great name, and the inheritance of a great example.” In our country, some of our greatest heroes are veterans, individuals who answered our Nation’s call to protect and defend our freedom.

Our veterans are one of our Nation’s greatest treasures and, as such, our country has given them a firm promise. Because of their willingness to protect us with their service, when their service ends, we promise to take care of them. But, unfortunately, if you talk to veterans today, they don’t believe that our government is living up to their promises.

When we made the commitment to take care of our troops when they returned home, we never said anything about making them jump through hoops or navigate a complicated bureaucracy. We promised our veterans

the Moon and, instead, have failed, in many instances, to provide them with the most basic of care.

As of March 16 this year, the Columbia, South Carolina Regional Office of the Veterans Administration had over 21,927 pending cases, with an average wait time of 232 days.

Survivor benefits for veterans' spouses can take between 10 and 18 months to be disbursed, and sometimes even longer, depending on the health status of the beneficiary.

My office is currently assisting a constituent who contacted us because he has had 12 claims pending before the VA, which date all the way back to 2004. Another constituent has had her claims delayed over 18 months because she's been told by the VA that they don't have medical records. Now, this is despite the fact that she's already sent the VA her medical records twice by certified mail.

Unfortunately, claims aren't the only backlog facing the VA. Veterans are also facing delays in seeking medical attention. A lack of doctors and inefficiency in the system have forced some veterans to have to wait months to receive medical care.

Mr. Speaker, to put it simply, the VA isn't clicking and ticking. Despite the best intentions of VA personnel to deliver a high level of service and care to our veterans, too many of our former servicemen and -women are falling through the cracks.

In the Third District of South Carolina, we recently created an advisory committee composed of retired military veterans to provide insight into some of the problems that they're facing today. Their view is not that the law needs to be changed necessarily, but that the spirit of the law is not being followed. Veterans were promised certain benefits and, in too many cases, they are still waiting to receive them.

In addition to the mounting pile of problems regarding veterans services, I'm deeply concerned that veterans will be negatively impacted by the implementation of ObamaCare. The clear goal of the Obama administration's unconditional and unconstitutional health care law is to begin lumping our servicemen and -women into the bureaucracy of ObamaCare. Not only do I think that this breaks a promise made to our veterans, but I'm afraid it will make an already bad situation worse.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, we can do better; and for the sake of our living heroes, we must do better. Let us not forget the promises that we've made to our veterans, and let us not just honor our veterans with our words, but let's also honor them with our actions.

Thank you. May God bless our troops in the field, those here at home. May God bless those who have served our country in uniform, and may God continue to bless the United States of America.

#### DISCRIMINATORY VOTER IDENTIFICATION LAWS

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to talk about the discriminatory voter ID laws that are undemocratic and simply un-American.

The American Legislative Exchange Council, also known as ALEC, has long been a secretive collaboration between big business and conservative Tea Party Republican politicians serving in this Nation's State and Federal legislatures. ALEC's goal is to advance the special interests of large corporations and the super-rich and wealthy by any means necessary.

Yesterday, I discussed how ALEC has fiendishly and unabashedly produced legislative policy that degrades our air and water quality and wrecks our environment. Last week, I outlined how ALEC has infiltrated our criminal justice system by producing legislation that stimulates higher and higher levels of incarceration, to the benefit and to the surging profits of the private for-profit prison industry.

And if that wasn't enough, with 194 days left until the general election, ALEC has been working hard to suppress the votes of the most vulnerable in our society. ALEC has met with its corporate allies and right-wing State officials behind closed doors to promote legislation to suppress the votes of likely Democratic voters.

By making it more difficult for people to exercise their right to vote, ALEC's model voter ID act grants an electoral advantage to Republicans, while undermining the right of individuals to vote.

In addition, ALEC has worked to make it easier for corporations to participate in the political process. Their Public Safety and Elections Task Force promotes model legislation that would disenfranchise millions of voters, devastate campaign finance reform, and allow for greater corporate influence in elections.

Mr. Speaker, it has injected these corrosive laws into our States, and they have spread like untreated cancer. Bills based on ALEC's model legislation have already been introduced in 34 States and passed in many of those States.

□ 1040

Voter suppression comes in many forms, from new voter ID laws to eliminating Election Day registration to restricting voter registration drives by community groups to reducing the number of days for early voting and limiting the number of days for voter registration. There is no doubt that ALEC is directly tied to the proliferation of these voter ID laws in the States' legislatures.

These policies are not about preventing fraud in the voting process. This legislation is solely about disenfranchising minorities, the elder-

ly, and other at-risk voters, such as the poor, who are unlikely to have the technical kinds of ID that these pieces of legislation demand.

After the spotlight has started to shine on ALEC, they have come out publicly and said, Okay, we're going to get out of the public policy business. They're not going to not write any more model legislation like the Florida "shoot first and ask questions later." They're not going to introduce any more of that type of legislation. They also have announced they're going to shut down their Public Safety and Elections Task Force, which is the committee that produced the voter suppression legislation.

That's a good thing. But the damage has already been done, and we're going to have to remain vigilant about this group, this shadowy group, ALEC, this unholy alliance between Tea Party Republican legislators and big business. We'll have to keep our eyes open. I'll have more to talk about in the coming days.

#### JONATHAN FRANK DAVIS

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

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, I've come to the floor this morning with great sadness but also with a great sense of pride to honor the service of a Georgia hero, Private First Class Jonathan Frank Davis.

On March 29, 2012, Jonathan gave the ultimate sacrifice in Kandahar province, Afghanistan, while supporting Operation Enduring Freedom.

Jonathan was the son of Reverend and Mrs. Kerry Davis of Griffin, Georgia. His mother, Tracey, described him as tenderhearted, a tenderness that extended to both his peers and animals. His heart was so large that they now have numerous pets running around their home due to Jonathan not being able to turn away a single stray.

His nurturing and giving nature was one of the things that was loved most about him. As a child, Jonathan always stood up for his classmates who were being bullied, and many of Jonathan's peers remember that he was the first to come to their defense. He was willing to give his shirt off his back to help others and was always concerned about the well-being of everyone around him, especially those less fortunate.

Jonathan was playful and strove to make others happy, either by playing funny pranks on them or with his unforgettable smile that could light up a room. Jonathan attended Griffin High School, where he played soccer, and after graduation, he, like myself, married his high school sweetheart. Her name is Kristen.

Kristen is expecting their first child, and Jonathan talked all the time of how excited he was to become a father. He carried the sonogram of baby Benjamin in his wallet everywhere he went

and couldn't wait to teach their baby boy soccer.

Jonathan's unwavering courage, huge heart, and strong Christian faith are the reasons why he answered his calling to join the Army. He was assigned to the 4th Squadron, 73rd Cavalry Regiment, 4th Brigade Combat Team of the 82nd Airborne Division at Fort Bragg, North Carolina. He was pursuing a medical career after the Army and, having already completed part of his EMT and paramedic training, was on the path to attending medical school.

Jonathan was part of a scout group sweeping an area in Afghanistan and doing what he does best—protecting others—when his group came under enemy fire and he suffered fatal wounds. At only age 20, Jonathan was taken from us much too soon. On April 7, the First Assembly of God Church in Griffin, Georgia, celebrated the life of Jonathan, and he was laid to rest by his close family and friends.

I am proud to stand before you and honor the life of PFC Jonathan Davis and thank him for his dedicated service to our country. His endless generosity and brave spirit are among the many reasons he will be missed so much by all who had the privilege to know him.

Joan and I extend our deepest sympathy to the friends and family of Jonathan, and we will never forget his great sacrifice for our Nation and those that allow us to live free every day.

Jonathan, until we meet again some day, thank you, Brother.

#### STOP MILITARY RAPE

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

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise again for the 19th time to highlight the epidemic of rape and sexual assault in the military.

By the military's own figures, 19,000 sexual assaults and rapes occur each year, but only 13 percent of the members of the military actually report them.

Last week, I met with Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta, along with my colleagues, to discuss DOD's new report of data on rape and sexual assault in the military. The report shows a slight increase in reports of rape and assault but a startling decrease in the number of charges brought against reported perpetrators. With a decrease in charges came a significant decrease in prosecutions, in punishments, and in convictions. The numbers, frankly, are very discouraging.

When I left the meeting, I was only pleased about one thing. Secretary Panetta and I agreed that the only way to solve this problem is with an increase in prosecutions. We agree on the results to be achieved, but for right now, we do not agree on the steps to achieve it.

After our meeting, Secretary Panetta announced new initiatives, but DOD's three major proposals will not increase

prosecutions, convictions, or punishments.

Proposal one: elevate cases of rape and sexual assault to higher-ranking officials in the chain of command. Military commanders today told me that many are already having them handled by colonels and captains, yet this does not result in more prosecutions. I believe the cases have to be handled by an impartial office within the military but outside the chain of command.

Proposal number two: establish a special victim's unit in each service of the military. These units have been in place in the Army since 2009. I'm impressed with the training program that is offered to the various members of the investigation and prosecution within the Army. But again, we have not seen an increase in prosecutions, convictions, or punishments as of yet.

Proposal three: create a centralized database of these proceedings and cases. This is a good thing. It's already required in the Department of Defense as a result of the NDAA 2009.

So for all intents and purposes, all of these initiatives are already in place to some extent. The problem is the chain of command, and let me explain.

Claudia Castillo, an Army corporal whose attempts for justice back in 2003 and 2004 were thwarted repeatedly by commanding officers, including a high-ranking lieutenant colonel, all of whom were unmoved by her reports of sexual assault and harassment.

Corporal Castillo was on combat deployment in Iraq when she awoke to a fellow specialist on top of her sexually assaulting her and using force. She was in shock and screamed until he left. She immediately reported the assault to her platoon sergeant, who responded with a lack of surprise or concern. He advised her to wait while he "looked into it." He did not have any advice for how she could get help or go forward.

Corporal Castillo also encountered several incidents of harassment, stalking, and erratic behavior by a much older staff sergeant. She would wake up to find him standing by her bed while she slept. Her reports to command were greeted by ridicule and not taken seriously.

□ 1050

Command discretion empowers a commander to decide if the case goes forward to a court-martial. Even if very high-ranking commanders are in charge of these cases, captains and colonels are not shielded from the conflicts of interest that exist in the chain of command.

Victims should have the benefit of impartiality by objective experts, which is why my bill, H.R. 3435, attempts to do that. We need to overhaul the current military justice system, and I will continue to tell stories like Corporal Castillo's until military justice means justice for all.

DEE COOK—CHILD ADVOCATES OF FORT BEND COUNTY

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dee Cook, a distinguished leader in my home community of Fort Bend County, Texas. For over 40 years, Dee has given her time and her energy to help with the children of Fort Bend County, in part through her commitment and support of Child Advocates of Fort Bend County, which fights on behalf of abused and neglected children.

Dee has served as the grant officer of the George Foundation since 1988. The George Foundation contributes to many worthy causes throughout Fort Bend County, and Dee has played a pivotal role in making sure the generosity of the foundation is directed to causes that help our communities the most. However, it is her generous contributions through the George Foundation to Child Advocates of Fort Bend County that bring me to the floor today.

By contributing her time, energy and resources, Dee has enabled Child Advocates to serve over 8,000 children throughout Fort Bend County. Under her leadership, Dee Cook has helped teach the staff and volunteers to be better leaders, more effective program managers, and to achieve the dream of helping the most vulnerable children in our communities in ways we never thought possible 20 years ago. Her contributions are helping children and, in turn, are strengthening our communities and neighborhoods. On their behalf, she has given a voice to those who desperately need one.

Dee's efforts to build philanthropic leaders do not stop with Child Advocates. She has also started an annual 8-month Leadership for Nonprofit Excellence course to teach the rising stars of Fort Bend County the skills they need to harness and grow Fort Bend's strong nonprofit community. Most importantly, she has led a cooperative effort between the George Foundation and the Sugar Land Chamber of Commerce to create Youth in Philanthropy, the YIP Team. The YIP Team is 100 Fort Bend County high school juniors and seniors who spend a school year seeing how volunteerism and philanthropy co-exist to serve our Fort Bend community. At the end of the school year, the YIP Team will put their knowledge to the test by awarding monetary grants to nonprofits—life changing, indeed.

I commend Dee Cook for a lifetime of service to Fort Bend County. I simply want to say to Dee, on behalf of the people of Fort Bend County, thank you. Fort Bend County would not be the county that we all know and love without Dee Cook.

In closing, Dee's love for Fort Bend County will be on display tonight at Constellation Field as Fort Bend's new pro-baseball team, the Sugar Land Skeeters, has its first home game. I join Dee and the people of Sugar Land and Fort Bend County in saying, Go Skeeters.

## STUDENT LOANS

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, we all know if Congress doesn't come together soon, interest rates on student loans will double on July 1. Rates will go from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent.

Right now in our country, student loan debt is higher than credit card debt. This is a huge challenge and barrier facing students, their families and our economy. We cannot have our graduates leaving school with crushing debt. It limits the careers they can pursue, and we certainly don't want young people shying away from continuing their education because they know they'll never be able to afford it. We must keep open the doors of opportunity for all and, in the process, produce a well-educated workforce that's going to grow our economy.

But, if Congress doesn't act soon, more than 7 million low- and middle-income students nationwide will be required to pay more for their student loans. This would mean adding thousands of dollars to a college bill, and that's why I am a proud supporter of legislation to address this issue. I support ending some of the lavish subsidies we give to extraordinarily profitable oil companies and using that money to keep student loan rates from doubling and, at the same time, reducing our deficit by billions of dollars.

We must get our priorities straight. We should be investing in our students and bringing down our deficit instead of handing over taxpayer dollars to some of the richest corporations in the world. I urge my colleagues to join in this effort.

VA COMMUNITY-BASED  
OUTPATIENT CLINICS

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

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I recently received the first monthly update from the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs since the announced delays associated with the Lafayette and Lake Charles VA Community-based Outpatient Clinics. VA Secretary Eric Shinseki's office followed through on my request for detailed monthly updates of the progress the VA is making with regard to these clinics in both Lafayette and Lake Charles. The errors in the contracting process were solely the VA's fault, and they've admitted it. I will remain vigilant in overseeing the expedited process to deliver south Louisiana veterans the local care they need and deserve.

I am pleased to announce that there are new and much-needed services for veterans coming to Lafayette in early May. These services include home-based primary care, imaging and x ray services, prosthetics and dental care.

For the veterans in Lake Charles, a mobile clinic providing primary care services is expected to begin June 4, and the selection of a location is under way. This will be a first for our veterans in Lake Charles who have had to travel far to get basic care. According to the VA officials, the Veterans Affairs' clinic primary care services will be available in Lake Charles 3 days per week also beginning June 4. Women's services will be provided 1 day per week in Lake Charles beginning then as well.

We need to do more, and we're going to do more. These are all very important services the veterans of south Louisiana deserve after sacrificing so much for our country. They should not have to wait any longer for this very much needed medical care. Expediting this process must remain a top priority for the VA.

Having cared for veterans in the VA system during my medical career, I know localized, personalized outpatient facilities and care are best for our veterans. This is a critical priority for our area. This is the least we can do for those who have fought on behalf of our country, and I am committed to ensuring that this unnecessary VA mistake does not repeat itself in the future. I will continue demanding accountability from the VA leadership on this and on other issues. I will continue to be the leading advocate for local veterans as we work to improve health care for our veterans in Lafayette and Lake Charles and in the surrounding communities of south Louisiana.

God bless those who have served our country. God bless America.

## VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT

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

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I come humbly to the well today, under the "E Pluribus Unum," to ask that there be swift bipartisan action in reauthorizing the Violence Against Women Act. VAWA's authorization, of course, lapsed at the end of the last fiscal year, on September 30, 2011.

□ 1100

Unfortunately, for every day that passes by, women pay the price. The annual National Census of Domestic Violence Services—a daily snapshot taken every year by the National Network to End Domestic Violence—found that in one 24-hour period in the United States, over 67,000 victims were served through emergency shelters, transitional housing, counseling, legal advocacy, and more. Over 22,000 hotline phone calls were answered and over 26,000 people participated in domestic violence prevention and education training.

For all these people who are served, unfortunately, in the same 24-hour period, there are nearly 11,000 unmet requests for services because these programs neither have the resources to

help these victims nor the authorizations based on best practices on how we need to change VAWA in order to meet the needs of women.

Our colleagues across the Capitol in the Senate are on the cusp of passing a bipartisan VAWA reauthorization bill that contains these provisions to strengthen our ability to combat not only domestic violence, but also sexual assault, dating violence, and stalking. And I'm so proud to say that right here on this floor, 1 month ago, I introduced a companion bill to the Senate legislation that contains these badly needed updates to reflect the input of numerous stakeholders and lays a path forward for VAWA.

The vision is to protect all victims, no matter what their gender, sexual orientation, immigration status, or whether or not they reside in sovereign territories or in States. These updates have garnered criticism from our colleagues on the other side of the aisle that offer fundamental, simple rights that ought to be guaranteed by the 14th Amendment.

For example, this bill would recognize the tribes' authority to prosecute non-Indians or Indians who abuse their American Indian spouses or dating partners on tribal lands. Fifty-two percent of women who are beaten, battered, raped, or stalked on tribal lands are not prosecuted because tribes have no authority. And on tribal lands, there is no follow-up and no prosecution.

The bill would also provide equal opportunity for areas that are in traditionally underserved areas, including those who have barriers because of their religion, gender identity, or sexual orientation. It's absurd to say that because you are a homosexual that you don't deserve protection from being beaten, stalked, or raped. And, of course, the Hippocratic Oath would have us scoop up a person who may be lying in the street, hit by a truck. We don't ask people for their immigration papers in order to intervene in a life-saving intervention. Why would we demand this of immigrant women?

We have got to ensure a more comprehensive response to the continuing problem of enforcement, reporting, and services for victims of sexual assault.

In spite of the strides we have made toward a new and improved VAWA, just yesterday the House Republicans put their so-called "clean" reauthorization bill on the floor. Let me tell you this: it's clean, perhaps, because we don't want to sully our hands dealing with the beaten, stalked, murdered, and bullied butch-batterers, because we don't want to deal with homosexuality. We want clean reauthorization, a sleight of hand that keeps immigrant women in the shadows and keeps their pain and their battery and their victimization in the shadows and makes them invisible. We're actually sanctioning the abuse that occurs on tribal lands and providing a sanctuary for assailants who commit these crimes on

native lands by not providing this authority to tribal nations.

I urge my Republican colleagues to work together with House Democrats to craft a truly bipartisan update of VAWA.

---

#### 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 11 o'clock and 5 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

---

□ 1200

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FLEISCHMANN) at noon.

---

#### PRAYER

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

Eternal God, we give You thanks for giving us another day. Lead us this day in Your ways that our Nation might be guided along the roads of peace, justice, and goodwill.

Grant strength and wisdom to our Speaker and the Members of both the people's House and the Senate, to our President and his Cabinet, and to our Supreme Court.

Bless as well the moral and military leaders of our country, and may those who are the captains of business, industry, and unions learn to work together toward the mutual benefit of all, walking in the ways of righteousness and working for the highest good of our beloved land.

Grant us the courage to develop a sound energy program for the good of all, and may our people respond with willing hearts to make that program work.

Bless us this day and every day, and may all that is done within the people's House be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

---

#### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 pro tempore. Will the gentleman from New York (Mr. HIGGINS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. HIGGINS 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.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

S. 1789. An act to improve, sustain, and transform the United States Postal Service.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 5 of title I of division H of Public Law 110-161, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the following Senator as Vice Chairman of the U.S.-Japan Interparliamentary Group conference for the One Hundred Twelfth Congress:

The Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI).

---

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

---

#### YUCCA REPOSITORY BILL

(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. Mr. Speaker, in 2002, Yucca Mountain was approved as the location for our Nation's nuclear repository, which was previously authorized by Congress in 1987. In 2010, sadly, the President placed party politics over the interests of the American people and began the wasteful process of stopping the project.

Consumers in South Carolina have paid over \$1.3 billion for the establishment of a national nuclear repository at Yucca Mountain. In order to establish accountability and to protect the people living in the Second Congressional District of South Carolina, I have introduced the Yucca Utilization to Control Contamination Act. This bill gives the administration two options: first, certify the Yucca Mountain project or, second, face fines to reimburse consumers across the Nation who have paid for its opening.

The President constantly talks about fairness. It is only fair that the people of South Carolina receive the services they have already paid for with hard-working taxpayer dollars promoting jobs.

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

---

#### PATIENTS DESERVE CHOICE

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

Ms. CHU. Patients deserve choice when selecting the right prescriptions and pharmacies for them, but powerful, unregulated middlemen, known as pharmacy benefit managers, or PBMs,

are limiting their options, and most people don't even know it.

These companies are telling doctors what drugs they can prescribe, limiting access to pharmacy patient care, and they're telling customers what pharmacies they can go to. That's not fair to patients. With the pending merger of two of the biggest PBMs, one company will control three-quarters of the private insurance market. This leaves us with even less competition, higher prices, and fewer choices.

That's why I support the Medicare Pharmacy Transparency and Fair Auditing Act. This bill will ensure that PBMs are transparent and fair when dealing with local pharmacies, and it will help make sure the Medicare part D prescription program works for seniors. It will be an important step in protecting pharmacy choice for patients.

---

#### SUGAR REFORM

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, last week, liberal MSNBC host Ed Schultz found himself agreeing with the Heritage Foundation and Mitt Romney. What issue could possibly unite liberals and conservatives? The answer is: sugar reform.

You see, sugar farmers and sugar processors benefit from a Federal sugar program that fixes prices and guarantees their profits. Indeed, Schultz noted that one of the biggest processors, American Crystal Sugar, makes \$1.5 billion in revenue and pays its CEO \$2.4 million a year in compensation.

While Schultz is, probably, mostly concerned about a labor dispute between American Crystal and its workers, I hope he will also consider the many other workers in sugar-using industries. The Federal program inflates the price of sugar in the U.S., placing American sugar users at a severe disadvantage to their foreign competition. In the last 15 years, more than 100,000 workers in sugar-using industries have lost their jobs.

I've been proud to work with Congressman DANNY DAVIS to reform this program and to make it fair for everyone. Democrats and Republicans, liberals and conservatives agree that the government shouldn't be guaranteeing corporate profits at the expense of workers and consumers. I hope the Ag Committee will reform the sugar program as we deal with the farm bill.

---

#### HORSE SLAUGHTER

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today about a serious issue: horse slaughter.

A recent poll confirms what many of us already know: 80 percent of American voters are opposed to slaughtering

horses for human consumption. Regardless of gender, political affiliation, or whether they live in urban or rural areas, Americans oppose this awful practice.

The last U.S. horse slaughterhouses were closed in 2007 but, despite public opposition, Congress recently restarted horse meat inspections, paving the way for slaughterhouses to reopen. That's why we need to pass the American Horse Slaughter Prevention Act, which would prohibit the sale and transport of horses for slaughter in the United States, as well as prohibit their transport across the borders to Canada and Mexico. The passage of this critical bipartisan bill would save the lives of approximately 100,000 American horses exported for slaughter each year.

Horses have a special place in our Nation's history and folklore, and they are not raised for food. This bill would make sure that these majestic creatures are treated with the respect and dignity they deserve. It should be passed now.

□ 1210

SUPPORT FOR ISRAEL

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

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, today is Israel's independence day, Yom Ha'azmaut, and I recognize our great ally's many achievements over the past 64 years.

Israel has endured against all odds, against border attacks, against deniers of a right to exist, against international bias; and even in the face of the threats posed by Iran's nuclear ambitions, Israel valiantly strides forward.

Israel is a world hub for biotechnology, for medical research, green energy and innovation, and she is also a welcoming home to those seeking freedom and equal rights as the region's only true democracy.

So as we celebrate Israel's independence day, let's remember why our bonds run so deep. It's more than strategic cooperation or shared security. It's the values that Americans and Israelis share. For democracy and freedom, for basic human dignity, that's what forms the bond; and it's a bond that I will always work to protect and support.

NATIONAL CHILD ABUSE PREVENTION MONTH

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

Mr. SCHILLING. Mr. Speaker, a few months ago I had the opportunity to visit the Children's Advocacy Center in my hometown of Rock Island, Illinois. The work that they do there to help children and their families that are

victims of crimes is truly amazing, and I am grateful for their commitment to helping the children that need it the most.

April is recognized as National Child Abuse Prevention Month. Unfortunately, sexual abuse of children is still a serious problem in our country, and too many cases go unreported.

My colleague from California and I have introduced H.R. 3486, the Speak Out to Stop Child Abuse Act, which would require States that receive Federal funding under their Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act to have a law on the books that makes it a criminal penalty for any adult who knowingly fails to report the sexual abuse of a child.

H.R. 3486 simply asks States to help by requiring adults who witness the sexual abuse of a child to report it. I want to thank Congresswoman BASS for introducing this legislation, and I also recommend all of my colleagues help support this, also.

CHILD ABUSE PREVENTION

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

Ms. BASS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize April as National Child Abuse Prevention Month. During this month, it is important that we acknowledge the role that we all play in promoting the social and emotional well-being of children in our communities. Unfortunately, throughout this congressional term, we've been astonished by a few high-profile child sex abuse cases; and in some situations, the abuse was unreported for years, leaving dozens of youth vulnerable to further maltreatment for decades. This is unacceptable. Adults should never turn a blind eye after seeing sexual abuse firsthand.

Sadly, failing to report child sexual abuse is not new. In 1999, Sherrice Iverson, a 7-year-old girl from Los Angeles was attacked in a restroom. A witness didn't stop the attack or even call for help. She was ultimately murdered. Fortunately, California enacted a law in her name to help ensure this never happens again.

At the end of 2011, Representative BOBBY SCHILLING and I introduced a similar bill here in Congress. The bipartisan Speak Out to Stop Child Abuse Act requires all adult witnesses to report child sexual abuse to law enforcement or Child Protective Services. I ask my colleagues to cosponsor this bipartisan bill.

EPA

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

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Speaker, the EPA is out to get you and crucify you. That's the message from one of President Obama's EPA appointees to our country's oil and natural gas companies.

Yesterday, we learned that an official at the Environmental Protection Agency based in Dallas used the Roman Empire to illustrate the kind of philosophy that he's followed at the EPA. Here's what he said:

The Romans used to conquer little villages in the Mediterranean. They'd go into a little Turkish town somewhere, they'd find the first five guys they saw, and they would crucify them. And then you know that town was really easy to manage for the next few years.

That's exactly what he did as an EPA official, going after a company that was safely using hydraulic fracturing to drill for gas. He led the charge to crucify this company with no proof that the company had done anything wrong in a case that was finally dismissed last month by a Federal court.

This is enviro-fascism at its worst; and if someone needs to be made an example of, it's this EPA official who disregarded science and facts to radically and negligently pursue the Obama administration's war on energy.

VA DISABILITY CLAIMS

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

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to discuss issues affecting veterans throughout California, particularly the VA disability claims backlog and inaccuracy rates at the Oakland regional office.

A Vietnam veteran from my district, like many others across the country, is suffering from stage 4 lung cancer caused by exposure to Agent Orange. He made great sacrifices to defend our country, but waited for more than a year for the Oakland office to process his claim.

My office was able to help him, but such delays are unacceptable. Unfortunately, long waits have become the norm for veterans in northern California. With more and more veterans returning from Iraq and Afghanistan, it is imperative that the VA take action now to address the backlog in Oakland.

While I welcome the news that the entire staff at the facility will be retrained, much more is needed. I call on the VA to implement a concrete plan to address the inaccuracies and delays at the Oakland office. Our region's and Nation's veterans deserve no less.

STUDENT LOANS

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to discuss an important issue to young America: that's access to affordable higher education.

Young Americans today are graduating college with a degree but also with \$25,000, \$50,000, and \$100,000 in student loan debt. Thirty-seven million people have outstanding student loan debt totaling over \$1 trillion. Two-

thirds of the debt held by Americans under the age of 30 is student loan debt.

In 2007, a Democratic Congress cut the interest rate on student loans in half to 3.4 percent, but it is set to expire this summer, and allowing the interest rate to double would constitute a tax hike on students in middle America.

In my western New York district alone, this rate increase would affect 62,000 students and their families. I urge my colleagues to take immediate action on this issue because all Americans deserve a fair shot at a good education.

□ 1220

#### LET'S HELP THE STUDENTS

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, the House Republicans want to play politics on the issue of doubling the student loans. They say, well, the reduction in student loan interest rates was never supposed to be permanent. Guess what. The Bush tax cuts, which I voted against, for millionaires and billionaires were never supposed to be permanent either, but you're fighting to preserve them every step of the way.

We can do one simple thing here. If we raised the tax rate on income over \$350,000 only from 35 to 36 percent, we could give millions of students a more affordable education with lower interest rates. Those who have already made it would share a little bit of the burden to help those who want to be the next generation of business leaders and political leaders and scientists for our country.

Come on, guys. The millionaires and billionaires, they can take care of themselves. That wasn't supposed to be permanent. Let's help the students.

#### GIRL SCOUTS

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

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, a century ago Juliette Gordon Low assembled 18 girls from Georgia for the first Girl Scout meeting. From "Daisy" Low's start, 50 million people have been counted among the ranks of the Girl Scouts of the USA, and today there is a membership of more than 3 million.

Today, Girl Scouts are involved in much more than cookies. I've had the privilege to see their wonderful community service projects, have attended award ceremonies, and I know about their work to introduce girls of all ages to math and science.

Recently, I had the opportunity to spend time with members of the Girl Scouts from West Windsor in Plainsboro, New Jersey. Their robotics team placed first in the Eastern Pennsylvania Division of the FIRST LEGO

League, and they're competing in the World Festival in St. Louis this week. I send them my best wishes.

I'm inspired by the Girl Scouts, and I rise to honor all the work that the Girl Scouts have done over 100 years, and I wish them success for the next 100 years.

#### STUDENT LOAN REFORM

(Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in a global economy, putting a college education within reach for every American has never been more important, but it has also never been more expensive.

Our Nation's young people have been hit particularly hard over the economic downturn in the last several years. In Texas and all across the country, students and recent college graduates are now facing the highest unemployment rate of any other group. Two-thirds of the class of 2010 graduated with an average of \$25,000 of student loan debt. Young Americans are rightly concerned about their future, and so am I.

Mr. Speaker, on July 1 of this year, Stafford loan interest rates are set to double unless Congress takes action. As we sit here as a Congress, we need to work together to prevent this increase. I, along with my Democratic colleagues in Congress and President Obama, have been working on a number of efforts to make college more affordable.

#### PROTECTING OUR FUTURE

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, the best thing Members of Congress can do to represent their constituents well is to stay in touch.

Today we had another teletown hall in my district, and we listened to seniors be concerned about Social Security and Medicare. They wondered why the Ryan budget takes away from them and why would Social Security and Medicare, which are good for so many years to come and not the cause of the deficit, why their future health care expenses and their daily expenses are being threatened. Those are good questions, and I let them know that the Democrats in this Congress and in the Senate aren't going to allow that to be jeopardized. We are going to maintain Social Security and Medicare as we know it. It's so important.

For the young people—and I see one up there. The young people, Mr. Speaker, need to see that student loan rates stay at 3.4 percent and not the way the Republicans are going to do it and pay for it by taking away cervical cancer screenings and mammograms for women. That's wrong. We need to pro-

tect our future, the future generations, be statesmen and not worry about tomorrow's election.

#### NATIONAL DAY OF PRAYER

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

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today for the observance of the National Day of Prayer, which will take place next Thursday, May 3.

This tradition began under President Eisenhower and continued through peacetime and wartime, through times of prosperity and times of uncertainty, and demonstrates our commitment as a Nation to maintaining a foundation of prayer.

Through prayer, we acknowledge that God gives us peace in the midst of our circumstances, we seek the wisdom to know and act upon God's purpose for our lives, and we feel the power of God to protect and provide for those of us who call on His name. We know that the true source of power cannot be found here in the Halls of Congress or in the Oval Office in the West Wing or in the chambers of the Supreme Court, but only on our knees before the one who is the true source of power.

So may we pray not only next Thursday on the National Day of Prayer and join communities across this Nation which are joining in prayer for our country, but may we do so also in honor and in recognition of our national motto, "In God we trust." Indeed, may God bless this great Nation.

#### RESPECT AMERICA'S CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

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

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, we must hold the government accountable for the safekeeping of the sensitive information that we choose to share with it.

In response to a number of privacy concerns I have with the Cyber Intelligence Sharing and Protection Act, I sought to encourage more government accountability by cosponsoring a bipartisan amendment with Congressman WOODALL that was offered to the Rules Committee yesterday addressing some of these concerns.

Under the current bill, the threshold for having a cause of action against the government for disclosing personal information is exceptionally hard to meet. Our amendment would have lowered this threshold, ensuring that the government treats highly sensitive and personal information it receives with the utmost care.

While this amendment was a great example of Democrats and Republicans coming together on an issue that all Americans care about deeply, unfortunately, the Rules Committee chose not to move it forward.

While I believe it is important to protect our country against impending

cyberattacks, it must be done in a manner that fully respects Americans' constitutional rights.

**PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3523, CYBER INTELLIGENCE SHARING AND PROTECTION ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4628, INTEREST RATE REDUCTION ACT; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES**

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 631 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

**H. RES. 631**

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3523) to provide for the sharing of certain cyber threat intelligence and cyber threat information between the intelligence community and cybersecurity entities, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 112-20. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. It shall be in order at any time through the legislative day of April 27, 2012,

for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules, as though under clause 1 of rule XV, relating to the following measures:

(a) The bill (H.R. 2096) to advance cybersecurity research, development, and technical standards, and for other purposes.

(b) The bill (H.R. 3834) to amend the High-Performance Computing Act of 1991 to authorize activities for support of networking and information technology research, and for other purposes.

(c) The bill (H.R. 4257) to amend chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, to revise requirements relating to Federal information security, and for other purposes.

SEC. 3. Upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 4628) to extend student loan interest rates for undergraduate Federal Direct Stafford Loans. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 4. The Committee on Appropriations may, at any time before 6 p.m. on Wednesday, May 2, 2012, file privileged reports to accompany measures making appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013.

□ 1230

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FORTENBERRY). The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

**GENERAL LEAVE**

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule, House Resolution 631. The rule provides for consideration of multiple pieces of legislation meant to provide solutions to some of today's most pressing threats and concerns. House Resolution 631 ensures that we'll be able to have a robust debate on important issues facing our Nation's cybersecurity infrastructure while also providing the path forward for student loan legislation that reflects quick action we need to take on this pressing issue.

First, House Resolution 631 gives this House the opportunity to be a leader when it comes to our Nation's cybersecurity needs. The rule also sets up the opportunity for us to vote tomorrow on a measure that addresses our Nation's student loan programs. Without this legislation, Americans with Federal student loans will see their rate double starting in July.

These are issues that cannot wait. Our Nation's security cannot wait. At a time when our workforce is so bleak and President Obama's policies keep digging us deeper and deeper into a financial hole, we cannot wait on finding a solution for those young people with student loan debt who are still trying to find a place in our workforce.

We all know that the Internet has fundamentally changed the way we live our lives day-to-day. I think it's safe to say that even 20 years ago, many of us in this room couldn't have imagined that one day we would live in a world where we could do almost anything we wanted, be it buy groceries, run a business, or talk to a loved one serving our country overseas, through a computer. The Internet has made all this possible.

But for all the ways the Internet has made life, business, and even government, to some extent, faster, more responsive, and more transparent, it has also opened us up to new threats. U.S. companies report an onslaught of cyberintrusions that steal sensitive information. Even our own government has suffered from cyberattacks. This type of rampant Internet theft not only costs American companies valuable information, intellectual property, and research and development work, it also costs American workers their jobs. It's hard to say exactly how much cyberattacks cost our Nation's economy, but they could cost as much as \$400 billion a year, according to one report from the Computer Security Institute and the FBI.

Today, the House will begin consideration of a bill that will help protect our Nation from these kinds of threats. H.R. 3523, the Cyber Intelligence Sharing and Protection Act, would allow private companies to voluntarily share information with each other and with the government in a sort of public-private Internet security partnership. The bill includes significant safeguards to protect personal and private information. It significantly limits the Federal Government's use of that information that the private companies voluntarily provide, including the government's ability to search data.

It requires that the independent inspector general for the intelligence community audit information shared with the government and report the results to Congress to ensure regular oversight. It also encourages the private sector to make the information it shares with others, including the government, as anonymous as possible.

This is a strongly bipartisan piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker, that was passed out of the Intelligence Committee with an overwhelming vote of 17-1. In the Rules Committee yesterday, we heard testimony from both sides, speaking to the cooperative, bipartisan work that was done in this piece of legislation. I commend the work that the Intelligence Committee did with members on both sides of the aisle, as well as with private sector companies, trade groups, privacy and

civil liberty advocates, and the executive branch. It's because of these efforts that virtually every sector of the economy supports this legislation. It's also why there are more than 100 cosponsors of this legislation, including 11 committee chairmen.

But recognizing that we don't always face one problem at a time, this rule also provides for consideration of a measure to address student loans. Our legislation, the Interest Rate Reduction Act, would prevent federally subsidized student loan interest rates on new loan disbursements from doubling to 6.8 percent from the current 3.4 percent on July 1 of this year. This 1-year measure would cost the government \$5.9 billion.

Now, you all probably heard me talk again and again about bringing our Nation back to its core mission. You've also heard me talk about how we need to cut back on the "nice-to-haves" and make hard choices of what we will and won't pay for. Back when the previous majority passed their health care takeover in 2010, they paid for it, in part, by taking \$9 billion from college financial aid trust funds. Now that they've robbed Peter to pay Paul, they're realizing Peter still needs that money, too. To resolve the problem, the Interest Rate Reduction Act pays for this stopgap measure by taking some of that stolen money back from the ObamaCare slush fund and redirecting it to student financial aid.

Sometimes this House has to multitask, Mr. Speaker. As we face an economy that can't afford to lose any more jobs to cyberattacks and college loan recipients who can't find a job thanks to President Obama's failed policies, that is one of those times. House Resolution 631 provides the House with a way forward on both of these critical measures.

With that, I encourage my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule, "yes" on the underlying pieces of legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the rule and the underlying bills: H.R. 3523, the Cyber Intelligence Sharing and Protection Act, or CISPA, and H.R. 4628, the Interest Rate Reduction Act.

□ 1240

Both bills are being brought to the House under a hyperpartisan, closed process that limits debate and discussion that can improve the legislation and allow the House to work its will. Many of the meaningful amendments that would have protected privacy under CISPA were not allowed under this rule, and under the Interest Rate Reduction Act, no amendments were allowed.

I want to address both of the bills that are contained in this underlying rule. First, the Interest Rate Reduc-

tion Act. This is a bill of rather mysterious origin that appeared in the Rules Committee yesterday mere hours after having been introduced by its lead sponsor, Mrs. BIGGERT of Illinois. No regular order was followed for this bill. This bill received no hearings and no markups by the committee of jurisdiction, and within hours of its being introduced, it was brought immediately to the Rules Committee with direction to go to the floor of the House of Representatives without a single member of either party having any opportunity to amend the bill and with only 1 hour of debate.

What is new about this cliff with regard to student loan rates? This was a well-known fact with regard to the expiration date that, in fact, the Stafford student loan interest rate would increase from 3.4 to 6.8 percent. I've joined my colleague, Mr. COURTNEY, who will later address these issues as a sponsor of his bill that would address extending the lower student loan rate, and yet, there had been no interest from the committee chair or Republicans with regard to this issue until yesterday afternoon, when a new bill, without the benefit of a markup, was presented in committee and to the Rules Committee, going completely around the committee of jurisdiction.

Look, there is a legitimate issue here. Middle class families are having a tougher and tougher time affording college for their kids at the same time that a college education is more necessary than ever for young people to have the skills they need to compete in the global economy. It's a serious issue that deserves serious treatment. There's a lot of cost drivers with regard to education. Some have commented about a higher education bubble that has led to higher and higher tuition rates. Certainly, how the State and Federal share of higher education funding is targeted and the manner in which it's spent absolutely affect tuition rates and whether there's a bubble.

But instead of a thoughtful approach, an approach that looked at drivers of cost, an approach that looked at outcomes from higher education, and an approach that looked at employment levels pre- and post-higher education, a bill was immediately created and brought to the floor within a day. Again, there is technically a 3-day rule that the majority has said that they would follow. They would give Members of this body on both sides 3 days to consider legislation, but they calculate 3 days in a very funny way. There were, as far as I know, no Members of this body who saw that particular student loan bill before yesterday afternoon. Here we are today on the rule, with final passage vote—without any opportunity to amend—expected to occur midday tomorrow.

By most calculations, it sounds like, well, less than 3 days. They had maybe 6 hours, 7 hours yesterday, 24 today, and maybe 10 tomorrow. It seems like,

in fact, less than 48 hours, less than 2 days. But, nevertheless, it's yet another example of only governing out of a sense of crisis, and with regard to this issue one in which we do have time, fundamentally, to follow regular order, and even more importantly, we did have time. This is not an issue that appeared from nowhere. Why has the chair of the committee of jurisdiction not been working on this issue for weeks or months? While many of us on our side, including myself, appreciate the sudden interest in helping middle class families afford college, it would be good to do so in a more thoughtful manner that truly addresses the cost drivers of education.

I also take issue with the other underlying bill, the initial bill that we thought would be debated under this rule before this other mysterious bill appeared out of nowhere and came to the Rules Committee. This was a bill that did follow regular order in the Intelligence Committee, and while a number of amendments that are meaningful are included in this rule, several of the most meaningful amendments that truly would have addressed the privacy concerns with regard to CISPA are not allowed under this rule.

CISPA asks Americans, once again, to make a false choice between security and liberty. Now, we all agree, on both sides of the aisle, Americans in general, that cybersecurity is an important issue that needs to be addressed. That's why it's critical that we get information-sharing correct. This bill in its current form before us is an unprecedented, sweeping piece of legislation that would waive every single privacy law ever enacted in the name of cybersecurity. It would even waive the terms of service and would supersede the terms of service that most American consumers, American people, believe they are entering into in a contract with a provider of a Web site or service of their choice. That information, without any safeguards, would be shared with the government.

As a former tech entrepreneur myself, I know very well how important cybersecurity is. Frankly, it's something that I've never thought we could rely on the government to do for us, and I think a lot of tech companies feel the same way. But that doesn't mean that in the effort for expediency we should give up our privacy rights and liabilities to protect online networks.

While I appreciate the efforts the sponsors of the bill have made to improve the bill slightly in the direction that people can have more comfort with, they haven't gone nearly far enough to ensure that customers' private information remains just that, private. There's nothing in this bill to stop companies from sharing their private information with every branch of the government, including secret, unaccountable branches, including the military. And allowing the military and the NSA to spy on American citizens on American soil goes against

every principle that this Nation stands for.

A lot has been made of saying, oh, it's optional. Well, it may be optional for the corporations to share information, but is it optional for their users, whose information they have, who entered a specific terms of service agreement, to have their information shared without their consent? In many cases, under a terms of service agreement, the users, in fact, may be the owners of the information. The company that it's hosted on may, in fact, merely be a host or provider. But, again, outside of any legal process, this gives that company, whether it's hosting or providing, the ability to share wholesale information that can include health records, that can include firearm registration information, that can include credit card information, that can include account information, and that can include political information, with secret government authorities.

Now, we have government authorities that have the responsibility and are charged with keeping America safe on American soil, namely, the Department of Homeland Security and the FBI. They've worked hard over decades to strike a fine balance between protecting our liberties and security. The military and the NSA are unaccustomed to that balance. That's why even within the military many from DOD have expressed opposition to this bill. Eric Rosenbach, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Cyber Policy within DOD, said that a civilian agency, and not an agency within DOD, should be responsible for securing the domestic civilian Internet.

According to Mr. Rosenbach:

It's almost certainly not the right approach for the United States of America to have a foreign intelligence focus on domestic networks, doing something that throughout history has been a domestic function.

So, not only will the military and the NSA be able to receive private information if CISPA passes, but they'll be able to use it for almost any justification. Now, while ostensibly a cybersecurity bill, CISPA allows information-sharing "for the protection of national security," a broad and undefined category that can include practically everything under the sun. Is a Tea Party activist a threat to national security? Is a Communist activist a threat to national security? The danger that this can be used for political oppression and to stifle political speech is very real under this bill.

In addition, because of the immunity clauses of this bill, there's no incentive at all for companies to withhold their customers' sensitive private information. Companies are exempted from any liability for violating their own terms of service and sharing information with secret government agencies. In fact, given the high compliance cost for this sort of sharing, CISPA actually incentivizes companies to dump all of their information on the government so they can take advantage of this

blanket immunity that this bill includes.

This legislation also has glaring omissions when it comes to the Nation's future capacity to be competent in cybersecurity. The bill lacks adequate support and direction for paths that can actually improve the cybersecurity of our Nation: Training in the pipeline for cybersecurity experts, including STEM programs in our K-12 schools in computer science; embedding cybersecurity in computer science; and providing scholarships and ways that students can attain the highest levels and enter public service to support the cybersecurity of the Nation.

□ 1250

Mr. Speaker, there should be an open rule for both of the underlying bills to give Members of this House across the ideological spectrum the opportunity to address the deficiencies in both these bills.

Now, we've heard from supporters of the cybersecurity bill that privacy concerns are overblown. "Trust us," they've said. Republicans say: Trust Big Government bureaucrats. Trust anonymous intelligence officers to use that information responsibly.

Well, under this bill, we have no choice but to trust them, because the bill imposes no serious limitation on what corporations or secret government agencies can do with our private information.

It's outrageous to have a closed rule on the student loan interest bill—a bill that no Member of this body, Democrat or Republican, has had any opportunity to amend. And it is also outrageous to not allow a full discussion of the thoughtful amendments brought forth by Members of both parties that would remedy some of the very severe deficiencies in the cybersecurity bill.

I, therefore, cannot support this rule or these flawed bills, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY).

Mr. THORNBERRY. I appreciate the gentleman from Florida for yielding to me.

I rise in support of the rule and the cyber bill that it brings to the floor, as well as the other cyber bills which the House will consider today and tomorrow.

Let me begin, Mr. Speaker, by acknowledging the leadership of the Speaker and majority leader for setting up a process for a thoughtful examination of the many issues related to cybersecurity. They recognize that not only is it a significant national security threat, it's a threat to our economy and to jobs. But at the same time, what we are trying to protect, at least 85 to 90 percent of it is owned and operated by the private sector. So one has to tread carefully in this area, and we have tried to do so with the limited legislation that is before the House today and tomorrow.

I also want to thank the members of the House Cybersecurity Task Force, who put in a great deal of time and expertise in sorting through these issues and making recommendations: Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. HURT, Mr. LATTA, Mr. LUNGREN, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. TERRY. Of course, a number of Members have worked on these issues for several years, including a number of those I've just mentioned, as well as Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, people on both sides of the aisle.

Finally, I also want to take a second to thank the staffs of the various committees who have worked on this issue, as well as Josh Martin and Michael Seeds of my office, as well as Jen Stewart, the Speaker's national security adviser, whose guidance on substance and process was invaluable.

Mr. Speaker, we will have ample opportunity to debate the merits of the individual pieces of legislation, but I think it's important at the beginning just to step back and say: Why all this hubbub about computers? What does all that mean?

Well, I think we should start with the point that cyber—and that includes networks that are connected to the Internet and networks that are not connected to the Internet—but cyber is deeply ingrained in virtually every facet of our lives now, from the time we get up until the time we go to sleep and all the times in between. We very much depend on cyber, and anything you very much depend on can, and often does, become a vulnerability.

We know of at least three different kinds of vulnerabilities these days. People can reach through the Internet and steal information which businesses, large, medium, and small, have produced. It happens every day in this country. Intellectual property is ripped out of the possession of those who produce it. And every time people steal information, they cost us jobs; they are stealing jobs as well. So our economy is directly affected by the difficulty in protecting the information that we, as individuals and businesses, store on our computers.

In addition to that, though, information can be destroyed on our computers or it can be manipulated, or the computers themselves can be manipulated so that what we intend to do or what we want to do is not possible. If, for example, you have a lot of bank records that are destroyed or other such important records, then it can have a huge effect on our economy as well as our security.

But going beyond stealing information, destroying information, we now know it's possible to reach through the Internet and other networks to have physical consequences in the real world, to flip a switch, to open a valve. It's the sort of thing that happened with the Stuxnet virus in Iran. But there are physical consequences to doing so. So that's part of the reason

that people talk about the electricity grid going down, a whole city being poisoned by its water supply, chemical plants releasing emissions that they don't intend to release, physical consequences.

Real death, potentially, and destruction can occur all because of things going on the Internet. That's the reason a lot of people talk about a cyber 9/11 or a cyber Pearl Harbor.

I know it's tempting to think all that's hype, but the truth is that over the past decade—and especially over the past couple of years—the number and sophistication of threats has grown much more rapidly than our ability to respond. And it's especially our laws and policies that have not kept up with the growing sophistication of threats.

So the bills that we have before us this week, four of them, try to begin to take a step to close that gap between the growing threat and laws and policies. They don't solve all the problems, they don't try to, but they are a step in the right direction.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. NUGENT. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute, if he needs it.

Mr. THORNBERRY. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I would just point out two other things, briefly:

One is, again, one criticism one hears is that, well, you don't solve this problem or that problem, and that is absolutely true. These bills, all four of them, don't solve all the problems in cyberspace. But we shouldn't let the pursuit of the perfect answer prevent us from accomplishing some significant steps in the right direction, and that's what these bills do.

The second point I'd make, as the gentleman from Florida mentioned, is three of these bills were reported out of committee by voice vote. The information-sharing bill was reported out 17–1. I believe that it has been made better since then. New protections are there. A host of restrictions on how the information can be used and privacy protections have been added and will be added with the amendments to come.

So I think this deserves the support of all Members on both sides of the aisle, and Members on both sides of the aisle should take credit for taking a step to make our Nation more secure.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, it's my honor to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise today to oppose the rule and the underlying bill, despite my genuine concern for cybersecurity.

I believe that despite some positive changes by the chairman and ranking member it still fails to adequately safeguard the privacy of Americans, and that is why I am the one that voted against it in committee.

We absolutely can combat the serious threat by cyberattacks and still ensure

that we are protecting not only our computer systems, but also the civil liberties of Americans. As the Obama administration wrote yesterday in opposition to this bill, "cybersecurity and privacy are not mutually exclusive."

I am particularly concerned because this legislation has the potential of exposing personal information of customers that may be shared both with the government and between companies. The Obama administration writes that the bill "lacks sufficient limitations on the sharing of personally identifiable information between private entities."

I offered an amendment to simply require companies to make reasonable efforts to remove information unrelated to the cybersecurity threat which can be used to identify specific persons. Even with this basic standard for compliance, the big private companies refused to make the effort, and my amendment was not made in order.

Further, the bill allows the U.S. military to directly receive cyberinformation on Americans. By allowing companies to give information to the NSA or other military agencies, this bill threatens the long-held American tradition that the military does not snoop on U.S. soil against U.S. citizens. So I also offered an amendment to require that information to be received only by civilian agencies, ensuring a layer of protection between citizens and the military.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Unfortunately, my amendments, together with all other privacy amendments, will not be considered today.

□ 1300

I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this rule and the underlying bill. We can and we will have the opportunity to do better.

Mr. NUGENT. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

Mr. SCHIFF. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in reluctant opposition to this rule and to the underlying bill in its current form. I greatly appreciate the nonpartisan work on the issue by Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member RUPPERSBERGER. They've worked in a refreshingly collaborative fashion on this bill and on the work of the Intelligence Committee, generally.

Yet, I find I cannot support the bill in its current form due to my concerns about its impact on civil liberties and the privacy of Americans. While amendments were submitted to the Rules Committee that would address these issues, including an amendment I jointly submitted with Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. HASTINGS, none of

these amendments were made in order in this rule.

I share the view of the sponsors of the legislation that cybersecurity is a serious issue that requires congressional action. I also believe that information-sharing is an important piece of responding to the cybersecurity threats, though it is, by no means, sufficient alone without other elements such as hardening critical infrastructure against cyberattacks.

I'm disappointed in the rule because the problems with the bill are eminently fixable and, in fact, multiple amendments, including my own, were submitted that would improve the bill.

Yesterday afternoon, the White House issued a Statement of Administration Policy saying the President's senior advisers would advise him to veto the bill if it came to him in the current form because of the lack of protection for civil liberties. As the administration's statement said: "Cybersecurity and privacy are not mutually exclusive."

I believe we can and must protect ourselves from cyberattack and that we can and must preserve our privacy. This is eminently doable, but we are not there yet.

My amendment, which was not made in order, would have accomplished four tasks. First, it would have made DHS, a civilian agency, the primary coordinating agency for information-sharing.

Second, it would require rules to minimize the sharing of personally identifiable information. The amount of personally identifiable information shared would be the least amount needed to combat the cybersecurity threat, and no more.

Third, it would narrow the uses of cybersecurity information to cybersecurity purposes, specific national security threats, and certain other serious crimes.

And, finally, it would more specifically define cyberthreat information to make sure that we don't sweep up information we don't intend to and don't need.

In conclusion, amendments like this one would have improved the bill and better balanced the need to protect ourselves against cyberthreats with the equal imperative of preserving the privacy of the American people.

I am disappointed that the House won't have the opportunity to vote on those amendments; and, as a result, I urge a "no" vote on the rule.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON).

(Mr. BARTON of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I do rise in support of the rule. I think the number of amendments that they've made in order is consistent with Speaker BOEHNER's policy of running an open House.

Unfortunately, one of those amendments that was not made in order is

the Barton-Markey amendment on privacy. I am going to vote “no” on the underlying bill because it does not protect the privacy of the individual American citizen.

We do have a real threat, a cyberthreat, in this country. This bill is an honest attempt to deal with that threat; but absent explicit privacy protection against individuals, to me, that is a greater threat to democracy and liberty than the cyberthreats that face America.

So unless they pull the bill and they revise some of the privacy protections, I am going to ask for a “no” vote on the bill. But on the rule, I do think we should vote for the rule.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule and the underlying bill.

At the beginning of this Congress, expectations were high for meaningful progress on cybersecurity. Speaker BOEHNER even established a task force within the Republican Conference to come up with recommendations.

But a funny thing happened on the way to Cyber Week. Key Republican task force recommendations were abandoned. They abandoned measures to approve data breach notification laws, formalize DHS’ cyber-role and, more importantly, enhance the cybersecurity of critical infrastructure networks.

These omissions from Cybersecurity Week were no small matter. We all have critical infrastructure in our districts, be it a pipeline, a power plant, an airport or even a dam.

Top national security officials, both in the Obama and Bush administrations, have briefed us on the significant cyberattacks to critical infrastructure. They have told us that voluntary information-sharing is simply not enough.

In fact, the CSIS Cyber Commission, the Republican task force, and NSA Director Alexander have all said that Congress must do something to proactively address critical infrastructure vulnerabilities.

But House leadership ignores these voices. Instead, it has decided that information-sharing alone is enough to fix the problem.

Mr. Speaker, this boils down to a simple question: Who do you trust?

Turning to H.R. 3523: What does it do?

In an effort to improve our cybersecurity, this bill would erode the privacy protections of every single American using the Internet. Put simply, this bill would allow any certified business to share with any government agency, who can then use this information for any national security purpose and grant that business immunity from virtually any liability. None of these amendments authored by the Intelligence Committee would change that truth.

Further, the Rules Committee decided to block consideration of amend-

ments submitted by me and other like-minded colleagues to address the fundamental privacy flaws in this bill.

If my colleagues want to do something on cybersecurity, then vote “yes” on any or all of the suspension bills to be considered today; but do not vote for H.R. 3523. It would set back the privacy rights that our constituents have enjoyed since the beginning of the Internet.

Again, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the rule and the underlying bill.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

Mr. MARKEY. This legislation might as well be called the Cyber Insecurity Bill because it fails to address the reality of cyberthreats already facing our Nation. And if this bill had a privacy policy, it would read: you have no privacy.

They would not even allow the Barton-Markey privacy language to be put in order to debate out here on the House floor.

Let’s talk about what the bill does not do. Although the bill would allow the government to tell nuclear power plant operators that a new version of the Stuxnet computer worm could cause widespread Fukushima-style meltdowns in this country, would this bill require the industry to take even a single step to protect American nuclear reactors? No.

Would this bill require industry to even tell the government what it is doing to protect against a cyberthreat nuclear meltdown? No.

Would this bill require industry to even tell the government when it had experienced an actual cyberattack? No.

Now, let’s talk about what this bill would do. Could companies share personal information about consumers with other companies, even if that information had nothing to do with cybersecurity? Yes.

Would companies be free from liability if they share that personal information of every American? Yes.

Could the government use personal information to spy on Americans? Yes.

In this last Congress, FRED UPTON and I wrote the GRID Act, which passed by voice vote on the suspension calendar 2 years ago.

□ 1310

It would have said to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission: Do you have the authority to mandate grid security standards against an attack coming in from Iran or from China?

This bill does nothing to protect against the threat at the electricity grid system in this country that could lead to nuclear meltdowns. This Republican Congress still refuses to bring up the real security we need against a cyberattack. We have an all-volunteer

Army in Iraq and Afghanistan, brave men and women, but they follow orders. We must give the orders to the electric industry and to the other industries to protect this country against a cyberattack. This bill does not do it.

Mr. NUGENT. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to provide that, immediately after the House adopts this rule, we will bring up H.R. 4816, Mr. TIERNEY’s bill, to prevent the doubling of student loan interest rates, fully paid for and then some, reducing the deficit by \$7 billion by repealing tax giveaways for big oil companies.

To discuss our student loan bill, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY).

Mr. TIERNEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that this House take action to stop the need-based student loan interest rates from doubling at the end of June. If we defeat the previous question, the House will have an opportunity to take up a bill that I have filed and introduced that will keep those interest rates at 3.4 percent for 1 year.

My Democratic colleagues and I recognize the importance of being fiscally responsible, so our bill is completely paid for. We pay for it by ending unnecessary tax subsidies for big oil and gas companies. These are the same companies that took home \$80 billion in profits last year. Exxon pocketed nearly \$4.7 million every hour.

We have to make choices here in Congress. Our side of the aisle believes that it is a fair and reasonable choice to eliminate an unjustified subsidy to hugely profitable industries so that 7 million students, including some 177,000 in my Commonwealth of Massachusetts alone, will not see an increase in their student loans. Our side of the aisle believes that encouraging middle class students and their families to be able to pay for college educations should be a bigger priority than continuing tax subsidies for Big Oil.

Now, the other side of the aisle has been tremendously late to this issue. I know the presumptive nominee for the Presidential race has changed his mind and has come around to believing that this is important—a practice that he does on a regular basis. They’ve come around to the side of knowing that we should keep these interest rates low, and we welcome that; but the fact of the matter is that they have decided to make the wrong choice in how we’re going to pay for it.

The bill that is expected to come to the House floor tomorrow includes a short-term fix for the student loan issue, but it will do it at the expense of women and children. What is it with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle with the knee-jerk reaction of,

every time they have to do something, they take a gratuitous swipe at women's health benefits and women's health choices? Their bill would end funding for breast and cervical cancer screenings for women, and their bill would end funding for child immunizations. Their bill makes the wrong and the reckless choice.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this motion so that we can consider my bill for a vote on the floor, a bill that makes the right choice, that makes sure we keep the rates low, that makes sure the oil companies get rid of that subsidy they no longer need or should have.

Mr. NUGENT. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California, the ranking member of the Education and the Workforce Committee, Mr. MILLER.

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in strong support of the Tierney motion, the legislation that he and Mr. COURTNEY of Connecticut introduced yesterday in the Congress.

For years now, the Democrats have stood on the side of lower interest rates for families and for students. We have paid for 4 years of that starting in 2007. We took the money and the subsidies away from the big banks, and we recycled that on behalf of students and their families in order to lower the cost of college and to make it more affordable for those families seeking college educations for their young children.

The fact of the matter is that the Republicans fought that effort. They're fighting that effort today. Actually, they were fighting it yesterday, and they changed their minds. After almost a unanimous vote on their budget—the Ryan budget, the Republican budget—to allow student interest rates to double, they have now changed their minds. That's important. That's good. We need to make sure that the rates don't double on July 1.

How are you going to pay for that?

We want it paid for. We don't want to do what they did last week and provide \$46 billion in tax cuts to the wealthiest Americans and add it to the deficit—\$46 billion in new deficit spending in 1 year. So the Speaker says, well, he's just going to take it out of the slush fund. Really? The Speaker of the House thinks that the prevention fund is a slush fund? The Speaker of the House thinks that birth defects and the funding to mitigate birth defects is a slush fund? Does the Speaker of the House really believe that a screening program for women with cervical and breast cancer is a slush fund?

No. This is a matter of life and death for young children who get immunized out of the prevention fund. For women who get this screening, we know what the early detection of breast cancer means for women and their surviv-

ability rates. This isn't a slush fund; but what they're asking you to do is to repeal this fund that goes to communities all over this country in order that people will have access to this kind of preventative care.

Yes, they'll say, but you took some money out of this fund to do the payroll tax reduction for the middle class. Yes, but we didn't repeal the fund. They're taking \$10 billion out of the fund and repealing it and putting women and children at risk. That's not a slush fund, Mr. Speaker. That's immoral.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, our second President, John Adams, once said:

Facts are stubborn things, and whatever may be our wishes or the dictates of our passion cannot alter the state of facts.

As to how we got here on the student loan bill, here are the facts. Unlike what was stated by the proponent of this rule, on January 24, the President of the United States stood on that podium and challenged Congress to block the increase of rates from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent. The Republican majority has done nothing over the last 3 months to respond to that—no bill, no hearing, no markup. In fact, they passed the Ryan budget, which locked in the higher rate at 6.8 percent and doubled down and went after Pell Grants for needy students who need those grants to pay for college.

The politics has changed. That's the fact.

What happened here, and the Speaker's reversal over the last 24 hours, which we welcome, is now being paid for by a grotesque pay-for which goes after women and children rather than going after the folks who can afford to pay for it—the oil companies, the gas companies that made \$137 billion in profits last year.

Support the Tierney motion and oppose this rule.

Mr. NUGENT. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. It is my honor to yield 1 minute to my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. PETERS).

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have cosponsored legislation with my colleagues Mr. COURTNEY and Mr. TIERNEY in order to keep student loan rates from doubling in 65 days.

Right now, millions of high school seniors are deciding where they are going to attend college. At kitchen tables across the country, students are making decisions that will impact the rest of their lives. So, today, I find it hard to believe that Republicans have decided to pit public health against higher education. By introducing this misguided, deeply partisan bill, it is clear that my Republican colleagues aren't taking the responsibility to fam-

ilies very seriously. It is unconscionable that this body would be playing politics with our children's futures.

With the same urgency that Republicans rammed through a \$46 billion tax cut to millionaires and billionaires, I am sure we can find a responsible way to prevent piling on even more debt on our college students. I urge my colleagues to vote for the defeat of the previous question and to adopt a bipartisan, bicameral solution that can be quickly signed by the President.

Mr. NUGENT. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Florida if he has or is expecting any additional speakers.

Mr. NUGENT. I do not.

Mr. POLIS. It is my honor to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Democratic leader.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for giving us this opportunity to talk about a choice we have here today.

Everybody knows that what is essential to a democracy is the education of our children, of investments in the future so that people can reach their own personal self-fulfillment and provide for their families but, also, so that our country can be competitive in the global economy. It is a very important part of the American Dream.

□ 1310

Democrats believe in imposing ladders of opportunity where people can have the opportunity to succeed if they want to work hard, play by the rules, take responsibility.

An important rung of that ladder is education. We all know the impact that the GI Bill had on America's great middle class, growing America's great middle class, the education of our returning veterans to our country, enabling them to have more education than their parents, and that has been the way it has always been in our country's history, the enduring theme of re-igniting the American Dream.

So we have a challenge before us, because the clock is ticking on a July deadline. At that time, left to the budget of the Republicans, the Ryan-Republican-Tea Party budget, there would have been a doubling of interest rates from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent. We've been having this debate for a while on how we could stop that doubling from happening. Republicans told us they were tired of hearing about the interest rate debate.

Until now, thanks to President Obama taking this issue public so that the American people understood what was at stake here and that the doubling of interest rates would deprive some people of even going to college and be more costly for many others. In fact, 7 million students would be affected, and that means at least 20 million people, assuming they have an average of two people in their families.

So this has a direct impact on many people in our country. It's a bread-and-

butter issue. It's a kitchen table issue where people talk about how they're going to make ends meet, and one of those ends is the education of their children.

So all of a sudden Republicans in the House have seen the light. They're willing to reverse a vote that they took not more than a week ago—100 percent of them voted for the Ryan budget, which would allow the interest rates to double from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent. Thank God they have seen the light. Thank you, President Obama, for shedding some light on this, and now they say they're for stopping that.

But how do they want to pay for it? They want to take it from their favorite target—women's health. I don't know why it hasn't dawned on them yet that the health of America's women is very important to the health of America's families.

So they want to take the funds from women's health and then also childhood immunizations. That's very important. Immunization of every child in America is very important to every other child in America. That's where they want to take the money from.

The motion that we have here today is to say instead of taking the money, instead of robbing Paula to pay Peter, we should be taking the money from the tax subsidies that go to Big Oil in our country. That's what we should be doing. Isn't that a better show of what our values are, that we value the health of our women and our children?

To make matters worse, not only are they suggesting that we take the money from the prevention fund, the immunization and screening for breast cancer and cervical cancer and other women's health issues, not only are they saying we should take the \$6 billion from there, they're saying we should take the additional \$5 billion that would be left in the account and repeal it. We're taking twice as much money as we need for the student loan bill because we're going to use this as an excuse to do away with this prevention initiative that affects women's health so directly. It's outrageous. We prefer tax subsidies for Big Oil rather than the health of America's women.

Once again, they're targeting women's health.

So, I urge my colleagues to vote against the previous question so we will have an opportunity to at least put before the House an alternative that says give us a choice to choose between whether we want to pay for our young people's education by removing some of the subsidies to Big Oil or we want to take it out of women's health.

The very idea that the Republicans would deny us a vote to do that speaks very clearly about how focused they are on targeting women's health as something that they want to cut.

So, again, I urge my colleague to vote "no" on the previous question, which would allow the House to vote on a Democratic bill that reduces the interest rates, keeps them at 3.4 in-

stead of raising them to 6.8, which is in the Republican budget. If we cannot do that, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this ill-conceived, way-out-of-whack statement of values that we would make women's health pay for children's education when we should be doing both.

So "no" on the previous question—we're not allowed to at least even take a vote—"no" on the bill, and let's admit that we can do better than that.

Mr. NUGENT. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. I yield myself the remainder of the time.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment of Mr. TIERNEY's bill into the record along with extraneous material immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GINGREY of Georgia). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. TIERNEY's bill will not only provide the House, as was passionately argued by the leader, Ms. PELOSI, and Mr. TIERNEY, the opportunity to decide between women's health or special tax breaks for oil and gas companies, but will also reduce the deficit by \$7 billion. The time of record deficits when restoring the fiscal integrity of our Nation is critical to our competitiveness in job creation. I hope that this House acts boldly by defeating the previous question and allowing us to vote on reducing the deficit by \$7 billion.

With regard to CISPA, it simply strikes the wrong balance between security and liberty. Information-sharing is important. I think a bipartisan consensus can be reached. And while I appreciate the spirit with which CISPA was offered and members of both parties worked on it, the bill is so far from perfect, we need to continue to work on it and defeat this rule and allow more amendments.

Any American who values his or her privacy should be concerned by the implications of this bill trusting Big Government and secret agencies with our most personal information. The reality is that CISPA represents a massive government overreach in the name of security. We need accountability and we need oversight. We can't have secretive agencies accountable to no one with vast powers over American citizens on our soil.

For these reasons, I oppose the underlying pieces of legislation. I urge a "no" vote on the rule and the previous question.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I've been here now 1 year and 4 months, and I'm always amazed at what we hear from the other side. I hear about how this is supposed to be an attack on women's health. You know, it's interesting because that's the position that President Obama's taken. I understand that

that's the position that my friends on the other side of the aisle have taken, but it's not true.

You know, yesterday in markup in Energy and Commerce in regards to this pay-for, they talked about a number of issues in regards to this slush fund that HHS has. Now, it's interesting, part of that slush fund comes out to a partly paid for by the U.S. Department Health and Human Services, the Department's Communities Putting Prevention to Work campaign.

□ 1330

It's \$100 million. Part of it was in spaying and neutering pets, which I agree with, but I don't see how that is taking money away from women's health. If you go on to HHS' Web site, where they actually chronicle the spending from this slush fund, not one place does it talk about cervical cancer or breast cancer in regards to the dollars spent. So to stand here on this floor and accuse Republicans of being against women and women's health when the facts don't back it up—if you go to HHS' Web site, you will see specifically where the money has been spent. Like I said, in one area it is \$100 million. The other area that they've gone after is media campaigns as they relate to soda, fast-foods, and others. That's not women's health.

Mr. Speaker, the Democrats would like you to forget that in 2010, they took over \$9 billion away from student financial aid. The same argument that they're making today, they took it away. I wasn't here in 2010, so it's kind of hard to have your cake and eat it, too. When we say robbing from Peter to pay Paul, and now Peter needs the money, those are students that need the money. Those are students that can't afford to pay additional interest on loans that they're already having a hard time paying off because they are trying to find a job.

Mr. Speaker, we've heard so much about cybersecurity today, but remember that the committee started their work on cybersecurity over a year ago in regards to hearings and working in a bipartisan way that produced a bill that was overwhelmingly bipartisan, 17-1. In this Congress, that's pretty difficult to do. But they saw the need based upon their experience within where we stand today as it relates to threats against our infrastructure, those people that actually create jobs, and against our government.

Not only have they worked tirelessly amongst themselves, but they reached out to other stakeholders in a way that I believe has been unprecedented in regards to trying to craft a bill that, while not perfect, is a step in the right direction.

This isn't about government coming in—you heard one gentleman up here talking about how government should tell businesses what to do. Folks, this is America. This is about freedom for businesses. If they don't act upon information, shame on them. It's not about

government takeover of private businesses that tells them how to operate. It is about, though, the ability of government to help formulate the aspect of protecting our cybersecurity. It's all about that. It's about sharing of information. It's about right now the Federal Government is precluded from sharing information to help alert those businesses out there to protect themselves. We know about it, and we can't even tell them.

That was one of the inherent problems we had back in 9/11, the fact that we couldn't talk to each other, that agencies didn't talk and share information. Now we want to set ourselves up for a greater catastrophe, one that could bring this Nation down to its knees or worse.

You heard about regular order or not regular order. We had regular order on the cybersecurity bill, and it's not enough. Sixteen amendments were made in order. The gentleman from Colorado's amendment was made in order. Five privacy-related amendments were made in order, two Republican and three of those bipartisan. Of the total of those 16 amendments made in order, eight were Republican, four were Democrats, and four were bipartisan. Mr. Speaker, I believe in regular order, and I think that was a perfect example of how this House is supposed to work. That was regular order at its best.

We talk about a fair and open process. I want to make sure that we protect the American people; that when you go to bed tonight, your financial information is still going to be secure tomorrow, that you're going to have the ability to protect yourself financially. One of those is to allow businesses to share cyberthreats that are made against them and others, and also for the Federal Government to share when they see a cyberthreat coming that could affect a business today in America.

HHS has discretion on how they spend that slush fund. Remember, that money was stolen from students back in 2010 to provide for their education. It was stolen. Call it what you want, but now it's just righting a wrong. It's about making sure that our students have the ability to get an education and hopefully get a great job.

I also heard my good friend from Colorado mention about how we're going to make a decision as to who's a national security threat. He mentioned the Tea Party in the same word with Communists. I think it's pretty clear that the Tea Party is not a national security threat and communism is. I don't think that takes a whole lot of rocket science.

Mr. POLIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NUGENT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. POLIS. The point being made is that it depends on one's political perspective where one sees a national security threat. Some see it on the left,

some see it on the right. I don't trust Big Government decisionmakers to decide who is and isn't a threat to security.

Mr. NUGENT. Reclaiming my time, I get what you're saying. But at the end of the day when you're trying to say, I guess, a description in regards to that, and you say Communists and then you say Tea Party, I think it's pretty clear. The Tea Party is not a threat to national security. Communism is and has been.

Mr. Speaker, I support this rule and encourage my colleagues to support it as well.

We're talking about two issues here today that have a lot of bipartisan agreement. Our Nation's cybersecurity is just an integral part of our national security as a whole. It's part—not all—but part of our national security as a whole. And we agree something must be done with our Nation's students as it relates to the loan debt that they have. These are issues that I think we all agree on, Democrats and Republicans alike.

I know from some of our previous conversations that my friend, Mr. POLIS, is a fan of NPR. So I wanted to let him know this, just in case he didn't. This morning NPR did a story about the fact that China and Russia aren't the only threats to our Nation's cybersecurity anymore. In fact, according to the story today, the newest cybersecurity threat we face today is going to continue and grow, and it's from Iran. Even though Iran may not have as strong a cyberpresence now as Russia and China do, it's continuing to grow. It's growing at the same time as their nuclear program is growing, too. Iran has learned how to manipulate the Internet to shut down protesters in their own country, to hack Web sites that have antigovernment messages, and carry out sophisticated cyberattacks in their own country to identify those dissidents who may disagree with the government. With threats like that growing every day, we need to make sure our networks here at home in America are safe and secure.

This bipartisan—I can't stress this enough—this bipartisan Rogers cybersecurity bill is critical. It's a critical step in ensuring America and our private industry are safe from cyberattacks. We talk about bipartisan a lot in this Chamber. We don't always practice it. This committee not only practiced it, but they reached outside of the committee itself to those that may be supportive and may be opposed, and they tried to work and put forth amendments that would make this a better bill.

□ 1340

That's what it's all about, the amendment process, is to make something better, nor tear it down. So I encourage colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this strongly bipartisan legislation both on cybersecurity

and protecting our students and student loans.

As the President begins his taxpayer-funded college tour, which is really more like a reelection tour, he's going to be talking a lot about student loan debt. Well, he can talk all he wants because in this House we're going to act—and we're going to do it in a way that fixes a problem that was a temporary fix for 5 years.

Well, guess what. We're going to fix it again. We're going to make sure that our students have the ability to get a college education and be able to pay it back in a way that they can be successful in the future. We're going to make sure that the ratio of the student loan rates don't double come this July 1.

In Washington-speak, to a lot of people, that's a ways off. But up here, this House, this Congress has kicked cans down the road before to the tune of 20 years when they're looking out and saying, oh, we've got plenty of time, and all of sudden we have other issues facing this country—and now we have one here.

This House is taking action to correct a wrong or a problem that exists today in America, both in cybersecurity and in student loans, and we're going to do it without costing the taxpayers anything by taking money out of the ObamaCare slush fund, which was funded by cuts to student loan programs to begin with, and sending it back to our student loans.

Now remember, this slush fund can be used for anything. As we saw, they used it for a whole bunch of things. As they tried to link us to women's health issues, not one of those were related to that. Not one nickle or dime was spent on those, even though they would like to say it was.

So, Mr. Speaker, I support the rule and the underlying legislation.

The material previously referred to by Mr. POLIS is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 631 OFFERED BY  
MR. POLIS OF COLORADO

Amend section 3 to read as follows:

SEC. 3.(a) Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4816) to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to extend the reduced interest rate for Federal Direct Stafford Loans, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final

passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

(b) Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of the bill specified in subsection (a).

(The information contained herein was provided by the Republican Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 110th and 111th Congresses.)

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

Because the vote today may look bad for the Republican majority they will say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, sec-

tion 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. NUGENT. With that, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adopting House Resolution 631, if ordered; and suspending the rules and passing H.R. 2240, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 241, nays 179, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 182]

YEAS—241

Adams	Crenshaw	Harris
Aderholt	Cuellar	Hartzler
Akin	Culberson	Hastings (WA)
Alexander	Denham	Hayworth
Amash	Dent	Heck
Amodei	DesJarlais	Hensarling
Austria	Diaz-Balart	Herger
Bachmann	Dold	Herrera Beutler
Bachus	Dreier	Huelskamp
Barletta	Duffy	Huizenga (MI)
Bartlett	Duncan (SC)	Hultgren
Barton (TX)	Duncan (TN)	Hunter
Bass (NH)	Ellmers	Hurt
Benishek	Emerson	Issa
Berg	Farenthold	Jenkins
Biggart	Fincher	Johnson (IL)
Bilbray	Fitzpatrick	Johnson (OH)
Bilirakis	Flake	Johnson, Sam
Bishop (UT)	Fleischmann	Jones
Black	Fleming	Jordan
Blackburn	Flores	Kelly
Bonner	Forbes	King (IA)
Bono Mack	Fortenberry	King (NY)
Boren	Fox	Kingston
Boustany	Franks (AZ)	Kinzinger (IL)
Brady (TX)	Frelinghuysen	Kline
Brooks	Gallegly	Labrador
Broun (GA)	Gardner	Lamborn
Buchanan	Garrett	Lance
Bucshon	Gerlach	Landry
Buerkle	Gibbs	Lankford
Burgess	Gibson	Latham
Burton (IN)	Gingrey (GA)	LaTourette
Calvert	Gohmert	Latta
Camp	Goodlatte	Lewis (CA)
Campbell	Gosar	LoBiondo
Canseco	Gowdy	Long
Cantor	Granger	Lucas
Capito	Graves (GA)	Luetkemeyer
Carter	Graves (MO)	Lummis
Cassidy	Green, Gene	Lungren, Daniel
Chabot	Griffin (AR)	E.
Chaffetz	Griffith (VA)	Mack
Coble	Grimm	Manzullo
Coffman (CO)	Guinta	Marchant
Cole	Guthrie	Matheson
Conaway	Hall	McCarthy (CA)
Cravaack	Hanna	McCaul
Crawford	Harper	McClintock

McCotter	Rehberg	Simpson
McKeon	Reichert	Smith (NE)
McKinley	Renacci	Smith (NJ)
McMorris	Ribble	Smith (TX)
Rodgers	Rigell	Southerland
Meehan	Rivera	Stearns
Mica	Roby	Stivers
Miller (FL)	Roe (TN)	Stutzman
Miller (MI)	Rogers (AL)	Terry
Miller, Gary	Rogers (KY)	Thompson (PA)
Mulvaney	Rogers (MI)	Thornberry
Murphy (PA)	Rohrabacher	Tiberi
Myrick	Rokita	Tipton
Neugebauer	Rooney	Turner (NY)
Noem	Ros-Lehtinen	Turner (OH)
Nugent	Roskam	Upton
Nunes	Ross (FL)	Walberg
Nunnelee	Royce	Walden
Olson	Runyan	Walsh (IL)
Palazzo	Ryan (WI)	Webster
Paulsen	Scalise	West
Pearce	Schilling	Westmoreland
Pence	Schmidt	Whitfield
Petri	Schock	Wilson (SC)
Pitts	Schweikert	Wittman
Platts	Scott (SC)	Wolf
Poe (TX)	Scott, Austin	Womack
Pompeo	Sensenbrenner	Woodall
Posey	Sessions	Yoder
Price (GA)	Shimkus	Young (AK)
Quayle	Shuler	Young (FL)
Reed	Shuster	Young (IN)

NAYS—179

Ackerman	Frank (MA)	Napolitano
Altmire	Fudge	Neal
Andrews	Garamendi	Olver
Baca	Gonzalez	Owens
Baldwin	Green, Al	Pallone
Barrow	Grijalva	Pascarell
Bass (CA)	Gutierrez	Pastor (AZ)
Becerra	Hahn	Pelosi
Berkley	Hanabusa	Perlmutter
Berman	Hastings (FL)	Peters
Bishop (GA)	Heinrich	Peterson
Bishop (NY)	Higgins	Pingree (ME)
Blumenauer	Himes	Polis
Bonamici	Hinchee	Price (NC)
Boswell	Hinojosa	Quigley
Brady (PA)	Hirono	Rahall
Bralley (IA)	Hochul	Reyes
Brown (FL)	Holt	Richardson
Butterfield	Honda	Richmond
Capps	Hoyer	Ross (AR)
Capuano	Israel	Rothman (NJ)
Cardoza	Jackson (IL)	Roybal-Allard
Carnahan	Jackson Lee	Ruppersberger
Carney	(TX)	Rush
Carson (IN)	Johnson (GA)	Ryan (OH)
Castor (FL)	Johnson, E. B.	Sanchez, Linda
Chandler	Kaptur	T.
Chu	Keating	Sanchez, Loretta
Cicilline	Kildee	Sarbanes
Clarke (MI)	Kind	Schakowsky
Clarke (NY)	Kissell	Schiff
Clay	Kucinich	Schrader
Cleaver	Langevin	Schwartz
Clyburn	Larsen (WA)	Scott (VA)
Cohen	Larson (CT)	Scott, David
Connelly (VA)	Lee (CA)	Serrano
Conyers	Levin	Sewell
Cooper	Lewis (GA)	Sherman
Costa	Lipinski	Sires
Costello	Loeb	Smith (WA)
Courtney	Loeb	Speier
Critz	Lofgren, Zoe	Stark
Crowley	Lujan	Sutton
Cummings	Lynch	Thompson (CA)
Davis (CA)	Maloney	Thompson (MS)
Davis (IL)	Markey	Tierney
DeFazio	Matsui	Tonko
DeGette	McCarthy (NY)	Towns
DeLauro	McCollum	Tsongas
Deutch	McDermott	Van Hollen
Dicks	McGovern	Velázquez
Dingell	McIntyre	Visclosky
Doggett	McNerney	Walz (MN)
Donnelly (IN)	Meeks	Wasserman
Doyle	Michaud	Schultz
Edwards	Miller (NC)	Watt
Ellison	Miller, George	Welch
Engel	Moore	Wilson (FL)
Eshoo	Moran	Woolsey
Farr	Murphy (CT)	Yarmuth
Fattah	Nadler	

## NOT VOTING—11

Davis (KY)	McHenry	Sullivan
Filner	Paul	Waters
Holden	Rangel	Waxman
Marino	Slaughter	

□ 1405

Mr. BILIRAKIS changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, on rollcall 182, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 236, nays 185, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 183]

YEAS—236

Adams	Duncan (SC)	Kelly
Aderholt	Duncan (TN)	King (IA)
Akin	Ellmers	King (NY)
Alexander	Emerson	Kingston
Amash	Farenthold	Kinzinger (IL)
Amodei	Fincher	Kline
Austria	Fitzpatrick	Labrador
Bachmann	Flake	Lamborn
Bachus	Fleischmann	Lance
Barletta	Fleming	Landry
Bartlett	Flores	Lankford
Barton (TX)	Forbes	Latham
Bass (NH)	Fortenberry	LaTourette
Benishke	Fox	Latta
Berg	Franks (AZ)	Lewis (CA)
Biggart	Frelinghuysen	LoBiondo
Billray	Gallely	Long
Bilirakis	Gardner	Lucas
Bishop (UT)	Garrett	Luetkemeyer
Black	Gerlach	Lummis
Blackburn	Gibbs	Lungren, Daniel
Bonner	Gibson	E.
Bono Mack	Gingrey (GA)	Mack
Boustany	Gohmert	Manzullo
Brady (TX)	Goodlatte	Marchant
Brooks	Gosar	Matheson
Broun (GA)	Gowdy	McCarthy (CA)
Buchanan	Granger	McCaul
Buchson	Graves (GA)	McClintock
Buerkle	Graves (MO)	McCotter
Burgess	Griffin (AR)	McKeon
Burton (IN)	Griffith (VA)	McKinley
Calvert	Grimm	McMorris
Camp	Guinta	Rodgers
Campbell	Guthrie	Meehan
Canseco	Hall	Mica
Cantor	Hanna	Miller (FL)
Capito	Harper	Miller (MI)
Carter	Harris	Miller, Gary
Cassidy	Hartzler	Mulvaney
Chabot	Hastings (WA)	Murphy (PA)
Chaffetz	Hayworth	Myrick
Coble	Heck	Neugebauer
Coffman (CO)	Hensarling	Noem
Cole	Herger	Nugent
Conaway	Herrera Beutler	Nunes
Cravaack	Huelskamp	Nunnelee
Crawford	Huizenga (MI)	Olson
Crenshaw	Hultgren	Palazzo
Culberson	Hunter	Paulsen
Denham	Hurt	Pearce
Dent	Issa	Pence
DesJarlais	Jenkins	Petri
Diaz-Balart	Johnson (IL)	Pitts
Dold	Johnson (OH)	Platts
Dreier	Johnson, Sam	Poe (TX)
Duffy	Jordan	Pompeo

Posey	Ryan (WI)
Price (GA)	Scalise
Quayle	Schilling
Reed	Schmidt
Rehberg	Schock
Reichert	Schweikert
Renacci	Scott (SC)
Ribble	Scott, Austin
Rigell	Sensenbrenner
Rivera	Shimkus
Roby	Shuler
Roe (TN)	Shuster
Rogers (AL)	Simpson
Rogers (KY)	Smith (NE)
Rogers (MI)	Smith (NJ)
Rohrabacher	Smith (TX)
Rokita	Southerland
Rooney	Stearns
Ros-Lehtinen	Stivers
Roskam	Stutzman
Ross (FL)	Terry
Royce	Thompson (PA)
Runyan	Thornberry

NAYS—185

Ackerman	Frank (MA)	Napolitano
Altmire	Fudge	Neal
Andrews	Garamendi	Oliver
Baca	Gonzalez	Owens
Baldwin	Green, Al	Pallone
Barrow	Green, Gene	Pascrell
Bass (CA)	Grijalva	Pastor (AZ)
Becerra	Gutierrez	Pelosi
Berkley	Hahn	Perlmutter
Berman	Hanabusa	Peters
Bishop (GA)	Hastings (FL)	Peterson
Bishop (NY)	Heinrich	Pingree (ME)
Blumenauer	Higgins	Polis
Bonamici	Himes	Price (NC)
Boren	Hinchey	Quigley
Boswell	Hinojosa	Rahall
Brady (PA)	Hirono	Reyes
Braley (IA)	Hochul	Richardson
Brown (FL)	Holt	Richmond
Butterfield	Honda	Ross (AR)
Capps	Hoyer	Rothman (NJ)
Capuano	Israel	Roybal-Allard
Cardoza	Jackson (IL)	Ruppersberger
Carnahan	Jackson Lee	Rush
Carney	(TX)	Ryan (OH)
Carson (IN)	Johnson (GA)	Sánchez, Linda
Castor (FL)	Johnson, E. B.	T.
Chandler	Jones	Sanchez, Loretta
Chu	Kaptur	Sarbanes
Cicilline	Keating	Schakowsky
Clarke (MI)	Kildee	Schiff
Clarke (NY)	Kind	Schrader
Clay	Kissell	Schwartz
Cleaver	Kucinich	Scott (VA)
Clyburn	Langevin	Scott, David
Cohen	Larsen (WA)	Serrano
Connolly (VA)	Larson (CT)	Sewell
Conyers	Lee (CA)	Sherman
Cooper	Levin	Sires
Costa	Lewis (GA)	Smith (WA)
Costello	Lipinski	Speier
Courtney	Loeb sack	Stark
Critz	Lofgren, Zoe	Sutton
Crowley	Lowey	Thompson (CA)
Cuellar	Lujan	Thompson (MS)
Cummings	Lynch	Tierney
Davies (CA)	Maloney	Tonko
Davis (IL)	Markey	Towns
DeFazio	Matsui	Tsongas
DeGette	McCarthy (NY)	Van Hollen
DeLauro	McCollum	Velázquez
Deutch	McDermott	Visclosky
Dicks	McGovern	Walz (MN)
Dingell	McIntyre	Wasserman
Doggett	McNerney	Schultz
Donnelly (IN)	Meeks	Waters
Doyle	Michaud	Watt
Edwards	Miller (NC)	Waxman
Ellison	Miller, George	Welch
Engel	Moore	Wilson (FL)
Eshoo	Moran	Woolsey
Farr	Murphy (CT)	Yarmuth
Fattah	Nadler	

NOT VOTING—10

Davis (KY)	McHenry	Slaughter
Filner	Paul	Sullivan
Holden	Rangel	
Marino	Sessions	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1414

So the resolution was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 183, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

#### LOWELL NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK LAND EXCHANGE ACT OF 2012

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (H.R. 2240) to authorize the exchange of land or interest in land between Lowell National Historical Park and the city of Lowell in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, 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.

□ 1420

#### CYBER INTELLIGENCE SHARING AND PROTECTION ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. 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 H.R. 3523.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOODALL). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 631 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 3523.

The Chair appoints the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1422

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3523) to provide for the sharing of certain cyber threat intelligence and cyber threat information between the intelligence community and cybersecurity entities, and for other purposes, with Mrs. BIGGERT in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ROGERS) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RUPPERSBERGER) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Madam Chair, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Never a problem have I seen when it comes to our national security, Madam Chair, that we are just not prepared to handle.

In just the last few years, nation-states, like China, have stolen enough intellectual property from just the Fed's contractors that it would be equivalent to 50 times the print collection of the Library of Congress. We have nation-states that are literally stealing jobs and our future. We also have countries that are engaged in activities and have capabilities that have the ability to break networks, computer networks, which means you can't just reboot. It means your system is literally broken. Those kinds of disruptions can be catastrophic when you think about the financial sector or the energy sector or our command and control elements for all of our national security apparatus.

This is as serious a problem as I have seen. So, last year, I and my partner—DUTCH RUPPERSBERGER, the vice chairman and ranking member of the Intelligence Committee—agreed that this was a significant enough problem to the future prosperity of America that we'd better do something about it.

We needed to stop the Chinese Government from stealing our stuff. We needed to stop the Russians from what they're doing to our networks and to people's personal information, data, and resources. We needed to prepare for countries like Iran and North Korea so that they don't do something catastrophic to our networks here in America and cause real harm to real people.

So, in a bipartisan way, we set out to do something very, very, very narrow. When the government spies overseas, it collects malware—viruses, software that is dangerous to our computers. That means they can either steal our stuff—the personal information off of your computer—or they can steal the secrets that make your business viable, the kinds of secrets that give people jobs.

So wouldn't it be great if we could take that source code, that software and share it with the private sector so that they could put it on their private systems, like they do every single day to try to protect networks, and have that added advantage of that extra coverage from that malicious source code? The good news is this happens every day. If you have Norton or McAfee or Symantec or any other antivirus protection on your computer, it has patches of information that they know is really bad stuff, and every time you turn your computer on, it updates and tries to protect your computer, your personal information.

That's all this is. It is adding to that patchwork some zeroes and some ones

that we know is malicious code that is either going to steal your information or break your computer or something worse. That's all this bill is. It draws a very fine line between the government and the private sector. It is all voluntary. There are no new mandates. There is no government surveillance—none, not any—in this bill. It just says, if we know we have this source code, shouldn't we be obligated to give it so it doesn't do something bad to the companies and individuals in America. That's all this bill does.

We have worked collaboratively with hundreds of companies, with privacy groups, with civil libertarians. We have worked with government folks. We have had hundreds and hundreds of meetings for over a year. We have kept this bill open in an unprecedented transparent way to try to meet the needs of privacy concerns, civil libertarian concerns, civil liberties concerns. We wanted to make sure that, with this bill, people understood exactly what we were trying to do, how simple it is, and how crucial it is to the future defense of this great Nation.

Without our ideas, without our innovation that countries like China are stealing every single day, we will cease to be a great Nation. They are slowly and silently and quickly stealing the value and prosperity of America.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. I yield myself an additional 1 minute.

One credit card company said that they get attacked for your personal information 300,000 times a day—one company. We have a company that can directly show you stolen intellectual property. This one particular company estimated 20,000 manufacturing jobs that they lost for Americans, which were good-paying jobs, because countries like China stole their intellectual property and illegally competed against them in the marketplace.

This is as bad a problem, Madam Chair, as I have seen. I think you'll hear throughout the day this has been a responsible debate and that it has been a responsible negotiation to get to privacy concerns and our ability to protect your information on your computer through this series of zeroes and ones, the binary code on our computers.

Again, I want to thank my ranking member for his partnership and his work. He has been exceptional to work with on something on which we both agree and on which we agreed, in a bipartisan fashion, was a danger to the future prosperity of America.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First of all, I do want to thank the chairman for working with us in a bipartisan way to protect our country from this very serious threat of cyberattacks.

As the ranking member of the House Intelligence Committee, people often ask me what keeps me up at night. I tell them: weapons of mass destruction entering the country undetected and also a catastrophic cyberattack shutting down our water supply, power grid or banking systems; and those are just a few of the many areas that could be attacked and shut down.

Every day, U.S. Web sites and our Nation's networks are threatened by foreign governments like China, Iran, Russia, and other groups trying to steal our money and valuable trade secrets. According to the National Counterterrorism Executive, the number one thing cyberthieves are trying to steal is information and communication technology, which form the backbone of nearly every other technology. In fact, according to the United States Cyber Command, \$300 billion worth of trade secrets are stolen every year. This proves we need to make real changes to how we protect our cybersystems.

The Cyber Intelligence Sharing and Protection Act helps the private sector protect itself and its clients from these attackers and data thieves. The intelligence community has the ability to detect these cyberthreats, these malicious codes and viruses, before they are able to attack our networks; but right now, Federal law prohibits the intelligence community from sharing the classified cyberthreat with the companies that will protect us, that control the network—the AT&Ts, the Verizons, the Comcasts, those groups. We have the ability to give them the information to protect us; yet we have to pass a law to do that, and that's why we are here today.

□ 1430

The Cyber Intelligence Sharing and Protection Act will clearly do that if we pass the bill. It allows the intelligence community to share the codes and signatures associated with malware and viruses and the means to counter the bad stuff with the companies. These companies keep a lookout for these viruses and work to stop them before they are able to attack their system.

Companies then voluntarily give information about the cyberattack back to the government, machine code consisting of strings of zeroes and ones that uniquely identifies the malware. Cyberanalysts will use this information to better understand the attack and try to figure out who launched it and where it came from.

This information will be used to protect against similar attacks in the future.

Now, the Democrats worked hard to protect privacy and civil liberties in this bill throughout the entire process. We fought for additional privacy protections in the original bill that was marked up in committee. In the version we will vote on tomorrow morning, additional changes are also included in the amendments.

Privacy and civil liberty groups and the White House all agree we made important positive changes that went a long way to improve the initial bill that came out of committee. We severely limit what information can be shared with the government and how it can be used.

It is also important to note the entire process is completely voluntary and provides industry the flexibility they need to deal with business realities.

The bill also requires an annual report from the inspector general of the intelligence community to ensure none of the information provided to the government is mishandled or is misused. This is a very important privacy issue.

The review will include annual recommendations to improve the protection of privacy and civil liberties. That review will be done again by the inspector general.

We also made it clear this legislation grants no new authority to the Department of Defense, the National Security Agency, or the intelligence community. At the urging of the White House and others, we included the Department of Homeland Security in the process so that there is not even a perception that our intelligence agencies or military will be in control of this. The Homeland Security Department will be coordinating as a civil body.

In addition, companies that act in good faith to protect systems and networks can receive liability protection. This is what our bill does.

Now, what does it not do? The bill does not allow the government to order companies to turn over private email or other personal information. This is not surveillance. The bill does not allow the government to monitor private networks, read private email, censor, or shut down any Web site.

We have a broad coalition of support with 100 cosponsors, close to 30 companies and industry groups, and dozens of trade organizations like Facebook, Microsoft, IBM, a lot of different groups that are supporting this bill.

This is not a perfect bill, but the threat is great. I believe this legislation is critical for our national security and yet deals with the issue of privacy. We can do better in privacy, and we hope to get the bill to the Senate, where there will be a lot more negotiation. Congress must act now, and I encourage my colleagues to vote for this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) who is on the Intelligence Committee and has a tremendous expertise on counterterrorism issues.

Mrs. MYRICK. I want to say a big thanks to the chair and to the ranking member for all of their months of hard work on putting this cybersecurity bill together, and it is a bipartisan Intelligence Committee bill.

We all know the private sector is a very diverse world that includes rep-

utable companies but also grey market suppliers and counterfeiters, and State-owned enterprises and other entities that often act against the national security interests of the United States, as well as other private companies.

The information technology sector, in particular, includes companies that are associated with some foreign governments and militaries and intelligence services of nations that attack the United States in cyberspace daily.

State and local entities, along with the private sector, don't have the resources, the capabilities, or the information necessary to address these cybersecurity threats. This bill creates a necessary mechanism for the Federal Government to share its informational resources and cybersecurity threat analysis with the private sector and with State and local entities.

The purpose of the bill is to transmit important cybersecurity information from the Federal Government to the private sector, not vice versa. The bill would empower the private sector to begin taking necessary steps to protect itself from cyberattacks, some they don't have any clue are happening.

Ultimately though, it's going to be important for Congress and the Federal Government to continue the debate on cybersecurity to determine how to best confront the changing threats because this world is changing daily, and the Federal Government can't leave those responsibilities solely to the private sector, especially, like the chairman already mentioned, countries like China that are continuously developing cyberwarfare capabilities and the cyberattacks that they commit against the Western companies and infrastructures and government entities we all know about.

So I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this important piece of legislation and an important step in trying to protect the private sector in this country.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague from the State of Utah (Mr. BOSWELL) who formerly served on the Intelligence Committee.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. BOSWELL. Thank you, I appreciate the correction. We grow corn in Iowa, and we grow potatoes in Idaho. A little bit of fun.

I rise to speak in support of this bill today. I look across at Chairman ROGERS and here at Ranking Member RUPPERSBERGER, and I have great confidence. I know these men. I know their staff. They've come to this very serious matter that lays before our country that we need to understand. We must take action.

I'm encouraged by the process to involve key stakeholders from private industry and privacy groups during this drafting. This transparent engagement shaped many of the bipartisan constructive amendments being considered today that will improve the bill, and it's a good thing.

The threat from malicious actors in cyberspace is real. You've heard it said over and over already by those who have spoken ahead of me. I concur with what they say. It's an absolutely real thing. You only need to pick up the newspaper or turn on the TV to see the threats facing our networks. These networks include those that power our homes, our factories, and our small businesses, allow our banking system to function and provide the very backbone to our current American way of life, and we rely on these networks every day.

The bill under consideration today is a very narrow piece, but what we can agree on is it's a critical one to helping secure our networks and, therefore, the way of life as we know it today.

There are continuing debates on how to implement the bill, but the debate isn't over what needs to be done; it must be done. Information we ask our intelligence community to use and that protects our government networks should, in a secure way, be shared to protect the many other critical networks we rely on.

I believe companies are doing what they can to protect their networks to the extent they can today, but there is more that must be done.

We cannot be in a situation where the government had information to prevent or mitigate a catastrophic cyberattack, and yet we did not have the procedure in place to share this information. Our American way of life includes a great respect for privacy and our civil liberties. We make no mistake about that.

This bill, with the addition of many of the amendments which were drafted in concert with privacy groups, addresses many of those concerns.

In addition, the annual unclassified report required by the statutory intelligence community inspector general will inform whether there are additional adjustments needed to be made.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. I yield the gentleman an additional 10 seconds.

Mr. BOSWELL. So, in closing, I want to say this: Congress cannot wait to act. Network security hasn't kept up with network speed. This is the fundamental purpose of this bill. I encourage Members to begin to secure our networks through sharing information about the threats. Please vote "yes."

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KINZINGER).

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. I thank the ranking member and the chairman for your hard work on the issue and the members on the committee.

This is very important. It goes beyond partisanship. This is about national security.

The idea of cyberattacks, it's not something that is just out there in space that we really don't have to worry about. This is an issue that's here today, and it's here right now. In

fact, just today, the New York Stock Exchange was the target of a DDoS attack on some of its external computer systems. That's not something that we just magically happen to have today. This is happening every day, thousands and thousands of times a day.

□ 1440

I'm a military guy and I'm a military pilot. I think a lot about the threats from outside. You think a lot about threats of terrorism and threats of invasion or anything along that line. But I'll tell you one of the biggest threats that really keep us up at night is this idea of a cyberattack. I think it's something that we have to take head-on. This voluntary information-sharing between classified portions of our government and certified private actors will serve to enhance our defenses greatly.

It is important to note the amount of classified information currently shared between our government and private industry is muddled at best. The few private companies who are lucky enough to receive an invitation into the current classified annex of cybersecurity-sharing face significant challenges when it comes to even understanding what that information is. Many times they simply get a badly scanned printout of a current threat situation from which they try to prevent a future attack, and it is woefully inadequate.

We talk a lot about the Russians and about the Chinese and their use of cyberwarfare against us. That's a significant threat. That's something very serious. But I want to speak just momentarily about the threat from Iran.

We all know that Iran is a very serious country that is very seriously focused on bringing down, in many cases, the West. They've said it themselves. The Iranian regime from the highest level down has publicly stated their plans to fight enemies with abundant power in cyberspace and Internet warfare. It's also publicly stated that Iran blames the West for the Stuxnet virus which disrupted their nuclear program, and they have vowed retaliation. The combination of the low cost and effectiveness of cyberwarfare has led the Iranian Revolutionary Guard to actively and effectively recruit radical Islamist hackers for nefarious purposes. We can't stand idly by while we see nations like Iran threaten the future of this country.

So I support this bill, and I commend the folks who have worked on it.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague from the State of New Jersey, Mr. RUSH HOLT, who was formally on the Intelligence Committee.

Mr. HOLT. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman.

The proponents of this legislation, who are all friends and well intentioned, have repeatedly said there's a real threat, a threat to our critical in-

frastructure, affecting our waterworks, and our electric grid. But this bill is so poorly constructed it is not designed to protect against those threats. There are any number of flaws with it.

The American Civil Liberties Union points out that there would be an exception to all privacy laws; and it would allow companies to share private and personal data that they hold on their American customers, actually, among themselves and with the government. It would not limit companies to sharing only technical or nonpersonal data. They'd be free from any liability of misuse. They would only have to plead good intentions.

The bill fails to narrowly define the privacy laws it would contravene; it fails to put the cybersecurity efforts in a civilian agency; it fails to require companies to remove personal identifiable information about individuals; it fails to sufficiently limit the government's use of information; it fails to create a robust oversight and accountability structure. With the bill in its current form, there's no requirement that personal information must be removed. There's no consumer or stakeholder group involved in the oversight. There's no way for any member of the public to know if their data has been shared in error, and on and on.

And I should point out that it is not just the American Civil Liberties Union that opposes this. Even the American Library Association opposes it. The President, himself, says, if this passes, he will veto it. Passing this bill in response to the cyberthreat would be like going into Iraq because al Qaeda terrorists were a real threat.

Yes, there's a real threat. This is not the answer.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STIVERS).

Mr. STIVERS. Madam Chair, I would like to thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding me time. I would also like to thank him for his leadership on this effort, as well as the ranking member, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RUPPERSBERGER).

I rise today in support of the cybersecurity legislation under consideration. As a member of the Cybersecurity Task Force, I'm pleased that many of our recommendations are included in this bill.

Cybersecurity is a very important issue. Every day there are people trying to use cyberattacks to steal our money, steal our jobs, and attack our national security.

I know as a member of the Financial Services Committee that our financial sector spends billions of dollars every year trying to protect against cyberattacks. They protect consumers by increasing controls, making sure they have encryption, authenticating customers, and protecting customer data.

That's all protecting our wallets, but we also need to protect our jobs. Unfor-

tunately, there are folks who would like to use cyberattacks to steal our intellectual property and give it to those who compete against America, which will steal our jobs.

Not allowing information-sharing like this bill does would be like saying to the Marines and the Army, You can't share information about how the enemy is going to attack you. As a member of the National Guard for the last 26 years, I know that cyber is also a real threat to our national security.

This bill will update our information-sharing to allow private companies to share information with the government and the government to share information, and includes some important liability protection as well. It's a carefully crafted bill.

I think the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ROGERS) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RUPPERSBERGER) have been very open to working with folks to try to improve this bill. I'm looking forward to supporting some of the bipartisan amendments that I think will improve this bill.

Madam Chair, we must protect ourselves against cyberattacks, against those who would steal our money, steal our jobs, and attack our country. This bill is not a panacea, but it's a great start. I'm happy to support it, and I hope all my colleagues will vote "yes."

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague from the State of California, Mr. ADAM SCHIFF, who is also the ranking member on the Technical and Tactical Intelligence Committee.

Mr. SCHIFF. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chair, I rise in reluctant opposition to the bill. But at the outset, I want to acknowledge the extraordinary work done by our chairman, MIKE ROGERS, and our ranking member, DUTCH RUPPERSBERGER. These two gentlemen have changed the nature and culture of our committee, made it far more productive, and they've done great work getting us to this point. And I want to acknowledge that at the outset.

There's still work to be done in two areas principally, and I want to talk briefly about that. Even before I do that, I want to acknowledge why we're here.

We do ourselves, I think, a disservice when we talk about a cyberthreat. That sounds like something that may come in the future, something to be concerned about that might take place down the line. We're under cyberattack right now. This is not speculative. This is not intangible. This is happening right now. This needs to be dealt with, and we do need a sense of urgency. But there is a distance yet to go, and in two areas in particular.

One is, when we gather cyberinformation and we share it between companies or between the government and companies, as we must do, we want to make sure that we minimize any unnecessary invasion of privacy of the American people. We can

do both, and we have to do both. We need to protect ourselves from cyberattack, and we need to protect and preserve the privacy rights of the American people.

I think the bill needs a requirement that personally identifiable information be minimized to the maximum extent practicable. All we're asking for is what can reasonably be done. We're not asking for the private sector or the government to do the impossible, but we should require of our government that they minimize personal information that is shared to protect us from cybercrime. That's the first thing.

The second item that really needs to be incorporated in this bill that my colleague, Mr. THOMPSON, will talk about as well is the need to protect critical infrastructure. That is a big missing piece in the bill, and I understand from my colleagues that it's not within the Intelligence Committee jurisdiction. That's correct. But as we saw from the Rules Committee, they're more than capable of incorporating things from more than one committee's jurisdiction in the rule, as we see in a rule that incorporates student loan interest and a bill on that subject with a bill on cybersecurity. There is nothing preventing the Rules Committee from bringing into the discussion today and allowing amendments on critical infrastructure.

The absence of those two big pieces makes it impossible for me to support the bill today.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. SCHIFF. I thank the gentleman.

I just want to conclude by saying I look forward to our continued work on this bill, and I appreciate the great cooperation between the chair and ranking member, and I have respect for all the members of the committee.

□ 1450

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HECK).

Mr. HECK. I come to the floor today to voice my strong support for the Cyber Intelligence Sharing and Protection Act. We know that every day, American companies and computer systems are targeted by foreign nation-state actors who prey on sensitive business and personal information to gain an unfair advantage in the global marketplace. The theft of research and development results, negotiating positions, or pricing information costs us jobs here at home and puts personal information at risk. The same vulnerabilities that can result in the theft of sensitive business information could be used to attack critical infrastructure we rely on such as power plants, air traffic control systems, and electrical grids. An attack on these systems would be devastating. Protecting them and the constituents they serve must be considered an urgent national security concern.

The government currently uses classified cyberthreat intelligence to protect its own systems, computer networks, and critical infrastructure. The business community has voiced its desire to be given the tools necessary to protect itself from cyberthreats. This bill will allow the government to provide classified cyberthreat information to private sector companies so that they can protect sensitive information and their customers' privacy against malicious cyberattacks. The bill places no mandates or burdens on private sector companies and does not expand the size or scope of the Federal Government. All information-sharing is totally voluntary under this legislation, and there are strong privacy protections in place for the information that is shared.

After receiving input from the private sector and civil liberty groups and by building upon the success of an existing intelligence-sharing pilot program with defense contractors, we have produced a bill that upholds constitutional rights to privacy while providing the private sector with the necessary means to defend itself against cyberattackers. I want to commend Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member RUPPERSBERGER for their outstanding leadership in crafting this legislation that was written in a transparent and bipartisan fashion.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill that protects our homeland, protects our economy, and protects our privacy.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague from the State of Mississippi, Mr. BENNIE THOMPSON, who is also the ranking member of the Homeland Security Committee.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 3523. I also appreciate the efforts of my colleagues on the Intelligence Committee for fostering a greater sharing of cyberthreat information. This bill is a start, but my opposition is because it does not do what we know that we need to have done.

Having been involved in homeland security issues for nearly a decade, I know how important it is to protect our Nation's networks from cyberattacks. But in an effort to foster information-sharing, this bill would erode the privacy protections of every single American using the Internet. It would create a Wild West of information-sharing, where any certified business can share with any government agency, who can then use the information for any "national security" purpose and grant that business immunity from virtually any liability. None of the amendments offered by the chairman and ranking member would change any of those basic facts.

I and several of my colleagues offered amendments that would have addressed those concerns by ensuring that civilian agencies would take the lead in information-sharing, restricting how the

government could use the information, and making sure consumers' sensitive information is adequately protected. Unfortunately, the House will not have an opportunity to consider them today.

If my colleagues want to accomplish something on cybersecurity, then vote "yes" on any or all of the suspension bills before us today; but do not vote for H.R. 3523. It violates the "do no harm" rule and would set back the privacy rights of all our citizens who have enjoyed the establishment of the Internet.

This fatally flawed bill is opposed by not only every major privacy or civil liberties group, from the ACLU to the Constitution Project to the Center for Democracy and Technology, but also the Obama administration. For these reasons, Madam Chair, I strongly urge a "no" vote on H.R. 3523.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY).

Mr. TERRY. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Chairman, I rise in support of this bill. It's a sensible bill that builds a necessary pillar in the cybersecurity strategy of our Nation.

I've immersed myself in cybersecurity over the last couple of years. I've been on two task forces. I'm on the Energy and Commerce Committee. I've met with industry leaders in all of the critical infrastructure areas. And as I've gathered information and input, there's two principles at stake here. The common thread from all of them have said: we have to be flexible, and we have to be able to communicate. Those are the two principles on which this bill is based.

Number one, flexibility. What it means is you can't lock this into a government agency because when government agencies start taking control of setting standards or working with an industry group to set standards on cybersecurity, the hackers take 5 seconds to get around that, and it will take years then for the industry to move around that. You are setting them up as ducks waiting to be shot if we do that. So we can't. We've got to give them the flexibility. The least government interference is what gives them the flexibility.

The next part is communication. What I learned from the critical infrastructure industries is that what they want to know is, is there a threat out there, and what's the specifics of the threat? They know they're under attack every day. Maybe our defense agencies have specific information they can share, but they can't because it's top secret.

So this bill allows there to be communication of specific threats to perhaps communicate from government to private sector some better practices that they can enact. That's what this breaks down, that barrier, not some of these civil liberty conspiracy theories. This is simple communication between government and private sector or private sector to private sector. This isn't

reporting on whether you're downloading an illegal movie or whatever. This is about securing our infrastructure.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague and friend from the State of Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN), who is also a member of our Intelligence Committee and has worked very hard with the chairman and myself on the issue of cybersecurity. I consider him one of our experts on the Hill in the area of cybersecurity.

(Mr. LANGEVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANGEVIN. I want to thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 3523, and I want to thank Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member RUPPERSBERGER for a bipartisan and inclusive process on an extremely difficult and technical issue. While I don't believe this legislation is perfect, and much work remains to be done, CISPA represents an important good-faith effort to come together as a necessary first step towards better cybersecurity for our Nation.

I have long worked on this issue for many years to raise awareness and to secure our Nation against the threats that we face in cyberspace. Quite frankly, we are running out of time. I believe it's important that we act now to begin our legislative response to this critical issue.

We all know how dependent we are on the Internet and how we use it so much in our daily lives, but the Internet was never built with security in mind. What's happening is our adversaries are using the vulnerabilities against us.

I've also been very clear that we need to have robust privacy protections that must be included to safeguard personal information and also defend civil liberties in any cybersecurity response that we do enact. I'm pleased to say this legislation has been strengthened in that regard, and I believe more can be done as we continue this important debate.

That being said, the efficient sharing of cyberthreat information envisioned by this legislation is vital to combating advanced cyberthreats and stemming the massive ongoing theft of identities, intellectual property, and sensitive security information.

□ 1500

This legislation clearly and simply will allow the government to provide classified information threat signatures to the private sector and also allow the private sector to share with us the cybersecurity attacks that they are experiencing, sharing that with the government so we have better situational awareness. If you look at this, it basically gives us radar, if you will, in cyberspace, sharing information back and forth on cyberthreats that are facing the country.

This bill is a good step, but it's only a first step. Voluntary information-

sharing is helpful and it's needed, but it does not, on its own, constitute strong cybersecurity.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. I yield the gentleman from Rhode Island 30 additional seconds.

Mr. LANGEVIN. I thank the gentleman for the additional time.

I have long maintained that we must also move forward on legislation that establishes minimum standards for the cybersystems that govern our critical infrastructure, particularly the electric grid and our water systems.

With that, I again want to thank Chairman ROGERS and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER for their outstanding efforts, and I ask my colleagues to support this important cybersecurity information-sharing legislation.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mrs. BONO MACK).

Mrs. BONO MACK. Madam Chair, I rise today in strong support of this bill. This critically needed legislation will help to safeguard America in the future from cyberattacks by unscrupulous and rogue nations, terrorists and cybercriminals. We need to act before a disaster takes place, not after it, and this is our chance.

As chairwoman of the House Subcommittee on Commerce, Manufacturing and Trade, I have spent the past 16 months holding hearings and thoroughly examining the issue of online privacy. So as a cosponsor of this legislation, I have very carefully reviewed its privacy provisions, and I'm satisfied that it will not negatively impact American consumers.

Frankly, the privacy concerns are exaggerated. There is no bogeyman hiding in the closet, and Big Brother is not tapping into your hard drive. This bill provides absolutely no authority to the Federal Government to monitor private networks—none. Additionally, all information-sharing with the government would be completely voluntary.

The bill also encourages the private sector to "anonymize" the information it shares with the government or other entities, including—and this is very important to remember—the removal of personally identifiable information prior to sharing it.

Finally, the bill also requires the intelligence community inspector general to review information-sharing between the private sector and the government and to provide an annual report to the Congress on its findings.

These are very strong privacy protection features, and I applaud Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member RUPPERSBERGER for working so hard to protect the American consumer and to make this a truly bipartisan effort.

Unfortunately, some people and some groups will say anything to try and scuttle this bill—sounding false alarms and raising imaginary red flags—de-

spite the very real and dangerous threat posed by terrorists and our enemies if we do nothing.

Madam Chair, I strongly urge the adoption of H.R. 3523.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague from the State of Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Thank you, Ranking Member RUPPERSBERGER.

Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to this very disturbing bill.

One thing that is important to keeping our country number one has been the personal freedoms that we have all enjoyed since this country's beginning. Those freedoms lie in the Bill of Rights. And the Fourth Amendment to the United States Constitution within that Bill of Rights provides for a right of privacy. Now this right of privacy can be impacted by technology and various advances in science that make eavesdropping, surveillance, and investigation easier and also more secretive by law enforcement, by personal individuals, and by corporations, by any component that may look to misuse information for their personal benefit. So I rise in opposition to this disturbing bill.

CISPA would grant the private sector blanket permission to harvest Americans' data for extremely broad "cybersecurity purposes," notwithstanding any other provision of law. It would grant the private sector blanket permission to then share that data with the Federal Government, notwithstanding any other privacy laws or agreements with users.

The Acting CHAIR (Mrs. CAPITO). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Then, as if that weren't disturbing enough, this bill would grant the government broad authority to share that information between intelligence and law enforcement agencies and use it for virtually any purpose defined as important to cybersecurity or national security.

I know it's 2012, but it sure feels like "1984" in this House today. If you value liberty, privacy, and the Constitution, then you will vote "no" on CISPA.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. NUNES).

Mr. NUNES. Madam Chair, I rise in strong support of this bill.

The bill before us today is targeted towards a very specific and growing threat to our Nation. Every day, American businesses are being targeted by China, Russia, and other foreign actors for cyber-exploitation and theft. These acts of industrial espionage are causing enormous losses of valuable American intellectual property that ultimately costs the United States jobs. We cannot afford to allow high-paying jobs to be stolen in this manner, nor can we simply sit by and allow the cyberwarfare being conducted against us to continue without consequences.

Madam Chairman, jobs are at stake, as is the technological capital of the United States. But if the reality of this economic cyberwarfare isn't convincing enough, you should understand that there are other good reasons for us to support this bill.

The state-of-the-art technology stolen from Americans can easily be turned against us and represents a serious threat to America's critical infrastructure. None in this body would likely disagree that we have to prevent our enemies from protecting American military technology. That's why we have long had export controls and other mechanisms to prevent such a thing from occurring. Madam Chairman, how is the theft of intellectual property any less a threat today?

Whether we like it or not, cyberwarfare is a reality. Our government and its security agencies understand this and are using both classified and unclassified information to fight the threat. But without passage of this bill, they are being forced to do so without the meaningful participation of industries—private industries—that are being subjected to attacks, that in some cases our government even knows about but cannot share that with those private companies.

So we shouldn't expect America's private sector innovators to protect themselves if we won't tell them where the attacks are coming from. If we don't share this information or allow them to share information with us, how do we expect to secure the sensitive information?

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. I yield the gentleman from California an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. NUNES. So we essentially have three choices. We can pass this bill, very narrowly focused, allowing our intelligence community to work with private industry, or we can fund a massive new government program. I think we've proven that those massive new government programs seldom work and are often costly. Or would the opponents of this bill simply rather do nothing and allow our country to continue to be attacked every day?

We need to pass this bill to enable cyberthreat-sharing and provide clear authority for the private sector to defend its networks.

Madam Chair, I want to close by saying that we should congratulate Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member RUPPERSBERGER for the work that they've done to protect this country.

□ 1510

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Madam Chair, I yield 3 minutes to my distinguished colleague from the State of Oklahoma (Mr. BOREN), who is also a member of the Intelligence Committee. He has worked very closely with me and the chairman to bring this bill to the floor today, and we thank him for that.

Mr. BOREN. Madam Chair, I rise today in support of the Cyber Intelligence Sharing and Protection Act. I'm proud to have been a part of this bipartisan effort, led by Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member RUPPERSBERGER, to bring this bill to the floor today.

There is one fact on which everyone can agree: our country must strengthen its cybersecurity capabilities. To achieve this, we need the cooperation of industry, government, and our citizens, and we need to protect the unique interests of each of these groups.

Some may be asking the question, how does this bill protect American industry? It gives private companies the ability to receive classified information from the government to protect their networks. The bill also gives them flexibility to share information with the government without compromising their business equities or harming their customers. This information-sharing partnership will enhance government efforts to analyze and understand malicious codes and other cyberthreats.

I think companies that have publicly supported this legislation have gotten a bad rap in the press. I think we all need to remember that these American companies are not the enemy. They employ thousands of Americans and provide essential cyberservices to millions of people. They are profit-making entities that want to satisfy their customers and grow their businesses. These American companies have absolutely no motivation to send private customer information to the government or anyone else. In fact, they have every reason to protect it.

Under this legislation, American companies will enhance their capability to protect the private information of their customers by receiving classified assistance from the government. Moreover, they will help their customers and the country by voluntarily informing the government of malware and other malicious conduct and threats that emerge from their networks. But that is not the only way that this bill protects our citizens' privacy. It restricts the government's use and retention of any personal information that companies may choose to share. In addition, it directs the intelligence community inspector general to monitor and report any abuse of users' privacy.

Finally, we must also remember that the government is not the enemy. The intelligence community does not want to squander this opportunity to improve our Nation's cybersecurity by abusing the civil liberties or privacy of American citizens. To this end, the bill specifies that the government can only use the information it receives from the private sector for purposes directly related to addressing cyberthreats, national security, and threats to life and limb.

In closing, this legislation strikes the appropriate balance between the inter-

ests of the private sector industry, the Federal Government, and private citizens.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. BOREN. It will help our country avoid a potential cybercatastrophe that could threaten our national security and endanger our economic prosperity.

With that, I urge my fellow Members to join me and support this important bill.

Again, I want to say specifically to our ranking member and our chairman, thank you for putting the country's interests ahead of partisan gain. We're working together in this committee, both Democrats and Republicans, to do what is in the best interest of our intelligence community and the United States of America.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Madam Chair, may I ask how much time we have on both sides?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland has 8 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Michigan has 10½ minutes remaining.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Madam Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON).

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I thank the chairman.

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

My friends, that is the Fourth Amendment to the Constitution, one of the original 10 in the Bill of Rights protecting, in writing, the privacy of the United States citizenry.

I want to give Mr. ROGERS and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER an "A" for effort in terms of identifying the problem, but I have to give them an "F" for problem solution.

The word "privacy" in the underlying bill is mentioned one time, and that in passing. There are no explicit protections for privacy. In fact, there is an explicit exemption of liability to all people who engage in the collection, dissemination, transfer, and sharing of information. The cause of action, if you feel your privacy has been violated, is to go to district court and prove there was willful and knowing sharing of your information without your permission. If you prevail in Federal district court, you get \$1,000, or whatever it costs you.

My friends, we have a real problem. I take the chairman at his word—he's a former FBI agent—that he wants to solve this cyberthreat. I know he means it. But until we protect the privacy rights of our citizens, the solution is worse than the problem that they're trying to solve.

Please vote "no" on this bill.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Madam Chair, I have no more speakers, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First thing, there were some comments that I would like to respond to.

First thing, this bill does not allow the wholesale violation of privacy rights. This bill is extremely important to our national security, but also important to our citizens of this great country, our privacy rights, and civil liberties.

The chairman and I have taken this very seriously, as have the members of our caucus. We know this is not a perfect bill—there will probably be additional changes. We will have more debate later on this afternoon.

Now, some of the things I want to address. During the drafting of this legislation we put forward a wide range of privacy protections. We worked for the last year with the White House, privacy groups, and business groups to come to a coalition to make sure that we get this bill right.

First, the bill severely limits what kind of information can be shared with the government. Only information directly pertaining to the threat can be shared, which is mostly formulas, X's and O's of the virus code. It's almost something that the companies deal with now in dealing with spam.

Second, the bill encourages companies to voluntarily strip out personal information that may be associated with these zeroes and ones. Occasionally, that does occur, and we have to deal with that, and we'll continue to deal with that issue.

There also are strong use limitations on the data. This information must be used for cybersecurity purposes or the protection of national security. The information cannot be used for regulatory purposes. For example, if there's evidence of tax evasion, that information cannot be used in a criminal proceeding, only in national security, only in the areas of life and limb, or for anything involving juvenile crimes.

The bill prohibits the government from requiring the companies to give information to the government in exchange for receiving the cyberthreat intelligence. That means that when we pass the information of the attacks—it's called the secret sauce—to the providers, it's only voluntarily. The government can't put any restrictions on that whatsoever. That really means that this is not surveillance at all.

The bill does not allow the government to order you to turn over private email or other personal information. This is not, again, surveillance.

The bill does not allow the government to monitor private networks, read private emails, censor or shut down any Web site. This is not SOPA.

In an effort to improve the bill even more, the intelligence community—thank you to the leadership of Chairman ROGERS—has been working with privacy groups, the White House, and other interested parties to address

these concerns with the legislation. We on our side of the aisle take, again, this issue of privacy very seriously. The committee has maintained an open door policy and made more changes to the bill to make it even better as we have gone on up until today.

The legislation grants no new authority to the Department of Defense, National Security, or the intelligence community that require it to direct any public or private cybersecurity effort. If the government violates any of these restrictions placed on it by the legislation, the government can be sued for damages, costs, and attorneys fees.

I think it is extremely important—we on the Intelligence Committee deal with these issues every day. This is a very sophisticated area that we deal with that most people don't know. So we're attempting, and we have for the last year, to educate as many of our Members as we can. But it's important to know that national security is clear—our effort and what we're attempting to do—but also to maintain the privacy, the constitutional rights of our citizens.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1520

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY).

Mr. THORNBERRY. Madam Chair, I don't think we can say often enough how important it is that the chairman and ranking member have worked together, not only on the substance of this bill, but in the process of getting us here. They have, truly, put the country's interests first, and I think all Members should commend them for that.

This was a good bill when it was reported out of committee 17-1. I think it will be a better bill once the amendments are considered and adopted. And for any Member who has concerns about privacy or misuse of information, I think they should look at the amendments that are going to be adopted; and any reasonable concern, any semi-reasonable concern about privacy will be addressed with the limitations that those amendments add.

Madam Chair, this bill does not solve all the problems in cybersecurity. All four bills that we're considering today and tomorrow don't solve all the problems we have in cybersecurity. But it makes no sense to me, as some seem to have argued, that we should not solve this problem of information-sharing because we're not solving all the problems that somebody can see out there.

This problem of information-sharing has been central to cybersecurity concerns for some time. I happened across a report from December 2004 that was issued by a subcommittee I chaired of the Select Committee on Homeland Security, along with the gentlelady from California (Ms. ZOE LOFGREN), where we wrote: Whether it is vulnerability

assessments, threat warnings, best practices or emergency response, information-sharing with the private sector is critical to securing the United States from cyberattack. That was 8 years ago.

Why has it not occurred? Because all the legal obstacles, all the fear of being sued has prevented it from occurring. And that's what this bill does. It clears away the legal underbrush that has prevented the kind of information-sharing that people have been talking about for a decade.

This is a good, important step. It doesn't solve all the problems, but it puts more information at the disposal of critical infrastructure so that they can be protected. It should be adopted.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Madam Chair, I have a speaker on the way.

Mr. ROGERS, do you have any more speakers?

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. I do.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from the great State of Oregon (Mr. WALDEN).

Mr. WALDEN. I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their bipartisan and thoughtful approach to this incredibly important issue facing our country. I support your legislation. I commend you both for identifying a glaring hole in our cyberdefenses: better information-sharing between the private sector and the government.

Such sharing is a force multiplier. It combines the technological strength of our network providers with the ongoing efforts of our agencies to combat growing cyberthreats. From the get-go, the bill has protected privacy and civil liberties and ensured that any information-sharing is voluntary.

I understand Chairman ROGERS has also gone the extra mile to reach out to the privacy community and will be offering and supporting amendments to address any lingering concerns that may remain from misunderstandings over the language. Breaking down the barriers to information-sharing is a linchpin to better cybersecurity, and this legislation will be a tremendous step forward in securing cyberspace for our citizens.

But don't take my word for it. That's what cybersecurity firms and researchers, Internet service providers, and government officials told the Subcommittee on Communications and Technology, which I chair, in the three separate hearings that we held. That's what a bipartisan working group I convened concluded when it interviewed a broad spectrum of stakeholders in the cybersecurity debate.

By contrast, no matter how well-intentioned, cybersecurity regulations would likely just expand government, reduce flexibility, impose costs, misallocate capital, create more red tape and not more security. According to one government witness, regulating cybersecurity practices would "stifle

innovation and harm the industry's ability to protect consumers from cyberthreats."

Indeed, voluntary efforts, not government regulation, are already improving cybersecurity for communications networks that cover 80 percent of Americans.

When Congress is looking at a complex issue like cybersecurity, we need to heed the Hippocratic Oath: First, do no harm.

So I want to thank my colleagues for making this process especially open and transparent. Representative ROGERS has graciously reached out to members of the Energy and Commerce Committee to understand our concerns about protecting privacy and civil liberties and preventing regulatory overreach, and Representative THORNBERRY's work in organizing the House Republican Cybersecurity Task Force, which included Representatives TERRY and LATTA, members of my subcommittee.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. WALDEN. The bottom line is, we're going to protect America from the greatest threat to America and to Americans with this legislation. We need to make sure that our private sector is nimble and flexible and innovative; and tying its hands with prescriptive regulation—we heard over and over again in our subcommittee hearings—would do the opposite of that and would result in the bad guys getting an edge on the good guys.

I support this bipartisan legislation. I urge its passage.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague from the State of Georgia, Mr. JOHN LEWIS, one of the most respected Members of our Congress.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Madam Chair, I want to thank my friend, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RUPPERSBERGER) for yielding.

Madam Chair, I rise to oppose H.R. 3523. It is a step back.

Those of us who protested in the fifties and the sixties, who were called Communists, who had our telephone calls recorded, we have a long memory. We remember our Nation's dark past.

Martin Luther King, Jr.'s telephone was wiretapped. His hotel room was wiretapped. Our office was wiretapped. Our meetings were wiretapped. And it was not just people spying on civil rights activists, but people protesting against the war in Vietnam.

We didn't have a Facebook, a Twitter, or email. These new tools must be protected. Today we have a mission, a mandate, and a moral obligation to protect future generations of activists and protestors.

So I say to my colleagues, stand with us today. Stand up and stand on the right side of history. Oppose H.R. 3523.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Madam Chair, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Lots of misinformation about this bill today. I respect the gentleman from Georgia greatly for his efforts. I heard the gentleman from Texas talk about searches and seizures. And this is the good news: there are none of those things in this bill. None.

You know, if I knew that your house was to be robbed, I would expect that if the police knew, that they'd pick up the phone and call you and say, you are going to be robbed. Take precaution. We'll be their shortly.

This bill just says, if we have this nasty source code, these zeroes and ones, I want to give it to you so you can protect your systems. That's it. No monitoring, no content, no surveillance, nothing. That's not what this bill is about.

I understand the passion about it. That's why we've taken a year to forge this bipartisan effort to get where we believe privacy is protected. It is paramount that we do that, that our civil liberties are protected. It is paramount that we do that.

But we at least take down the hurdle to share nasty source code or software that's flying through the Internet, that's developed, and it's very sophisticated, by the Chinese and the Russians and the Iranians and other groups and non-nation-state actors that are going to steal your personal information.

That's all this is. It's sharing bad source code so you can put it on your system so you don't get infected. End of story.

I wish people would read the bill, all of it, every word of it. I think you'll find the carefully crafted language to make sure that our rights are protected, that the Fourth Amendment is protected.

And by the way, just like the Army, the Navy, the Marines, your FBI is protecting you. That's what this bill allows it to do, simply that.

So, as I said, I respect greatly the gentleman from Georgia. There's a lot of atrocities I think he lived through in his life that no one should have to live through. We took those things into consideration when we wrote this bill, and that's why we've got so much support and so much technical company support, companies like Facebook and Microsoft and all of those groups.

So I hope people read the bill and support the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1530

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In closing, I want to say again that the purpose of this bill, as the chairman just said, is very basic and simple. We want to protect our citizens from attacks. We are being attacked as we speak right now. Just last year, it was estimated we lost \$300 billion worth of trade secrets. We even know that one country is attacking a fertilizer company to find out how we make it better

than they do. This is putting our businesses in jeopardy and jobs in jeopardy, and we know we sure need jobs.

More importantly, those of us who work in this field know how serious these threats are. The head of our FBI, whose responsibility it is to provide our domestic national security, has said that one of the most serious threats, if not a bigger threat, in terrorism would be a catastrophic cyberattack. We've already talked today about what that would be. We have Secretary Napolitano, the Director of Homeland Security, who has said the same thing: that it is one of the most serious issues our country has to deal with. It's unfortunate, but most of our citizens aren't aware of how serious this threat is.

So we've attempted to allow our intelligence community, which is one of the best in the world, to have the ability to see these threats coming in from other countries or from terrorist groups and to be able right now to give this information over to the private sector to protect us, you, me, our businesses. That's what this bill does. Nothing more. What we're attempting to do is to move the bill and get the bill to the Senate.

We can always do better in the area of privacy and civil liberties, and we're going to continue to do that. We can always do better in the area of homeland security and go further to protect those institutions and our grid systems and that type of thing; but this is the start, because the one thing that now is stopping our country and is stopping us from protecting our citizens is this Congress.

This Congress needs to pass this bill now. We need to move forward. We need to get it to the Senate. We need to start working with the Senate. Then hopefully we'll deal and work very closely with the White House and find a bill so that we can protect our citizens and also protect our civil liberties and privacy.

I also understand Mr. LEWIS. We all respect him and what he has gone through. As a former prosecutor and lawyer who has worked on many search and seizure warrants and that type of thing, I can tell you this: there are no violations in this bill at all. That is not what this bill is about. If it were, I wouldn't be in favor of it.

I thank you, Mr. ROGERS, for your cooperation and for working with us in this bipartisan manner. It is a very serious issue.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. I yield myself the balance of my time.

I do want to thank the ranking member and both staffs from both committees who have been tireless in this effort to get it right and to find that right place where we could all feel comfortable.

The amendments that are following here are months of negotiation and work with many organizations—privacy groups. We have worked language

with the Center for Democracy and Technology, and they just the other day said they applauded our progress on where we're going with privacy and civil liberties. So we have included a lot of folks.

It has been a long road. It has been the most open and transparent bill that, I think, I've ever worked on here. We kept it open to the very end to make sure that we could find the language that clarified our intent to protect privacy, to protect civil liberties, and to just be able to share dangerous information with victims. That's all this bill is. The whopping 13 pages it is does only that. So I appreciate the comments today. I look forward to the amendment debate.

Again, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, it has been a joy to work with you on this particular issue.

As an old Army officer once told me, once you find a problem, you are morally obligated to do something about it. We set about it a year ago to make America safe and to protect your network at home from people stealing it, breaking it, and doing something worse.

So, Madam Chair, I look forward to the debate on the amendments, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Chair, although I am voting against the Cyber Intelligence Sharing and Protection Act of 2011 today, I recommend Representative C.A. "DUTCH" RUPPERSBERGER, the Ranking Member of the House Intelligence Committee, for his efforts to improve the bill significantly since its passage out of committee. He has been a leader in protecting our Nation against cyber attacks, and he has gone out of his way to make this bill as inclusive and bipartisan as possible. I want to thank him for the time he took to meet with me personally to discuss this legislation and ways to improve it going forward.

I oppose this bill in its current form for several reasons. First, the Republicans on the House Rules Committee refused to allow debate on an amendment offered by Representative BENNIE THOMPSON, the Ranking Member of the House Committee on Homeland Security, to expand this legislation to protect our Nation's critical infrastructure.

In testimony before the House Intelligence Committee, then-CIA Director Leon Panetta called cybersecurity "the battleground for the future." Our Nation's critical infrastructure—including power distribution, water supply, telecommunications, and emergency services—has become increasingly dependent on computerized information systems to manage their operations and to process, maintain, and report essential information. Any effort to address this national security threat must address our Nation's critical infrastructure.

In addition, the legislation includes several provisions that are problematic. For example, under the information-sharing provisions of the bill, private entities receive absolute immunity from criminal or civil liability for any harm that may result from a company's actions that stem from the sharing or receiving of cyber threat information as long as the company can show it was acting in good faith.

This bill would also create a new exemption to the Freedom of Information Act that is un-

warranted since current law exemptions provide the flexibility necessary to protect sensitive information. The bill would prohibit agencies from disclosing "cyber threat information," and it would hold the government liable for such disclosure. Unfortunately, an amendment offered on the floor did not sufficiently address these concerns.

Finally, the bill would allow companies to share private consumer data without adequate protections or oversight. Private entities would decide the type and amount of information to share with the Federal Government, and nothing in the bill would require companies to strip out unnecessary personally identifiable information. Again, an amendment offered on the floor did not go far enough to adequately address this issue.

I appreciate the great effort that went into pulling this bill together, but more work is needed before I can offer my support. It is critical that we protect Americans from cyber attacks, and I hope we can continue to improve this legislation as we move forward.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chair, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 3523, the Cyber Intelligence Sharing and Protection Act (CISPA).

The main topic this week, as announced by the House Republican Leadership, is cyber security, a serious issue for our Nation. As we become more dependent on computers and technology for even common or routine actions that happen every day, we become at increased risk of great damage from a cyber attack. Nations or individuals who wish us harm know that, and so we must be vigilant.

What we are considering today is premised on the idea that greater information sharing of cyber threats between the government and the private sector will improve security. While this is a relatively uncontroversial idea in concept, the bill before us raises a number of concerns.

It is important to note at the outset that the bill allows companies to share information, including private e-mails and other Internet communications, with the government—notwithstanding any other law. So, protections in existing law, such as the Electronic Communications Privacy Act (ECPA) and the Wiretap Act, are totally superseded. The government could get all of your information without a warrant or subpoena, and you would have little ability, if any, to stop it. Such a blanket exemption should give us great pause.

Unfortunately, the rest of the bill does not provide sufficient safeguards to justify this blanket exemption. To begin with, the definition of the cyber threat information to be shared is very broad. Suggestions have been made that define what should be included as cyber threat information in a narrow but sufficient way. These suggestions were not included in this bill.

At the very least, companies and other entities providing the government with information should be required to take some reasonable steps to remove personally identifiable information. Such reasonable steps need not be overly burdensome, but, again, even this limited protection was not included.

Once this information was shared with the government, it could be reviewed and used by any department. The Department of Defense, National Security Agency, and other defense and intelligence agencies thus would have access to the private, domestic internet activities of innocent Americans. This mixing of domestic information with military entities is dan-

gerous and unprecedented. In fact, our policy has long-been to keep the military out of such domestic affairs. Information about cyber security should be limited to the relevant domestic government bodies, such as the Department of Homeland Security.

The power of government to use the information it receives would also be tremendously broad. One allowable use for this information is the hopelessly vague "national security." In the past, the government has considered peace groups, civil rights activists, and other advocates to be "threats" to national security. It is easy to imagine how this term could be utilized for all the wrong reasons. The bill is supposed to be about cyber security, but allowing use of the information collected for national security purposes does not necessarily serve that purpose.

Further, the bill makes enforcing even the limited restrictions it contains difficult. With respect to private entities, as long as they act "in good faith," they are immune from any civil or criminal case in state or federal court. This low standard means that any time a company claims it thought it was following the law, persons harmed by the improper sharing of information will have no recourse.

The bill does allow for civil actions against government violations. Unfortunately, the ability to bring a lawsuit against the government, as provided for in the bill, is deficient in three ways.

First, the bill only would allow lawsuits against the government for breaches if filed "not later than two years after the date of the violation." That time period is wholly unworkable, unfair, and unrealistic.

Second, as written the bill only would impose liability on the government only for "intentionally" or "willfully" violating its restrictions. While this is helpful, such a limited liability scheme ignores damages arising from negligence. Such negligent acts could involve the failure to properly protect sensitive information or the failure to act with due care in deciding what information should be used.

Lastly, the only remedy is monetary damages. Injunctive relief, which could force the government to change its practices, is not provided for.

I filed an amendment with the Rules Committee to solve these three problems regarding the ability to hold the government accountable. It was not made in order.

In fact, multiple amendments were filed with the Rules Committee which would have made significant improvements to this bill. They would have narrowed its terms, limited how information could be used, protected personal information, and so on. The Rules Committee chose not to make them in order. Some of the amendments the House was allowed to consider will improve the bill, but not enough to sufficiently protect our privacy and civil liberties.

In closing, I want to reiterate that I recognize the importance of the issue of cyber security. I agree with the proponents of the bill that we must improve our cyber security defenses.

But, I remain firmly committed to the notion that we can protect our security and maintain our liberty, privacy, and freedom. This bill puts our privacy at great risk, and unnecessarily so. As such, I oppose its passage and recommend my colleagues do the same.

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Chair, I recognize the need to address the threats posed to our Nation and the American economy in cyber

space, but I also believe we must be very careful in maintaining the appropriate balance between protecting our national security and preserving our civil liberties.

Given the concerns about this measure and the perceived threat to sensitive and personal information of American citizens, I believe that the House should take additional time to deliberate on this measure. The American public deserves an opportunity to gain a fuller understanding of the provisions included in this bill and how their daily lives may be affected by it.

For these reasons, I will oppose the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee print 112-20. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 3523

*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 “Cyber Intelligence Sharing and Protection Act”.*

**SEC. 2. CYBER THREAT INTELLIGENCE AND INFORMATION SHARING.**

*(a) IN GENERAL.—Title XI of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 442 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:*

**“CYBER THREAT INTELLIGENCE AND INFORMATION SHARING**

**“SEC. 1104. (a) INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY SHARING OF CYBER THREAT INTELLIGENCE WITH PRIVATE SECTOR AND UTILITIES.—**

**“(1) IN GENERAL.—**The Director of National Intelligence shall establish procedures to allow elements of the intelligence community to share cyber threat intelligence with private-sector entities and utilities and to encourage the sharing of such intelligence.

**“(2) SHARING AND USE OF CLASSIFIED INTELLIGENCE.—**The procedures established under paragraph (1) shall provide that classified cyber threat intelligence may only be—

**“(A) shared by an element of the intelligence community with—**

**“(i) certified entities; or**

**“(ii) a person with an appropriate security clearance to receive such cyber threat intelligence;**

**“(B) shared consistent with the need to protect the national security of the United States; and**

**“(C) used by a certified entity in a manner which protects such cyber threat intelligence from unauthorized disclosure.**

**“(3) SECURITY CLEARANCE APPROVALS.—**The Director of National Intelligence shall issue guidelines providing that the head of an element of the intelligence community may, as the head of such element considers necessary to carry out this subsection—

**“(A) grant a security clearance on a temporary or permanent basis to an employee or officer of a certified entity;**

**“(B) grant a security clearance on a temporary or permanent basis to a certified entity and approval to use appropriate facilities; and**

**“(C) expedite the security clearance process for a person or entity as the head of such element considers necessary, consistent with the need to protect the national security of the United States.**

**“(4) NO RIGHT OR BENEFIT.—**The provision of information to a private-sector entity or a utility under this subsection shall not create a right or benefit to similar information by such entity or such utility or any other private-sector entity or utility.

**“(5) RESTRICTION ON DISCLOSURE OF CYBER THREAT INTELLIGENCE.—**Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a certified entity receiving cyber threat intelligence pursuant to this subsection shall not further disclose such cyber threat intelligence to another entity, other than to a certified entity or other appropriate agency or department of the Federal Government authorized to receive such cyber threat intelligence.

**“(b) USE OF CYBERSECURITY SYSTEMS AND SHARING OF CYBER THREAT INFORMATION.—**

**“(1) IN GENERAL.—**

**“(A) CYBERSECURITY PROVIDERS.—**Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a cybersecurity provider, with the express consent of a protected entity for which such cybersecurity provider is providing goods or services for cybersecurity purposes, may, for cybersecurity purposes—

**“(i) use cybersecurity systems to identify and obtain cyber threat information to protect the rights and property of such protected entity; and**

**“(ii) share such cyber threat information with any other entity designated by such protected entity, including, if specifically designated, the Federal Government.**

**“(B) SELF-PROTECTED ENTITIES.—**Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a self-protected entity may, for cybersecurity purposes—

**“(i) use cybersecurity systems to identify and obtain cyber threat information to protect the rights and property of such self-protected entity; and**

**“(ii) share such cyber threat information with any other entity, including the Federal Government.**

**“(2) SHARING WITH THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.—**

**“(A) INFORMATION SHARED WITH THE NATIONAL CYBERSECURITY AND COMMUNICATIONS INTEGRATION CENTER OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY.—**Subject to the use and protection of information requirements under paragraph (3), the head of a department or agency of the Federal Government receiving cyber threat information in accordance with paragraph (1) shall provide such cyber threat information to the National Cybersecurity and Communications Integration Center of the Department of Homeland Security.

**“(B) REQUEST TO SHARE WITH ANOTHER DEPARTMENT OR AGENCY OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.—**An entity sharing cyber threat information that is provided to the National Cybersecurity and Communications Integration Center of the Department of Homeland Security under subparagraph (A) or paragraph (1) may request the head of such Center to, and the head of such Center may, provide such information to another department or agency of the Federal Government.

**“(3) USE AND PROTECTION OF INFORMATION.—**Cyber threat information shared in accordance with paragraph (1)—

**“(A) shall only be shared in accordance with any restrictions placed on the sharing of such information by the protected entity or self-protected entity authorizing such sharing, including appropriate anonymization or minimization of such information;**

**“(B) may not be used by an entity to gain an unfair competitive advantage to the detriment of**

**the protected entity or the self-protected entity authorizing the sharing of information;**

**“(C) if shared with the Federal Government—**

**“(i) shall be exempt from disclosure under section 552 of title 5, United States Code;**

**“(ii) shall be considered proprietary information and shall not be disclosed to an entity outside of the Federal Government except as authorized by the entity sharing such information;**

**“(iii) shall not be used by the Federal Government for regulatory purposes;**

**“(iv) shall not be provided by the department or agency of the Federal Government receiving such cyber threat information to another department or agency of the Federal Government under paragraph (2)(A) if—**

**“(I) the entity providing such information determines that the provision of such information will undermine the purpose for which such information is shared; or**

**“(II) unless otherwise directed by the President, the head of the department or agency of the Federal Government receiving such cyber threat information determines that the provision of such information will undermine the purpose for which such information is shared; and**

**“(v) shall be handled by the Federal Government consistent with the need to protect sources and methods and the national security of the United States; and**

**“(D) shall be exempt from disclosure under a State, local, or tribal law or regulation that requires public disclosure of information by a public or quasi-public entity.**

**“(4) EXEMPTION FROM LIABILITY.—**No civil or criminal cause of action shall lie or be maintained in Federal or State court against a protected entity, self-protected entity, cybersecurity provider, or an officer, employee, or agent of a protected entity, self-protected entity, or cybersecurity provider, acting in good faith—

**“(A) for using cybersecurity systems or sharing information in accordance with this section; or**

**“(B) for decisions made based on cyber threat information identified, obtained, or shared under this section.**

**“(5) RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER LAWS REQUIRING THE DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION.—**The submission of information under this subsection to the Federal Government shall not satisfy or affect any requirement under any other provision of law for a person or entity to provide information to the Federal Government.

**“(c) FEDERAL GOVERNMENT USE OF INFORMATION.—**

**“(1) LIMITATION.—**The Federal Government may use cyber threat information shared with the Federal Government in accordance with subsection (b) for any lawful purpose only if—

**“(A) the use of such information is not for a regulatory purpose; and**

**“(B) at least one significant purpose of the use of such information is—**

**“(i) a cybersecurity purpose; or**

**“(ii) the protection of the national security of the United States.**

**“(2) AFFIRMATIVE SEARCH RESTRICTION.—**The Federal Government may not affirmatively search cyber threat information shared with the Federal Government under subsection (b) for a purpose other than a purpose referred to in paragraph (1)(B).

**“(3) ANTI-TASKING RESTRICTION.—**Nothing in this section shall be construed to permit the Federal Government to—

**“(A) require a private-sector entity to share information with the Federal Government; or**

**“(B) condition the sharing of cyber threat intelligence with a private-sector entity on the provision of cyber threat information to the Federal Government.**

**“(d) FEDERAL GOVERNMENT LIABILITY FOR VIOLATIONS OF RESTRICTIONS ON THE DISCLOSURE, USE, AND PROTECTION OF VOLUNTARILY SHARED INFORMATION.—**

**“(1) IN GENERAL.—**If a department or agency of the Federal Government intentionally or willfully violates subsection (b)(3)(C) or subsection

(c) with respect to the disclosure, use, or protection of voluntarily shared cyber threat information shared under this section, the United States shall be liable to a person adversely affected by such violation in an amount equal to the sum of—

“(A) the actual damages sustained by the person as a result of the violation or \$1,000, whichever is greater; and

“(B) the costs of the action together with reasonable attorney fees as determined by the court.

“(2) VENUE.—An action to enforce liability created under this subsection may be brought in the district court of the United States in—

“(A) the district in which the complainant resides;

“(B) the district in which the principal place of business of the complainant is located;

“(C) the district in which the department or agency of the Federal Government that disclosed the information is located; or

“(D) the District of Columbia.

“(3) STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.—No action shall lie under this subsection unless such action is commenced not later than two years after the date of the violation of subsection (b)(3)(C) or subsection (c) that is the basis for the action.

“(4) EXCLUSIVE CAUSE OF ACTION.—A cause of action under this subsection shall be the exclusive means available to a complainant seeking a remedy for a violation of subsection (b)(3)(C) or subsection (c).

“(e) REPORT ON INFORMATION SHARING.—

“(1) REPORT.—The Inspector General of the Intelligence Community shall annually submit to the congressional intelligence committees a report containing a review of the use of information shared with the Federal Government under this section, including—

“(A) a review of the use by the Federal Government of such information for a purpose other than a cybersecurity purpose;

“(B) a review of the type of information shared with the Federal Government under this section;

“(C) a review of the actions taken by the Federal Government based on such information;

“(D) appropriate metrics to determine the impact of the sharing of such information with the Federal Government on privacy and civil liberties, if any;

“(E) a review of the sharing of such information within the Federal Government to identify inappropriate stovepiping of shared information; and

“(F) any recommendations of the Inspector General for improvements or modifications to the authorities under this section.

“(2) FORM.—Each report required under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

“(f) FEDERAL PREEMPTION.—This section supersedes any statute of a State or political subdivision of a State that restricts or otherwise expressly regulates an activity authorized under subsection (b).

“(g) SAVINGS CLAUSES.—

“(1) EXISTING AUTHORITIES.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit any other authority to use a cybersecurity system or to identify, obtain, or share cyber threat intelligence or cyber threat information.

“(2) LIMITATION ON MILITARY AND INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT IN PRIVATE AND PUBLIC SECTOR CYBERSECURITY EFFORTS.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to provide additional authority to, or modify an existing authority of, the Department of Defense or the National Security Agency or any other element of the intelligence community to control, modify, require, or otherwise direct the cybersecurity efforts of a private-sector entity or a component of the Federal Government or a State, local, or tribal government.

“(3) INFORMATION SHARING RELATIONSHIPS.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to—

“(A) limit or modify an existing information sharing relationship;

“(B) prohibit a new information sharing relationship;

“(C) require a new information sharing relationship between the Federal Government and a private-sector entity; or

“(D) modify the authority of a department or agency of the Federal Government to protect sources and methods and the national security of the United States.

“(h) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) CERTIFIED ENTITY.—The term ‘certified entity’ means a protected entity, self-protected entity, or cybersecurity provider that—

“(A) possesses or is eligible to obtain a security clearance, as determined by the Director of National Intelligence; and

“(B) is able to demonstrate to the Director of National Intelligence that such provider or such entity can appropriately protect classified cyber threat intelligence.

“(2) CYBER THREAT INFORMATION.—The term ‘cyber threat information’ means information directly pertaining to a vulnerability of, or threat to, a system or network of a government or private entity, including information pertaining to the protection of a system or network from—

“(A) efforts to degrade, disrupt, or destroy such system or network; or

“(B) efforts to gain unauthorized access to a system or network, including efforts to gain such unauthorized access to steal or misappropriate private or government information.

“(3) CYBER THREAT INTELLIGENCE.—The term ‘cyber threat intelligence’ means information in the possession of an element of the intelligence community directly pertaining to a vulnerability of, or threat to, a system or network of a government or private entity, including information pertaining to the protection of a system or network from—

“(A) efforts to degrade, disrupt, or destroy such system or network; or

“(B) efforts to gain unauthorized access to a system or network, including efforts to gain such unauthorized access to steal or misappropriate private or government information.

“(4) CYBERSECURITY PROVIDER.—The term ‘cybersecurity provider’ means a non-governmental entity that provides goods or services intended to be used for cybersecurity purposes.

“(5) CYBERSECURITY PURPOSE.—The term ‘cybersecurity purpose’ means the purpose of ensuring the integrity, confidentiality, or availability of, or safeguarding, a system or network, including protecting a system or network from—

“(A) efforts to degrade, disrupt, or destroy such system or network; or

“(B) efforts to gain unauthorized access to a system or network, including efforts to gain such unauthorized access to steal or misappropriate private or government information.

“(6) CYBERSECURITY SYSTEM.—The term ‘cybersecurity system’ means a system designed or employed to ensure the integrity, confidentiality, or availability of, or safeguard, a system or network, including protecting a system or network from—

“(A) efforts to degrade, disrupt, or destroy such system or network; or

“(B) efforts to gain unauthorized access to a system or network, including efforts to gain such unauthorized access to steal or misappropriate private or government information.

“(7) PROTECTED ENTITY.—The term ‘protected entity’ means an entity, other than an individual, that contracts with a cybersecurity provider for goods or services to be used for cybersecurity purposes.

“(8) SELF-PROTECTED ENTITY.—The term ‘self-protected entity’ means an entity, other than an individual, that provides goods or services for cybersecurity purposes to itself.

“(9) UTILITY.—The term ‘utility’ means an entity providing essential services (other than law enforcement or regulatory services), including electricity, natural gas, propane, telecommunications, transportation, water, or wastewater services.”.

(b) PROCEDURES AND GUIDELINES.—The Director of National Intelligence shall—

(1) not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, establish procedures under paragraph (1) of section 1104(a) of the National Security Act of 1947, as added by subsection (a) of this section, and issue guidelines under paragraph (3) of such section 1104(a);

(2) in establishing such procedures and issuing such guidelines, consult with the Secretary of Homeland Security to ensure that such procedures and such guidelines permit the owners and operators of critical infrastructure to receive all appropriate cyber threat intelligence (as defined in section 1104(h)(3) of such Act, as added by subsection (a)) in the possession of the Federal Government; and

(3) following the establishment of such procedures and the issuance of such guidelines, expeditiously distribute such procedures and such guidelines to appropriate departments and agencies of the Federal Government, private-sector entities, and utilities (as defined in section 1104(h)(9) of such Act, as added by subsection (a)).

(c) INITIAL REPORT.—The first report required to be submitted under subsection (e) of section 1104 of the National Security Act of 1947, as added by subsection (a) of this section, shall be submitted not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) TABLE OF CONTENTS AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in the first section of the National Security Act of 1947 is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“Sec. 1104. Cyber threat intelligence and information sharing.”.

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in House Report 112-454. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. LANGEVIN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 112-454.

Mr. LANGEVIN. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 1, line 13, strike “UTILITIES” and insert “CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE OWNERS AND OPERATORS”.

Page 2, line 1, strike “utilities” and insert “critical infrastructure owners and operators”.

Page 3, line 13, strike “utility” and insert “critical infrastructure owner or operator”.

Page 3, line 16, strike “utility” each place it appears and insert “critical infrastructure owner or operator”.

Page 17, strike lines 12 through 16.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 631, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The bill that we are considering today creates a voluntary information-sharing network, which could provide owners and operators of critical infrastructure with valuable threat information that would help them to secure their networks from cyberattacks.

Unfortunately, the legislation specifies that it applies only to “private sector entities and utilities.” While “utilities” is defined extremely broadly in the legislation as any entity that provides “essential services,” including telecommunications and transportation providers, there remains the possibility that the definition may exclude pieces of our critical infrastructure that have significant cyber vulnerabilities.

My amendment, which I am offering with my good friend Mr. LUNGREN from California, strikes the uses of the word “utilities” and replaces it in each instance with the phrase “critical infrastructure owners and operators.” This is a commonsense way to avoid potential confusion and to eliminate any possibility that critical entities could be denied the opportunity to opt into this voluntary information-sharing framework and thereby share and receive the valuable classified threat information that will be available under CISPA.

This amendment will not significantly expand the scope of the legislation, but instead will help prevent interpretations of language that could be contrary to the committee’s intent, which I believe is the same as mine.

Now, while I recognize that any regulation of critical infrastructure would be outside the Intelligence Committee’s jurisdiction, I nonetheless want to take this opportunity to voice my strong conviction that our efforts must not stop with the legislation that we are considering this week.

Just as the airline industry must follow Federal Aviation Administration safety standards, the companies that own and operate the infrastructure on which the public most relies should be accountable for protecting their consumers when confronted with a significant risk. I, along with many Members on both sides of the aisle and experts within and outside of government, have come to the same basic conclusion: the status quo of voluntary action will not result in strong cyberprotections for our most valuable and vulnerable industries. The Secretary of Homeland Security emphasized last week that our critical infrastructure control systems, which are mainly in private hands, must come up to a certain baseline level in cybersecurity standards.

With increased public awareness helping to build momentum for legislative action, we have a real chance to address these threats. I hope that we will not look back on this moment years from now, regretting a missed opportunity after the damage has been done. While the amendment we are offering today will not by itself provide the protections that Mr. LUNGREN and I

ultimately believe are necessary for our critical infrastructure, it is a useful first step, and I am thankful to Mr. LUNGREN for joining me in this effort.

With that, Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. I want to first compliment Mr. LANGEVIN for working with us on the cybersecurity bill. He has been an instrumental force in pushing this cybersecurity issue to the front and in getting the language that we have that finds that right balance.

My concern with this, which is why I thought, at least, the President’s advisers who were recommending to him that he veto the bill were misguided, is that now we have done something in this bill that is fairly unique. It is all voluntary, and we have separated the government and the private sector. The government is not going to be involved in private sector networks, and they’re not going to be involved in the government networks. Perfect. That’s exactly the balance we found.

With this, it crosses both of those, and it gets us to a place that I think we need to have a lot more discussion on, and you can see by the level of debate just on this issue how people are really nervous about the Federal Government getting into their business.

□ 1540

This, I’m afraid, opens it up to that. Here’s the good news. We believe this is already covered in the bill as far as the sharing component, and you replace the word “utility” with something that isn’t defined, “critical infrastructure, owners and operators.” We’re not sure what that is, and in some cases you could extrapolate that to be even the local police, who argue they’re part of the national security infrastructure. Does that mean local police are going to get very sensitive foreign cyberintelligence information? And why would they have it? We don’t know the answers to those questions, and that’s why we’re having such a hard time with this amendment.

I would argue that there does need to be a Homeland Security bill, and it really shouldn’t be done in the Intelligence Committee. It should be done in the Homeland Security Committee.

So I would love to work with Mr. LANGEVIN as the process works its way through the Homeland Security Committee and believe that that should be fully debated.

Remember, when you start getting regulation into the private sector, including private networks, that, I argue, is troublesome and very worrisome to me, and something I would have a hard time supporting.

So, I look forward to working with the gentleman. I would have to oppose this amendment, but I want to thank you for all your work on the cyberissue

and, clearly, this cyber information-sharing bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANGEVIN. I thank the chairman of the Intelligence Committee for his thoughts. I respectfully disagree. The word “utilities” is important, but I believe “critical infrastructure,” out of an abundance of caution, is a better term than “utilities”.

How much time do I have, Madam Chair?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. LANGEVIN. I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished chairman on the Department of Homeland Security Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN).

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. I think the amendment is quite simple. As written, the bill allows for information to be shared with the private sector and utilities, but there are those that do not fall within that that I think we would all agree should be able to have this relationship.

Our amendment would have the simple effect of including those elements such as airport authorities, mass transit authorities, or municipal hospitals, which are neither private sector nor utilities, to be able to participate in this voluntary information-sharing regime.

I find it odd to find out that the committee is worried about the definition of “critical infrastructure.” That has been defined in the U.S. Code for over a decade. It is in the language in 42 U.S.C. 5195c, the Critical Infrastructure Protection Act of 2001, which defines critical infrastructure as:

Systems or assets, whether physical or virtual, so vital to the United States that the incapacity or destruction of such systems and assets would have a debilitating impact on security, national economic security, national public health or safety, or any combination of those matters.

That has been the definition that we have supported. That’s been the definition that we’ve worked on. Your committee, our committee, all committees have. I find this a very simple amendment that tries to reach what we are all trying to reach. It does not grant any more authority to the Federal Government. It allows for the sharing of information to vital entities, as the gentleman has suggested, that we would all agree ought to be there.

I would hope that pride of authorship is not the problem here. We’re trying to do something that we think makes common sense. And if folks have trouble with the definition of critical infrastructure, you would have thought it would have been raised in the last decade.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LANGEVIN. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. I would hope that we could have support for this bipartisan amendment brought forward by the gentleman who

serves on the Intelligence Committee. I serve on the Homeland Security Committee. I'm chairman of the Subcommittee on Cybersecurity.

It seems to me to make imminent sense. I do not understand why there is some opposition to this amendment. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. How much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. I would just remind the gentleman that the definition does not go back anywhere in this bill to that. It leaves it open, and when you start, again, crossing that valley between the government and the private sector, it causes serious issues—as you can see, the people who are very concerned that the government is going to get into regulating anything on the Internet.

I would say this is no pride of authorship. I don't know if Mr. RUPPERSBERGER and I could have any more authors participate in our bill than we have.

The problem here is very real and very substantive. And that's why I think both the gentlemen, who have as much passion and care and commitment to this issue as I've seen, need to work that issue on the Homeland Security Committee so you can do it in a way that won't rise to the level of the objections that we have seen when just the suggestion of regulating outside of the purview of national security comes into discussion.

That's why I would hope the gentleman would exercise extreme caution when taking that walk. It is perilous for the government to get into regulating the Internet, and I oppose that completely. That's why we have these problems, I think, arise from it. I think, if these are issues that they can get over, that this should have substantive debate. Remember, this very narrow bill took 1 year—1 year—of work and negotiation and discussions to get it to where we are today.

So, I would encourage that maybe more thought ought to be put in it, and I would look forward to working with both gentleman as they introduce and work their bills through the Homeland Security Committee, as I think would be appropriate.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Again, I thank the chairman of the Intelligence Committee for his thoughts. I want to be very clear that this term substituting "critical infrastructure" for "utilities" does not lend to regulating critical infrastructure. It just allows for the broadest possible definition of information-sharing among those entities that are deemed to be critical infrastructure.

With that, I thank Chairman LUNGREN for his support of this bipartisan amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island will be postponed.

The Chair understands that amendment No. 2 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. POMPEO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 112-454.

Mr. POMPEO. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 8, beginning on line 18, strike "or sharing information" and insert "to identify or obtain cyber threat information or for sharing such information".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 631, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. POMPEO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. POMPEO. I want to thank Chairman ROGERS and Chairman RUPPERSBERGER for their hard work on this important piece of legislation. I am among those folks who, when I first learned of this legislation, had some concerns to make sure that it was balanced and it did the right things. Also as a former Army officer, I recognize the deep national security implications of the cyberthreat, but I also wanted to make sure that we also did everything that was necessary to protect everyone's privacy rights.

This is a simple amendment. It makes clear that the liability protection in the bill with respect to the use of such systems only extends to the identification and acquisition of cyberthreat information and no further.

This is an unprecedented threat from countries like China and Russia. These are hostile nations, and they're committing resources, unprecedented resources, to attack U.S. networks each and every minute of every day. While this new threat is being developed by our foreign enemies, organized criminals and foreign hackers also just as easily deploy malicious cyberattacks to disrupt stock markets, transportation networks, businesses, governments, and even our military operations.

A devastating cyberattack could easily be unleashed from the remote comfort of enemies' computers thousands of miles away from our Nation. We must take this threat very, very seriously.

Part of the challenge in cyberspace is that a line of computer code could be just as deadly as a traditional military weapon. We've already seen these attacks used as an instrument of war. In 2008, Georgia suffered a significant cyberattack prior to the invasion by Russia. This attack crippled Georgia's banking system and disrupted the nation's cell phone services, helping to clear the battlefield for the invading Russians.

Perhaps the most significant dangerous activity in cyberspace even goes unnoticed. Cyberspies lay in wait for years in order to eventually steal precious military and economic secrets. Each of these examples further illustrates the need for legislation. Unfortunately, some civil liberties and privacy advocates claim that liability protection in this bill with respect to the use of cybersecurity systems could lead to broader activities than authorized.

This legislation doesn't do that, but my amendment simply provides clarifying language to the original language of the bill, and thus enjoys the support of bipartisan cosponsors of the legislation, as well as the outside groups that raise these concerns.

Madam Chair, I urge approval of this amendment.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any Member seek time in opposition?

Mr. POMPEO. I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ROGERS), the chairman of the Intelligence Committee.

□ 1550

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. I want to thank Mr. POMPEO for working with us. This was an amendment negotiated with Mr. RUPPERSBERGER and myself and Mr. POMPEO to clearly define the intention of the bill, and I think it offers protections. I think we should all strongly support Mr. POMPEO's amendment.

Mr. POMPEO. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. POMPEO).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF MICHIGAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 112-454.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. I have an amendment at the desk, Madam Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 9, beginning on line 2, strike "affect any" and insert "affect—".

Page 9, strike lines 3 through 5 and insert the following:

"(A) any requirement under any other provision of law for a person or entity to provide information to the Federal Government; or

"(B) the applicability of other provisions of law, including section 552 of title 5, United

States Code (commonly known as the 'Freedom of Information Act'), with respect to information required to be provided to the Federal Government under such other provision of law.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 631, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ROGERS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Madam Chair, I strongly encourage the support of this amendment. It's a simple amendment we negotiated. It is clarifying language again on FOIA.

With that, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA).

Mr. ISSA. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Hopefully there will be time left over also for Mr. CHAFFETZ, who has worked hard on this amendment.

I want to thank the chairman for working with our committee on this amendment that clarifies in the Cyber Intelligence Sharing and Protection Act that FOIA, the Freedom of Information Access Act, is in fact clearly in effect for the vast majority of this information.

We understand that companies—I will just take an example—such as electric utility companies may share their very vulnerabilities as a part of a process to reduce or eliminate these vulnerabilities. We certainly understand that that's not FOIAable. National security is not FOIAable. However, we, in this amendment, ensure that everything is at least possibly FOIAable whenever it would be appropriate, and then the only question is does it stand for one of the exclusions. So by making it narrow, we tell the American people that the Freedom of Information Act is in effect on cybersecurity and will not be unreasonably withheld.

I think this is critical at a time when greater transparency is the promise and there is a great deal of concern about cybersecurity somehow being something that would take away America's freedoms. Just the opposite is true. Our freedom of the Internet, our freedom to have an effective and efficient system on which to build our infrastructure both for electricity and other utilities, but also for our everyday life, essentially requires the kind of cooperation that we anticipate.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Madam Chair, I claim time in opposition to the amendment; however, I do not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. I agree with Mr. ISSA's comments. This is a joint amendment of Mr. ROGERS and me. The amendment would make it clear that while FOIA exemption protects information obtained under the bill, regulatory information required by other

authorities remains subject to FOIA requests.

The chairman and I agree the law should not create a broad change. The type of information that is available under the Freedom of Information Act, we have a responsibility to protect classified information from disclosure, but we also understand the need to keep information open to the public. The amendment makes clear that information available under other authorities remains subject to FOIA, and I urge all Members to support this bipartisan amendment.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I appreciate the bipartisan nature in which this is moving forward. I appreciate specifically Chairman ROGERS, Chairman ISSA, and the ranking member.

I stand in support of this amendment. I think FOIA is a very important principle we have in this, and this just strengthens that.

I would also say, Madam Chair, that I was opposed to SOPA. I was adamantly opposed to this. But this bill in particular is desperately needed in this country. Cybersecurity is a very real threat, and this bill is something that is needed in this country. I think it is strong in its Fourth Amendment protections. I think it's appropriate for this Nation to do this. We need to make sure that we're smart in how we advance.

There have been some much-needed amendments that were adopted. But again, the bill, as we see it moving forward, I think, will strengthen cybersecurity in this country, and I'm proud of the fact that Chairman ROGERS is bringing this bill to the floor.

I urge the support of this amendment and the underlying bill.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ROGERS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan will be postponed.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 112-454.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. QUAYLE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 112-454.

Mr. QUAYLE. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 9, strike lines 8 through 18 and insert the following:

“(1) LIMITATION.—The Federal Government may use cyber threat information shared with the Federal Government in accordance with subsection (b)—

“(A) for cybersecurity purposes;

“(B) for the investigation and prosecution of cybersecurity crimes;

“(C) for the protection of individuals from the danger of death or serious bodily harm and the investigation and prosecution of crimes involving such danger of death or serious bodily harm;

“(D) for the protection of minors from child pornography, any risk of sexual exploitation, and serious threats to the physical safety of such minor, including kidnapping and trafficking and the investigation and prosecution of crimes involving child pornography, any risk of sexual exploitation, and serious threats to the physical safety of minors, including kidnapping and trafficking, and any crime referred to in 2258A(a)(2) of title 18, United States Code; or

“(E) to protect the national security of the United States.

Page 16, before line 1 insert the following:

“(4) CYBERSECURITY CRIME.—The term ‘cybersecurity crime’ means—

“(A) a crime under a Federal or State law that involves—

“(i) efforts to degrade, disrupt, or destroy a system or network;

“(ii) efforts to gain unauthorized access to a system or network; or

“(iii) efforts to exfiltrate information from a system or network without authorization; or

“(B) the violation of a provision of Federal law relating to computer crimes, including a violation of any provision of title 18, United States Code, created or amended by the Computer Fraud and Abuse Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-474).”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 631, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. QUAYLE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. QUAYLE. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I appreciate the opportunity to speak in favor of this bipartisan amendment that I'm offering along with Congresswoman ESHOO, Congressman THOMPSON, and Congressman BROUN.

H.R. 3523 is designed to increase the sharing of government intelligence and cyberthreats with the private sector and allow private sector companies to share threat information on a voluntary basis. The bill is consistent with our founding principles and our Constitution. Indeed, as the nature of the threats facing our Nation change, I believe this legislation is vital to protecting our country.

Every day our military intelligence communities work to counter traditional threats like nuclear and biological weapons in order to prevent a catastrophic attack on U.S. soil, but today's security threats are becoming less traditional. Four nations have chosen cyberspace as an area of particular

vulnerability for America and are targeting critical military and economic cyberinfrastructure.

Admiral Mike Mullen, the former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, lists cyberattacks as one of the top threats facing the United States. Secretary of Defense and former CIA Director Leon Panetta warned that the next Pearl Harbor we confront could very well be a cyberattack that cripples our power systems, our grid, our security systems, our financial systems, our governmental systems.

This legislation not only protects our national security and intellectual property, it also provides private and public entities to voluntarily work with the government to protect every individual's personal information from nation-state actors like China, Russia, and Iran, who are determined to use cyberattacks to steal from us and weaken us.

□ 1600

This bipartisan amendment will further solidify protecting the homeland from foreign nation-states wishing to do us harm, while protecting civil liberties.

This amendment significantly narrows the bill's current limitation of the Federal Government's use of cyberthreat information that is voluntarily shared by the private sector. Specifically, this amendment strictly limits the Federal Government's use of voluntarily shared cyberthreat information to the following five purposes: cybersecurity purposes; investigation and prosecution of cybersecurity crimes; protection of individuals from danger of death or serious bodily harm; and protection of minors from child pornography, any risk of sexual exploitation, and serious threats to the physical safety of a minor; finally, protection of the national security of the United States.

If the government violates the use limitation, the bill provides for government liability for actual damages, costs, and attorney fees in Federal court. These provisions together ensure that information cannot be shared with the government or used under this bill unless there's a direct tie to cybersecurity.

Cyberterrorists work fast, so Congress needs to work faster to protect America. Enabling information-sharing between the government and private sector is the quickest and easiest way to prevent a cyberattack on our Nation. Our amendment ensures we can accomplish this goal while also protecting the privacy of all Americans, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. I rise to claim time in opposition, but I do not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr.

THOMPSON). He is on the Intelligence Committee and also a sponsor of this amendment.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chair, I rise in support of the Thompson-Eshoo-Quayle-Broun amendment to this bill. The threat of a devastating cyberattack is real and cannot be understated. I believe the Federal Government and private companies need to work together to protect our national and economic security. But in doing so, we still have a responsibility to protect the constitutional rights of law-abiding citizens.

I'm concerned that the underlying bill is drafted in a way where consumer information could be shared too broadly and used in ways unrelated to combating cybersecurity threats. The Thompson-Eshoo-Quayle-Broun amendment will tighten the bill's limitation on the Federal Government's use of cyberthreat information shared under this legislation. Specifically, our amendment will limit the Federal Government's use of shared information only for cybersecurity purposes, for the investigation and prosecution of cybersecurity crimes, to protect against the threat of imminent harm, and protect our country's national security.

This bill, even with our amendment, isn't perfect. As this legislation moves forward, I expect the word of the chairman to be honored when he says that our committee will work together to further protect personal information and limit its use. For example, further narrowing terms in this bill, such as "to protect the national security of the United States," will be necessary, I believe, to fully protect our civil liberties.

Mr. QUAYLE. I yield 30 seconds to the chairman of the Intelligence Committee, Mr. ROGERS.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Thank you, Mr. QUAYLE.

Again, this is an amendment worked out with Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. QUAYLE, and myself. Ms. ESHOO is also on the amendment.

This is in consultation with all of the privacy groups and the civil liberty groups. We wanted to make sure that the intent matched the language. And we think this is a limiting amendment on what it can be used for, which is very narrow, is very specific; and we think this enhances already good privacy protections in the bill, and I strongly support it and would encourage the House to strongly support the bipartisan amendment.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. QUAYLE. I just want to thank the chairman and the ranking member and their staffs for working tirelessly on this bill. It's a good bill, and this amendment, I believe, strengthens it.

I urge my colleagues to support it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. QUAYLE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. AMASH

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 112-454.

Mr. AMASH. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 10, after line 10, insert the following new paragraph:

“(4) PROTECTION OF SENSITIVE PERSONAL DOCUMENTS.—The Federal Government may not use the following information, containing information that identifies a person, shared with the Federal Government in accordance with subsection (b):

“(A) Library circulation records.

“(B) Library patron lists.

“(C) Book sales records.

“(D) Book customer lists.

“(E) Firearms sales records.

“(F) Tax return records.

“(G) Educational records.

“(H) Medical records.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 631, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. AMASH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. AMASH. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I'm extremely concerned about the privacy implications of the bill. The liability waiver goes too far, and the government can access too much of Americans' private information and use it in too many ways.

Our amendment addresses that last concern. Our amendment prohibits CISPA from being used to snoop through sensitive documents that can personally identify Americans. The documents that our amendment makes off-limits to the government are library and book records, information on gun sales, tax returns, educational records, and medical records.

We didn't pull this list out of thin air. In fact, the list already exists in Federal law as part of the PATRIOT Act. Under the PATRIOT Act, the Federal Government can obtain these documents as part of a foreign intelligence investigation only if senior FBI officials request the documents and a Federal judge approves.

Many have questioned the wisdom of allowing the government access to sensitive documents even in those more limited circumstances. If the PATRIOT Act requires the approval of a Federal judge and a senior FBI official, surely we can't allow access to such personal information without any judicial or agency oversight. I don't know why the

government would want to snoop through library lists or tax returns to counter a cyberattack. But if the government wants these records, it has existing legal processes to obtain them. Our constituents' privacy demands that we not give the government unfettered and unsupervised access to these documents in the name of cybersecurity.

Please support the bipartisan Amash-Labrador-Nadler-Paul-Polis amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any Member seek recognition in opposition to the amendment?

Mr. AMASH. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chair, I rise in strong support of the Amash-Labrador-Nadler-Paul-Polis Amendment.

While I believe most Members agree both that a cyber attack could be devastating and that sharing information will help to fight that threat, the underlying bill is overly broad and intrusive. Our amendment will add at least a modicum of protection for Americans' privacy.

While the idea of privacy may seem quaint to some in this day of social networking and the Internet, most Americans still believe that they have a zone of privacy vis-a-vis the government. As such, it is important we protect private actions from the prying eyes of government. Moreover, the government has a history of misusing such information and so we need to be very circumspect in what we allow it access to.

Our amendment prohibits records or information regarding what books you bought or checked out of the library, your medical records, tax returns, and so on from being used by the government for any purpose if it obtained that information pursuant to this bill. There is no need for the government to have this most personal of information—I don't see how any of it could be possibly relevant to cyber security. And, if the information can't be legally used, hopefully that will discourage companies from sharing it in the first place.

The categories of information in our amendment are already given a protected status in the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA). FISA requires a court order and the approval of a high-ranking FBI official to request these personal materials. If that is the standard under FISA, we should not let companies cavalierly hand such records to the government with no independent review at all.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. AMASH).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. AMASH. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. MULVANEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 112-454.

Mr. MULVANEY. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 10, after line 10 insert the following:  
“(4) NOTIFICATION OF NON-CYBER THREAT INFORMATION.—If a department or agency of the Federal Government receiving information pursuant to subsection (b)(1) determines that such information is not cyber threat information, such department or agency shall notify the entity or provider sharing such information pursuant to subsection (b)(1).

“(5) RETENTION AND USE OF CYBER THREAT INFORMATION.—No department or agency of the Federal Government shall retain or use information shared pursuant to subsection (b)(1) for any use other than a use permitted under subsection (c)(1).

“(6) PROTECTION OF INDIVIDUAL INFORMATION.—The Federal Government may, consistent with the need to protect Federal systems and critical information infrastructure from cybersecurity threats and to mitigate such threats, undertake reasonable efforts to limit the impact on privacy and civil liberties of the sharing of cyber threat information with the Federal Government pursuant to this subsection.

Page 14, after line 13, insert the following:

“(4) USE AND RETENTION OF INFORMATION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize, or to modify any existing authority of, a department or agency of the Federal Government to retain or use information shared pursuant to subsection (b)(1) for any use other than a use permitted under subsection (c)(1).”

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 631, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. MULVANEY. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I appreciate the opportunity to rise today to speak in favor to this amendment to the Cyber Intelligence Sharing and Protection Act. CISP is fundamentally based on the authority granted to Congress in article I of the Constitution and article IV of the Constitution, specifically to provide for the common defense and to protect the Nation against invasion—in fact, the only affirmative duty that this government is obligated to meet under the terms of our Constitution.

This bill protects our Nation from foreign cyberthreats through the voluntary sharing of cyberthreat information. It is important for Members to understand this bill allows for only voluntary sharing of information on cybersecurity threats to the United States between the government and the private sector.

□ 1610

It includes no mandates to the private sector. It contains no new spending and strictly limits how the government can use the information that is voluntarily provided by the private sector. The amendment that I've offered with Mr. DICKS today goes one step further to protect the private in-

formation of American citizens. It explicitly prohibits the Federal Government from retaining or using the information for purposes other than specifically specified or set forth in the legislation.

Let's make it clear. The government cannot keep or use the shared information to see if you failed to pay your taxes. The government cannot use this information to read your emails. The government cannot use this information to track your credit card purchases or look at the Web sites that you've been visiting. Under our amendment, the Federal Government cannot use retained information unless it was directly related to a cyber or national security threat.

Finally, this bipartisan amendment requires—requires—the Federal Government to notify any private sector entity that shares information with the government if that information is not, in fact, cyberthreat information so that it doesn't happen again, and the government must delete that information.

The privacy of American citizens is simply too important to dismiss. Our amendment narrows the scope of the bill to ensure personal information is protected and that we are focusing on the true threat—advanced, foreign state-sponsored cyberattacks against America and its private entities.

With that, I would yield such time as he may consume to the chairman.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Madam Chair, I just want to rise in strong support of this amendment. I appreciate Mr. MULVANEY's working with the committee.

This is a limiting amendment, and I think it, again, is in response to making sure that the intent of the bill meets the language of the bill, and this is well done to continue to protect privacy and civil liberties of all Americans and still allow for the government to share malicious source code with the private sector.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment; although I do not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. I also support this amendment. It is very important. It's another example of what we're attempting to do to protect the privacy and civil liberties of our citizens but yet have a bill that we clearly need to protect them from a national security perspective.

I yield back the balance of my time.  
Mr. MULVANEY. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MULVANEY. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in House Report 112-454.

Mr. FLAKE. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 12, after line 18, insert the following new subparagraph:

“(E) a list of the department or agency receiving such information;

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 631, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. This amendment is straightforward. It would require the inspector general of the intelligence community to include a list of federal agencies and departments receiving information shared with the government in the report already required by the underlying legislation.

This act is an important piece of legislation that will help private entities and utilities protect themselves from catastrophic attacks to their networks by creating the authority for private entities and utilities to voluntarily share information pertaining to cyberattacks with the Federal Government and vice versa.

H.R. 3523 avoids placing costly mandates on private industry and the creation of a new regulatory structure. That’s what I really appreciate about this legislation, as I’m sure everyone does—it’s voluntary.

As with any new intelligence program, however, it’s incumbent on us to make sure robust protections exist to safeguard privacy rights. The inspector general report required under H.R. 3523 will provide a thorough review of the information shared under these new authorities and will address any impacts such sharing has on privacy and civil liberties. Adding the list of the departments and agencies that were recipients of this shared information, as my amendment would do, would add information on which government agencies exactly are receiving shared information. Such information will further mitigate the risk of abuse to privacy rights and increase the effectiveness of the inspector general’s report.

I commend my colleagues from Michigan and Maryland. They’ve been working hard to put together this bipartisan measure, working up until the very last minute to ensure that Members’ concerns are addressed, and I believe that this is an important piece of legislation.

I’d like to yield to the gentleman from Michigan such time as he may consume.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. I want to thank the gentleman from Arizona for working with us. This, again, was a negotiated amendment. The gentleman approached us with concerns to make sure that the IG report adequately reflected and allowed us to perform the adequate oversight. This amendment does that. I appreciate his work and effort, and I think this strengthens the bill and continues to provide the oversight and protection of civil liberties and privacy for all Americans.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any Member seek recognition in opposition?

Mr. FLAKE. I just want to say I support the legislation in the underlying bill, and I would urge support for this amendment as well, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. POMPEO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 11 printed in House Report 112-454.

Mr. POMPEO. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 14, after line 13, insert the following:

“(4) LIMITATION ON FEDERAL GOVERNMENT USE OF CYBERSECURITY SYSTEMS.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to provide additional authority to, or modify an existing authority of, any entity to use a cybersecurity system owned or controlled by the Federal Government on a private-sector system or network to protect such private-sector system or network.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 631, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. POMPEO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. POMPEO. Madam Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to offer a second amendment to this incredibly important piece of legislation that’s been worked on for an awfully long time to balance the security needs of our Nation and the privacy rights of every United States citizen.

Similar to the first amendment I offered, this amendment addresses some of the concerns raised by me, privacy folks, and civil libertarian advocates to make very clear the intentions of this legislation. I talked earlier about the threat we face today. It’s real, it’s foreign, it’s domestic, and these cyberattacks are an enormous risk to our national security and to our economic security.

I now strongly support this legislation. I’ve had a chance to work with Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member RUPPERSBERGER to solidify limitations on this legislation that make it

very clear that this government’s use of this information will be limited.

I think some have claimed incorrectly that the current bill could be read to provide new authority to the Federal Government to install its Einstein system on private sector networks and to monitor traffic and send it back to the government with absolutely no limitations. That’s wrong.

This amendment, however, makes it even more clear. This amendment makes clear that nothing in this bill would alter existing authorities or provide any new authority to any entity to use a Federal Government-owned or -operated cybersecurity system on a private sector system or network to protect such a system or network.

Again, I’m pleased to support the legislation. It doesn’t create any new regulatory regime. It doesn’t create any more Federal bureaucracy. And it has no additional spending. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and final passage of CISPA.

I yield whatever time he may consume to the chairman of the Intelligence Committee.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. This is an important amendment, and again, I think it alleviates some of the concerns. They were misguided, but this locks it down, makes it very tight and makes it very clear on the limiting of this information, which is the intent of this bill. So I think this amendment addresses the privacy and civil liberties advocates’ claims that the liability protection in the bill with respect to the use of cybersecurity systems could be read to be broader than the activities authorized by the legislation.

As I said, that was not true, certainly not the intent. This amendment makes that very clear in the bill that that would not be its purpose, and it is a limiting amendment. I strongly support this amendment. It is a bipartisan amendment as well.

Mr. POMPEO. Madam Chairwoman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. POMPEO).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1620

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. WOODALL

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 12 printed in House Report 112-454.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 14, after line 13 insert the following:

“(4) NO LIABILITY FOR NON-PARTICIPATION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to subject a protected entity, self-protected entity, cyber security provider, or an officer, employee, or agent of a protected entity, self-protected entity, or cybersecurity provider, to liability for choosing not to engage in the voluntary activities authorized under this section.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 631, the gentleman

from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Chair, my amendment is a simple amendment. What we're doing here in this bill today, to the great credit of the chairman and the ranking member, is instituting a voluntary system by which our private companies and utilities can cooperate in the name of securing America's cyberspace. But what happens so often is, when the Federal Government creates a so-called "voluntary" standard, suddenly those folks who choose not to play on that playing field are subject to new liabilities because they rejected that voluntary standard.

Well, if it's going to be a truly voluntary standard, we have to ensure that those who reject it are not held to any new liabilities. I believe that was the intent of the committee as they crafted this legislation, but my amendment makes that clear to say that no new liabilities arise for any company that chooses not to participate in this new truly voluntary cybersecurity cooperative regime.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any Member seek recognition in opposition?

Mr. WOODALL. With that, I want to thank the ranking member and the chairman for their tremendous openness throughout this entire process. Briefing after briefing, phone call after phone call, they both made themselves available to Members on both sides of the aisle so that we could get our questions answered in what is sometimes a difficult area to understand and digest. I thank them both for their leadership, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. GOODLATTE  
The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 13 printed in House Report 112-454.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 14, after line 14 insert the following:

"(1) AVAILABILITY.—The term 'availability' means ensuring timely and reliable access to and use of information.

Page 15, strike lines 1 through 25 and insert the following:

"(2) CONFIDENTIALITY.—The term 'confidentiality' means preserving authorized restrictions on access and disclosure, including means for protecting personal privacy and proprietary information.

"(3) CYBER THREAT INFORMATION.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'cyber threat information' means information directly pertaining to—

"(i) a vulnerability of a system or network of a government or private entity;

"(ii) a threat to the integrity, confidentiality, or availability of a system or network of a government or private entity or any information stored on, processed on, or transiting such a system or network;

"(iii) efforts to degrade, disrupt, or destroy a system or network of a government or private entity; or

"(iv) efforts to gain unauthorized access to a system or network of a government or private entity, including to gain such unauthorized access for the purpose of exfiltrating information stored on, processed on, or transiting a system or network of a government or private entity.

"(B) EXCLUSION.—Such term does not include information pertaining to efforts to gain unauthorized access to a system or network of a government or private entity that solely involve violations of consumer terms of service or consumer licensing agreements and do not otherwise constitute unauthorized access.

"(4) CYBER THREAT INTELLIGENCE.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'cyber threat intelligence' means intelligence in the possession of an element of the intelligence community directly pertaining to—

"(i) a vulnerability of a system or network of a government or private entity;

"(ii) a threat to the integrity, confidentiality, or availability of a system or network of a government or private entity or any information stored on, processed on, or transiting such a system or network;

"(iii) efforts to degrade, disrupt, or destroy a system or network of a government or private entity; or

"(iv) efforts to gain unauthorized access to a system or network of a government or private entity, including to gain such unauthorized access for the purpose of exfiltrating information stored on, processed on, or transiting a system or network of a government or private entity.

"(B) EXCLUSION.—Such term does not include intelligence pertaining to efforts to gain unauthorized access to a system or network of a government or private entity that solely involve violations of consumer terms of service or consumer licensing agreements and do not otherwise constitute unauthorized access.

Page 16, strike line 5 and all that follows through page 17, line 2, and insert the following:

"(5) CYBERSECURITY PURPOSE.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'cybersecurity purpose' means the purpose of ensuring the integrity, confidentiality, or availability of, or safeguarding, a system or network, including protecting a system or network from—

"(i) a vulnerability of a system or network;

"(ii) a threat to the integrity, confidentiality, or availability of a system or network or any information stored on, processed on, or transiting such a system or network;

"(iii) efforts to degrade, disrupt, or destroy a system or network; or

"(iv) efforts to gain unauthorized access to a system or network, including to gain such unauthorized access for the purpose of exfiltrating information stored on, processed on, or transiting a system or network.

"(B) EXCLUSION.—Such term does not include the purpose of protecting a system or network from efforts to gain unauthorized access to such system or network that solely involve violations of consumer terms of service or consumer licensing agreements and do not otherwise constitute unauthorized access.

"(6) CYBERSECURITY SYSTEM.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'cybersecurity system' means a system designed or employed to ensure the integrity, confiden-

tiality, or availability of, or safeguard, a system or network, including protecting a system or network from—

"(i) a vulnerability of a system or network;

"(ii) a threat to the integrity, confidentiality, or availability of a system or network or any information stored on, processed on, or transiting such a system or network;

"(iii) efforts to degrade, disrupt, or destroy a system or network; or

"(iv) efforts to gain unauthorized access to a system or network, including to gain such unauthorized access for the purpose of exfiltrating information stored on, processed on, or transiting a system or network.

"(B) EXCLUSION.—Such term does not include a system designed or employed to protect a system or network from efforts to gain unauthorized access to such system or network that solely involve violations of consumer terms of service or consumer licensing agreements and do not otherwise constitute unauthorized access.

Page 17, after line 2 insert the following:

"(7) INTEGRITY.—The term 'integrity' means guarding against improper information modification or destruction, including ensuring information nonrepudiation and authenticity.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 631, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Chair, I rise to offer an amendment to H.R. 3523. This amendment is the result of a series of long discussions between Members of the bipartisan coalition supporting this bill and various privacy and civil liberties groups.

As many know, I have long worked with these outside groups and with industry to make sure that where Congress acts with respect to technology, it does so in a way that is thoughtful, intelligent, and shows a strong respect for privacy and civil liberties.

I am a firm believer that Congress can craft legislation that addresses technology issues and allows the private sector to flourish while also protecting the rights of Americans. This amendment seeks to move the legislation further down that path.

To do so, this amendment carefully narrows the definitions of the key terms in the bill—"cyberthreat information," "cyberthreat intelligence," "cybersecurity purposes," and "cybersecurity systems"—and adds in three new definitions from the existing law. Together, these new definitions ensure that companies in the private sector can protect themselves against very real cyberthreats. At the same time, they limit what information the private sector can identify, obtain, and share with others, and they do so in a way that is technology neutral so that the definitions we write into law today do not become obsolete before the ink is dry.

Specifically, these new definitions remove language from prior versions of the bill that could have been interpreted in broad ways. They remove or modify definitions that could have

been thought to cover things that the bill did not intend to cover, like unauthorized access to a system or network that purely involves violations of a terms of service. These revised definitions also rely in part on existing law to cover the appropriate set of threats to networks and systems without being overly broad.

I would note that these definitional changes are important on their own for the narrowing function they serve. In the view of groups like the Center for Democracy and Technology and the Constitution Project, this amendment represents "important privacy improvement." Specifically, the change to the definitions addresses a number of key issues raised by a variety of groups, and many in the Internet user community. As such, these amendments move an already important bill in an even better direction.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, but I do not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE of Texas. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Anytime the government gets involved in data sharing and data storage, there is going to be the possibility for abuse.

I hear from my constituents in Texas and U.S. companies that they continue to lose information to cyberattacks from abroad. Most of these attacks come from none other than the organized crime syndicate of China, as I call it. They steal our intellectual property, and then they use the stolen information to compete against the United States.

We need a commonsense information-sharing system to combat the growing threat to this way of life that we have in America. However, we have to do it in such a way that protects our privacy and constitutional rights of citizens.

While I believe the intent of the base bill was never to allow the government to use information it obtained for any other purposes than cybersecurity, I believe that the clear and simple language in Mr. GOODLATTE's amendment is necessary to make it 100 percent clear that this is strictly prohibited.

As we remember from the 2012 NDAA debate, it's important, especially when dealing with legislation that affects civil liberties and constitutional rights, Congress needs to be perfectly 100 percent clear. I believe the Goodlatte amendment does this. I urge all Members to support it.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Chairman, at this time, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the chairman of the Intelligence Committee, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. I want to thank the distinguished former chairman and member, Mr. GOODLATTE, for his commonsense amendment. Again, this is working to make sure that this bill is restricted for both information use, privacy, and civil liberties, and why the coalition, I argue, continues to grow because of the good work of folks like Mr. GOODLATTE. It's bipartisan in nature, and I would strongly urge the body's support for the Goodlatte amendment.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Chairman, I am not aware of any other speakers on this amendment, so I would urge my colleagues to support the amendment. It is, as the chairman indicated, the ranking member indicated, bipartisan legislation that will improve the underlying bill in significant ways and protect the civil liberties of American citizens in a more clear fashion.

I thank all of those in the Chamber and outside who contributed ideas to help us craft this amendment and urge all of my colleagues to support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia will be postponed.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Madam Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOODALL) having assumed the chair, Mrs. CAPITO, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3523) to provide for the sharing of certain cyber threat intelligence and cyber threat information between the intelligence community and cybersecurity entities, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during further consideration of H.R. 3523, pursuant to House Resolution 631, amendments No. 10 and No. 5 in House Report 112-454 may be considered out of sequence.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 631 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 3523.

Will the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) kindly resume the chair.

□ 1630

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3523) to provide for the sharing of certain cyber threat intelligence and cyber threat information between the intelligence community and cybersecurity entities, and for other purposes, with Mrs. CAPITO (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 13 printed in House Report 112-454 by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) had been postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MR. TURNER OF OHIO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 14 printed in House Report 112-454.

Mr. TURNER of Ohio. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 15, line 7, insert "deny access to or" before "degrade".

Page 15, line 20, insert "deny access to or" before "degrade".

Page 16, line 10, insert "deny access to or" before "degrade".

Page 16, line 21, insert "deny access to or" before "degrade".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 631, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. TURNER of Ohio. Madam Chairman, this amendment would make a technical correction to the definition sections of this bill to ensure that U.S. cybersecurity policies remain consistent for protections against threats to our government and private sector networks.

This amendment will maintain consistency among this bill and other cybersecurity policies. The terms "deny, degrade, disrupt or destroy" are found throughout our national cybersecurity strategy and our guidance documents. The term "deny" was inadvertently omitted from H.R. 3523. Inserting "deny" makes the bill consistent with other national documents in the discussion of cybersecurity.

The increase in cybersecurity incidents led to the development of centers like the Air Force's Cyberspace Technical Center of Excellence at Wright Patterson Air Force base in my district in Dayton, Ohio. To combat this growing trend in the sophistication of cyberattacks, the Center of Technical Excellence has been turned to that focus.

The need to protect U.S. networks from denial-of-service attacks was made clear when, for 3 weeks in 2007, Estonia was the target of a large-scale

series of denial-of-service attacks against government Web sites, banks, universities, and Estonian newspapers.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment and the underlying bill.

I yield 30 seconds to the chairman.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Madam Chair, I want to, again, thank Mr. TURNER for this important clarification amendment and working with us to improve the status of the bill to make sure that we are able to protect America's networks and increases the ability for us to protect privacy and civil liberties.

I appreciate the gentleman's good effort, and I would encourage the House to support the Turner amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any Member seek recognition in opposition?

Mr. TURNER of Ohio. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MR. MULVANEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 15 printed in House Report 112-454.

Mr. MULVANEY. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. 3. SUNSET.

Effective on the date that is five years after the date of the enactment of this Act—

(1) section 1104 of the National Security Act of 1947, as added by section 2(a) of this Act, is repealed; and

(2) the table of contents in the first section of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended by section 2(d) of this Act, is amended by striking the item relating to section 1104, as added by such section 2(d).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 631, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. MULVANEY. This amendment, ladies and gentlemen, is fairly simple and straightforward, but it bears discussion for a few moments. It requires the bill to expire of its own terms within 5 years. It's what we call in this business a sunset clause. And by its own terms, if the bill is passed, it will automatically cease to be, cease to be enforceable after 5 years unless this body acts affirmatively to renew it.

Generally, I think this is good policy with most things that we do in Washington, D.C. In fact, several people say that one of the biggest difficulties we have in this town is that we simply create laws all the time and they never go away. So generally speaking, I think sunset clauses are to be admired and to be encouraged.

Even more so is the case, however, when we deal with situations where we

have concerns regarding individual liberties. We've worked very, very hard to make this bill a good bill. It is an excellent bill. I'm proud to be a cosponsor of this bill.

But every single time that we start moving into the realm where the government action starts to bump up against individual liberties, it's a good idea to take a pause after this certain amount of time, in this case 5 years, and look our hands over, look over the actual implementation of the bill and make sure that we did exactly what we thought that we were going to do.

Finally, I think in a case when we're dealing with technology, which moves so very rapidly—in fact, we've written this bill as well as we possibly could to try and deal with unanticipated development in technology—but when you're dealing with technology that moves so rapidly and changes so quickly, I think it's important, after a certain period of time, again, here, 5 years, to step back, look our hands over and make sure that things worked exactly as we thought they would.

So, for that reason, Madam Chairman, I ask that this amendment be considered and be approved.

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

The Acting CHAIR. Does any Member seek recognition in opposition to the Member's amendment?

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MULVANEY. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON  
LEE OF TEXAS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 112-454.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 9, after line 5, insert the following:

“(c) CYBERSECURITY OPERATIONAL ACTIVITY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In receiving information authorized to be shared with the Federal Government under this section, the Secretary of Homeland Security is authorized, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to acquire, intercept, retain, use, and disclose communications and other system traffic that are transiting to or from or stored on Federal systems and to deploy countermeasures with regard to such communications and system traffic for cybersecurity purposes provided that the Secretary certifies that—

“(A) such acquisitions, interceptions, and countermeasures are reasonable necessary for the purpose of protection Federal systems from cybersecurity threats;

“(B) the content of communications will be collected and retained only when the communication is associated with known or reasonably suspected cybersecurity threat, and communications and system traffic will not be subject to the operation of a countermeasure unless associated with such threats;

“(C) information obtained pursuant to activities authorized under this subsection will only be retained, used or disclosed to protect Federal systems from cybersecurity threats, mitigate against such threats, or, with the approval of the Attorney General, for law enforcement purposes when the information is evidence of a crime which has been, is being, or is about to be committed; and

“(D) notice has been provided to users of Federal systems concerning the potential for acquisition, interception, retention, use, and disclosure of communications and other system traffic.

“(2) CONTRACTS.—The Secretary may enter into contracts or other agreements, or otherwise request and obtain the assistance of, private entities that provide electronic communication or cybersecurity services to acquire, intercept, retain, use, and disclose communications and other system traffic consistent with paragraph (1).

“(3) PRIVILEGED COMMUNICATIONS.—No otherwise privileged communication obtained in accordance with, or in violation of, this section shall lose its privileged character.

“(4) POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall establish policies and procedures that—

“(A) minimize the impact on privacy and civil liberties, consistent with the need to protect Federal systems and critical information infrastructure from cybersecurity threats and mitigate cybersecurity threats;

“(B) reasonably limit the acquisition, interception, retention, use, and disclosure of communications, records, system traffic, or other information associated with specific persons consistent with the need to carry out the responsibilities of this section, including establishing a process for the timely destruction on recognition of communications, records, system traffic, or other information that is acquired or intercepted pursuant to this section that does not reasonably appear to be related to protecting Federal systems and critical information infrastructure from cybersecurity threats and mitigating cybersecurity threats;

“(C) include requirements to safeguard communications, records, system traffic, or other information that can be used to identify specific persons from unauthorized access or acquisition; and

“(D) protect the confidentiality of disclosed communications, records, system traffic, or other information associated with specific persons to the greatest extent practicable and require recipients of such information to be informed that the communications, records, system traffic, or other information disclosed may only be used for protecting information systems against cybersecurity threats, mitigating against cybersecurity threats, or law enforcement purposes when the information is evidence of a crime that has been, is being, or is about to be committed, as specified by the Secretary.

Page 14, after line 24, insert the following:

“(2) COUNTERMEASURE.—The term ‘countermeasure’ means an automated action with defensive intent to modify or block data packets associated with electronic or wire communications, internet traffic, program code, or other system traffic transiting to or from or stored on an information system to counteract a cybersecurity threat.”

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 631, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and a

Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Chair, let me thank you for your courtesy. Let me thank the chairperson for his courtesy and the ranking member for his courtesy. I was very appreciative, with the overlapping committee work, for the courtesy of the floor. I thank you very much.

Let me hold up the Constitution and say that I believe in the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, particularly, that protects us against unreasonable search and seizure. And I also recognize the bipartisan effort of this particular legislation and recognize that we may have disagreement.

My amendment ensures that comprehensive policies and procedures are implemented by the Department of Homeland Security to protect Federal systems from cybersecurity threats and minimize the impact on privacy. What it does not do is allow Homeland Security and the Justice Department to spy on Americans.

Let me be very clear. It does not allow the infrastructure of Homeland Security and the Justice Department to spy on Americans. I would not adhere to that.

It is a shame that oversight of our Nation's critical infrastructure, however, was not included in this bill. The hard work that has been done by the Committee on Homeland Security, Mr. LUNGREN and Ms. CLARKE, joined with other Members, was worthy of consideration.

I understand the strictures that we're dealing with. My amendment is designed to put in place comprehensive privacy protections in order to prevent any gross infringement of an individual's civil liberties or privacy rights. It allows the Department of Homeland Security to protect Federal systems that enable air traffic controllers to operate.

Madam Chairperson, we know the climate that we live in. God has blessed us, if I might even say that, but more importantly, the hard work of men and women who happen to be Federal employees, that no action has occurred on our soil since 9/11.

This amendment would allow the Department of Homeland Security to protect Federal systems that enable air traffic controllers to operate, that enable Congress to operate, that enable all Federal agencies to operate.

My amendment is intentionally narrowly tailored to go after known or reasonable threats to our Federal systems. Let me be very clear. This is not a reflection on this legislation from the extent of hard work.

□ 1640

I am just saying that, coming from my perspective, I would hope that we would look at infrastructure.

I am not advocating for the bill. I am advocating for an open discussion on

this issue that certain elements have to be resolved in dealing with the cyberthreats that we face. I've long been an advocate for protecting the right to privacy and the civil liberties of all Americans—that is very much a part of this amendment—but I am also mindful of the importance of the infrastructure.

As we assess cybersecurity measures and take steps to implement legislation, I believe we must be sure to strike the proper balance between effective and strong security for our digital networks and protecting the privacy of individuals as well as infrastructure that involves transportation. I am ever mindful that we must be careful not to go about strengthening cybersecurity at the expense of infringing on people's privacy rights and civil liberties, which is why my amendment is narrowly tailored and sets clear restrictions on the scope of communications addressed and why and how that information can be used.

Our Nation's critical infrastructures are composed of public and private institutions in the sectors of agriculture, food, water, public health, emergency services, government, defense industrial base, information and telecommunications, energy, transportation, banking and finance, chemicals and hazardous materials.

I ask my colleagues to support the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. I yield myself 1½ minutes.

If you thought it was good for the businesses to require Facebook to give them your passwords, you'll love this. If not, you should go apopleptic. I think that's an awful practice on Facebook. This is worse. I want to read just from the law. Notwithstanding any other provision, it allows them to:

acquire, intercept, retain, use, and disclose communications and other system traffic that are transiting to and from or are stored on the Federal systems and to deploy countermeasures with regard to such communications and system traffic for cybersecurity purposes.

This is dangerous. It's dangerous. For the very narrow bill that has been misrepresented from what we do, this is Big Brother on steroids. We cannot allow this to happen. This would be the government tracking communications or your medical records from the veterans' association. It would track your IRS forms coming in and out of the Federal Government. This is exactly what scares people about trying to get into the business of making sure we protect our networks, but we can't do it by trampling on privacy and civil liberties.

This is awful. I am just shocked, after all of this debate and all of this discussion on our very narrow bill, that my friends would come up with some-

thing that wholesale monitors the Internet and gets all of the information which we've fought so hard to protect on behalf of average Americans.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND).

Mr. WESTMORELAND. I want to thank the chairman for yielding.

Let me say this to my colleague from Texas: that we have had a number of amendments here today that have tried to streamline this bill in order to make it even narrower and to take out any perception that it would be personal information and limit what government can do and be very explicit in the terms of what this sharing is, which is voluntary, which is narrowly drawn.

The chairman and the ranking member have done a wonderful job of working with other Members to allow these amendments to make this bill better. I am very disappointed. This amendment basically guts the bill—it expands it—when everybody who has been down here so far has been trying to narrow it. This just expands it even more. This is the type of amendment that people fear in that we would give Homeland Security the ability to intercept and keep the transmissions. That is totally out of hand.

I just hope that we will vote against this amendment and support the underlying bill.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. What an exaggeration. I know that they have been propelled by all of the media that has given them great support.

They know that the underlying bill, in fact, is considered an invasion of privacy; but if you look at my amendment, it is only when the communication is associated with a known or a reasonably suspected cybersecurity threat. It is narrow, but more importantly, it has a privacy provision. I believe in privacy. Let me just say that I was not going to be denied the right to come to the floor to be able to frame what we should be doing—looking at infrastructure and the complement of making sure that privacy is protected.

This particular book, even with the amendments they have, will probably not draw this to the point of acceptance. So I would argue that this is a productive debate but that the amendment that Jackson Lee has submitted does not, in fact, at all violate privacy. I would say to them that I look forward to being able to address this question as we go forward.

I am going to ask, at this time, unanimous consent to withdraw this amendment for the misinterpretation that my friends on the other side of the aisle have predicted or thought that they were going to put on this particular amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MS. RICHARDSON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in House Report 112-454.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Madam Chairwoman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 14, after line 6, insert the following new subparagraph:

“(C) prohibit a department or agency of the Federal Government from providing cyber threat information to owners and operators of critical infrastructure;

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 631, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. RICHARDSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. RICHARDSON. I stand today in support of the Richardson amendment to H.R. 3523; but I would like to take a moment to thank the majority leader, Mr. CANTOR, Chairman ROGERS, and Ranking Member RUPPERSBERGER for their tolerance in allowing us to come to the floor. I was ranking member of a committee that was in operation at this time, and I thank you for allowing us to come forward.

The Richardson amendment ensures that owners and operators of critical infrastructure systems that are potential targets to cyberattacks receive information about cyberthreats. Some examples of our critical infrastructure systems that this amendment would apply to are: energy facilities, banking and finance facilities, chemical facilities, dams, nuclear plants, emergency services, agriculture and food systems, water treatment systems. Many of these would be in great danger and would need information.

Every single Member of Congress has critical infrastructure sectors in their districts, whether they be public or private, and every community in this Nation has some critical infrastructure presence that should be protected and advised of threats. In my district, I have the Home Depot Athletic Center, which holds up to 27,000 people. There is the Boeing Company, which manufactures the C-17 planes. There is the Long Beach Police and Fire Department EOC center, the Long Beach Gas and Oil Department, and water treatment facilities. The numbers go on. We need to make sure that not only ports and government facilities but also private facilities are approved and entitled to have this same information.

Some inherent complications are that there are 18 different Federal Government agencies that have jurisdiction over critical infrastructure sectors. For example, the Department of Homeland Security has jurisdiction over chemical, commercial facilities, dams, emergency services, and nuclear power alone.

H.R. 3523, as currently drafted, does not mention how critical infrastructure sectors that do not fall within the jurisdiction of government intelligence agencies would receive critical

cyberthreat information or have the systems in place to share information appropriately. This amendment makes an important improvement to that legislation.

I would like to commend Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member RUPPERSBERGER, who mentioned in their testimony before the Rules Committee and the Intelligence Committee that there was a key fault here in this critical infrastructure section. I am further pleased that the Rules Committee acknowledged that by finding this amendment in order, and I urge my colleagues to consider this seriously.

While Chairman LUNGREN's original cyber bill did not make it to the House floor, I offer this Richardson amendment in the same bipartisan spirit that I did when his bill was brought forward in our subcommittee. Mr. LUNGREN and Mr. LANGEVIN spoke earlier on the bipartisan amendment regarding critical infrastructure, hence my building my comments on that.

Richardson amendment No. 10 ensures that our critical infrastructure sectors will not be left out from receiving information that could protect their systems against a terrorist attack.

□ 1650

This amendment makes sure that industries most at risk of a cyberattack receive information that they need to protect the public and the facilities at large. My amendment makes explicit that critical infrastructure sectors be included in information-sharing relationships and does not include any new Federal authorities.

With that, Madam Chairwoman, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. ROGERS from Michigan. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. I appreciate the gentlelady's effort. Again, we were pretty careful in this year-long process of trying to find a very narrow solution because of all of the challenges that come with trying to get a piece of legislation across the House to the Senate to the President's desk.

I argue that the Homeland Security Committee should engage in a critical infrastructure debate. Here's the problem: it's not defined for the purposes of this bill. So we don't know what that means. We've been very careful to separate the government from the private sector. There is no government involvement in the private sector networks. It is just information, malicious source code-sharing. That's it.

This, we're not sure where it goes. Many in industry believe that they're talking about the backbone of the Internet. Are they talking about the backbone of the Internet? We don't know. It's not well defined. That would mean, then, that the government for the first time gets into the backbone of

the Internet. I think that's a horrible, terrible idea.

So I don't think that's what the gentlelady intends, but the problem is that's not what the language says.

I look forward to working with the gentlelady as she works through those issues on Homeland Security because these are hard. They are tricky. Sometimes a word will get you in trouble, as we have found along the path here, and as it should. We should be really careful about how we're doing this.

So I would encourage the gentlelady to work with us. I know Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, since we've been through this, we can provide some help along the way, and we look forward to the product that you all work on that is geared toward the infrastructure piece. Again, this was never intended to solve all the problems. It was intended to be a very narrow first step to say, Hey, if your house is being robbed, we want to tell you before the robber gets there. That's all this bill does. It tells if your computer is going to get hacked and your personal information stolen, we want you to have the malicious code so you can protect yourself. That's all this bill does.

So we get a little nervous when it starts crossing that divide that we've established between the government and the private sector. You start crossing that divide, we think you can get into some serious trouble in a hurry without very clearly defined language and definition.

Unfortunately, I have to oppose the amendment, but I look forward to working with the gentlelady on a very important issue, infrastructure protection, as the Homeland Security does its work.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. As we said before, our bill is extremely limited, and we're attempting again to allow our government, our intelligence community, to give the information that's necessary to protect our citizens from these cyberattacks.

Ours is the most active bill that is out there now. Our bill, hopefully, will pass and go to the Senate, and there will be a lot more negotiation. But there is a lot of work to do in other areas, too, such as Homeland Security; and I know there are other issues involved in the Homeland Security markup, I know that there are issues involving Judiciary.

I can say this: I know that the chairman and I for 1 year now have worked very openly with every group that we think would be involved in this bill. Because of different positions taken, including HLU, we listened. This bill is better, and we hope that it passes.

So we clearly will work with you, but we on the Intelligence Committee are very limited to our jurisdiction, and that's why a lot of these issues we can't deal with other than what is in our bill right now.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.  
 Ms. RICHARDSON. Again, I'd like to thank both the chairman and the ranking member and look forward to the opportunity to work with you.  
 I would just give you one analogy to consider as we move forward. As you recall on 9/11 when the planes hit those two Twin Towers, the government had the ability to notify the private airlines to scramble the planes and to demand that all of the planes would be landed because we didn't know where they were going to go.

At that point, the government had the ability to work with the private sector, with the airline industry, to communicate information that they were now becoming aware of.

I'm certainly not suggesting that we interfere with the free-flowing ideas of the Internet. What this amendment is suggesting, and I look forward to working with you in the future, is that the government does have the ability if in the event something happens with dropping some chemicals into water, for example, treatment facilities, that the government should certainly have the ability to work with those private sector companies to be able to notify them and ensure that the public is protected.

I thank you for hearing the amendment, and I look forward to working with you going forward.

I yield back the balance of my time.  
 Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. I thank the gentlelady, and I look forward to that opportunity.

I yield back the balance of my time.  
 The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. RICHARDSON).

The amendment was rejected.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understands that amendment No. 16 will not be offered.

Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 112-454 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

- Amendment No. 1 by Mr. LANGEVIN of Rhode Island.
- Amendment No. 4 by Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.
- Amendment No. 6 by Mr. QUAYLE of Arizona.
- Amendment No. 7 by Mr. AMASH of Michigan.
- Amendment No. 8 by Mr. MULVANEY of South Carolina.
- Amendment No. 13 by Mr. GOODLATTE of Virginia.
- Amendment No. 15 by Mr. MULVANEY of South Carolina.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. LANGEVIN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) on which further pro-

ceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 167, noes 243, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 184]

AYES—167

- |               |                    |                   |
|---------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| Ackerman      | Gibson             | Neal              |
| Andrews       | Gonzalez           | Olver             |
| Baldwin       | Green, Al          | Owens             |
| Bass (CA)     | Grijalva           | Pallone           |
| Becerra       | Grimm              | Pascarell         |
| Berkley       | Gutierrez          | Pastor (AZ)       |
| Berman        | Hahn               | Pelosi            |
| Bishop (GA)   | Hanabusa           | Perlmutter        |
| Bishop (NY)   | Hastings (FL)      | Peters            |
| Bonamici      | Heinrich           | Pingree (ME)      |
| Boren         | Higgins            | Polis             |
| Boswell       | Himes              | Price (NC)        |
| Brady (TX)    | Hinchev            | Quigley           |
| Brale (IA)    | Hochul             | Reyes             |
| Brown (FL)    | Holt               | Richardson        |
| Butterfield   | Honda              | Richmond          |
| Capps         | Hoyer              | Rothman (NJ)      |
| Capuano       | Israel             | Roybal-Allard     |
| Carnahan      | Jackson (IL)       | Ruppersberger     |
| Carney        | Jackson Lee        | Rush              |
| Carson (IN)   | (TX)               | Ryan (OH)         |
| Castor (FL)   | Johnson, E. B.     | Sanchez, Linda T. |
| Chandler      | Kaptur             | Sanchez, Loretta  |
| Chu           | Keating            | Sarbanes          |
| Cicilline     | Kildee             | Schakowsky        |
| Clarke (MI)   | Kind               | Schiff            |
| Clay          | King (NY)          | Schwartz          |
| Cleaver       | Kissell            | Scott (VA)        |
| Clyburn       | Kucinich           | Serrano           |
| Coffman (CO)  | Langevin           | Sewell            |
| Cohen         | Larsen (WA)        | Shuler            |
| Connolly (VA) | Larson (CT)        | Smith (WA)        |
| Conyers       | Lee (CA)           | Speier            |
| Cooper        | Levin              | Stark             |
| Costa         | Lewis (GA)         | Sutton            |
| Critz         | Lipinski           | Thompson (CA)     |
| Cuellar       | Loebsack           | Thompson (MS)     |
| Cummings      | Lofgren, Zoe       | Thornberry        |
| Davis (CA)    | Lowe               | Tierney           |
| Davis (IL)    | Lujan              | Tonko             |
| DeFazio       | Lungren, Daniel E. | Towns             |
| DeGette       | Lynch              | Tsongas           |
| DeLauro       | Markey             | Turner (NY)       |
| Dent          | Matsui             | Van Hollen        |
| Deutch        | McCollum           | Velázquez         |
| Dicks         | McDermott          | Viscosky          |
| Dingell       | McGovern           | Walz (MN)         |
| Doggett       | McIntyre           | Wasserman         |
| Doyle         | Meehan             | Schultz           |
| Edwards       | Meeks              | Waters            |
| Ellison       | Michaud            | Watt              |
| Engel         | Miller (NC)        | Waxman            |
| Farr          | Miller, George     | Wilson (FL)       |
| Fattah        | Moore              | Woodall           |
| Frank (MA)    | Moran              | Woolsey           |
| Fudge         | Nadler             | Yarmuth           |
| Garamendi     |                    |                   |

NOES—243

- |             |             |               |
|-------------|-------------|---------------|
| Adams       | Bilirakis   | Chabot        |
| Aderholt    | Bishop (UT) | Chaffetz      |
| Akin        | Black       | Coble         |
| Alexander   | Blackburn   | Cole          |
| Altmire     | Bonner      | Conaway       |
| Amash       | Bono Mack   | Costello      |
| Amodei      | Boustany    | Courtney      |
| Austria     | Brady (PA)  | Cravaack      |
| Baca        | Brooks      | Crawford      |
| Bachmann    | Broun (GA)  | Crenshaw      |
| Bachus      | Buchanan    | Crowley       |
| Barletta    | Buerkle     | Culberson     |
| Barrow      | Burgess     | Denham        |
| Bartlett    | Burton (IN) | DesJarlais    |
| Barton (TX) | Calvert     | Diaz-Balart   |
| Bass (NH)   | Camp        | Dold          |
| Benishkek   | Campbell    | Donnelly (IN) |
| Berg        | Capito      | Dreier        |
| Biggart     | Carter      | Duffy         |
| Bilbray     | Cassidy     | Duncan (SC)   |

- |                 |               |               |
|-----------------|---------------|---------------|
| Duncan (TN)     | Kline         | Rivera        |
| Ellmers         | Labrador      | Roby          |
| Emerson         | Lamborn       | Roe (TN)      |
| Eshoo           | Lance         | Rogers (AL)   |
| Farenthold      | Landry        | Rogers (KY)   |
| Fincher         | Lankford      | Rogers (MI)   |
| Fitzpatrick     | Latham        | Rohrabacher   |
| Flake           | LaTourette    | Rokita        |
| Fleischmann     | Latta         | Rooney        |
| Fleming         | Lewis (CA)    | Ros-Lehtinen  |
| Flores          | LoBiondo      | Roskam        |
| Forbes          | Long          | Ross (AR)     |
| Fortenberry     | Lucas         | Ross (FL)     |
| Fox             | Luetkemeyer   | Royce         |
| Franks (AZ)     | Lummis        | Ryunan        |
| Frelinghuysen   | Mack          | Ryan (WI)     |
| Gallegly        | Manzullo      | Scalise       |
| Gardner         | Marchant      | Schilling     |
| Garrett         | Matheson      | Schmidt       |
| Gerlach         | McCarthy (CA) | Schock        |
| Gibbs           | McCarthy (NY) | Schrader      |
| Gingrey (GA)    | McCaul        | Schweikert    |
| Gohmert         | McClintock    | Scott (SC)    |
| Goodlatte       | McCotter      | Scott, Austin |
| Gosar           | McKeon        | Sensenbrenner |
| Gowdy           | McKinley      | Sessions      |
| Granger         | McMorris      | Sherman       |
| Graves (GA)     | Rodgers       | Shimkus       |
| Graves (MO)     | McNerney      | Shuster       |
| Green, Gene     | Mica          | Simpson       |
| Griffin (AR)    | Miller (FL)   | Smith (NE)    |
| Griffith (VA)   | Miller (MI)   | Smith (NJ)    |
| Guinta          | Miller, Gary  | Smith (TX)    |
| Guthrie         | Mulvaney      | Southerland   |
| Hall            | Murphy (PA)   | Stearns       |
| Hanna           | Myrick        | Stivers       |
| Harper          | Napolitano    | Stutzman      |
| Harris          | Neugebauer    | Sullivan      |
| Hartzler        | Noem          | Terry         |
| Hastings (WA)   | Nugent        | Thompson (PA) |
| Hayworth        | Nunes         | Tiberi        |
| Heck            | Nunnelee      | Tipton        |
| Hensarling      | Olson         | Turner (OH)   |
| Herger          | Palazzo       | Upton         |
| Herrera Beutler | Paulsen       | Pearce        |
| Hinojosa        | Pearce        | Peterson      |
| Huelskamp       | Peterson      | Walberg       |
| Huizenga (MI)   | Pitts         | Walden        |
| Hultgren        | Platts        | Petri         |
| Hunter          | Poe (TX)      | Walsh (IL)    |
| Hurt            | Pompeo        | Webster       |
| Issa            | Posey         | Welch         |
| Jenkins         | Price (GA)    | West          |
| Johnson (IL)    | Quayle        | Westmoreland  |
| Johnson (OH)    | Rahall        | Whitfield     |
| Johnson, Sam    | Reed          | Wilson (SC)   |
| Jones           | Rehberg       | Wittman       |
| Jordan          | Reichert      | Wolf          |
| Kelly           | Renacci       | Womack        |
| King (IA)       | Ribble        | Yoder         |
| Kingston        | Rigell        | Young (AK)    |
| Kinzinger (IL)  |               | Young (FL)    |
|                 |               | Young (IN)    |

NOT VOTING—21

- |             |              |              |
|-------------|--------------|--------------|
| Blumenauer  | Filner       | Murphy (CT)  |
| Bucshon     | Hirono       | Paul         |
| Canseco     | Holden       | Pence        |
| Cantor      | Johnson (GA) | Rangel       |
| Cardoza     | Maloney      | Scott, David |
| Clarke (NY) | Marino       | Sires        |
| Davis (KY)  | McHenry      | Slaughter    |

□ 1723

Messrs. ALEXANDER, COSTELLO, DUNCAN of South Carolina, REHBERG, COURTNEY and PEARCE changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. BRADY of Texas, Ms. SEWELL, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. WATERS, Ms. MCCOLLUM and Ms. PINGREE of Maine changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 184, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF MICHIGAN

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. CHAFFETZ). The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ROGERS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 412, noes 0, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 185]

AYES—412

Ackerman  
Adams  
Aderholt  
Akin  
Alexander  
Altmire  
Amash  
Amodei  
Andrews  
Austria  
Baca  
Bachmann  
Bachus  
Baldwin  
Barletta  
Barrow  
Bartlett  
Barton (TX)  
Bass (CA)  
Bass (NH)  
Becerra  
Benishek  
Berg  
Berkley  
Berman  
Biggart  
Bilbray  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Bonamici  
Bonner  
Bono Mack  
Boren  
Boswell  
Boustany  
Brady (PA)  
Brady (TX)  
Braley (IA)  
Brooks  
Broun (GA)  
Broun (FL)  
Buchanan  
Buerkle  
Burgess  
Burton (IN)  
Butterfield  
Calvert  
Camp  
Campbell  
Cantor  
Capito  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cardoza  
Carnahan  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Carter  
Cassidy  
Castor (FL)  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Chandler  
Chu

Ciilline  
Clarke (MI)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Coble  
Coffman (CO)  
Cohen  
Cole  
Conaway  
Connolly (VA)  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costa  
Costello  
Courtney  
Cravaack  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Critz  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (IL)  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
DeLauro  
Dent  
DesJarlais  
Deutch  
Diaz-Balart  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Dold  
Donnelly (IN)  
Doyle  
Dreier  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Ellmers  
Emerson  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Farenthold  
Farr  
Fattah  
Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Flake  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Foxy  
Frank (MA)  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Fudge  
Gallegly  
Garamendi

Gardner  
Garrett  
Gerlach  
Gibbs  
Gibson  
Gingrey (GA)  
Gohmert  
Gonzalez  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (MO)  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Griffin (AR)  
Griffith (VA)  
Grijalva  
Grimm  
Guinta  
Guthrie  
Gutierrez  
Hahn  
Hall  
Hanabusa  
Hanna  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hastings (FL)  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayworth  
Heck  
Heinrich  
Hensarling  
Hinojosa  
Hochul  
Holt  
Honda  
Hoyer  
Huelskamp  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurt  
Israel  
Issa  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson Lee  
Flake (TX)  
Jenkins  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Jordan  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kelly  
Kildee  
Kind

King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kissell  
Kline  
Kucinich  
Labrador  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Langevin  
Lankford  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Latta  
Lee (CA)  
Levin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (GA)  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loeback  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Long  
Lowey  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lujan  
Lummis  
Lungren, Daniel  
E.  
Lynch  
Mack  
Mancuso  
Marchant  
Markey  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McCollum  
McCotter  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McNerney  
Meehan  
Meeks  
Mica  
Michaud  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, Gary  
Miller, George  
Moore  
Moran  
Mulvaney  
Murphy (CT)  
Murphy (PA)  
Myrick  
Nadler  
Napolitano

Blumenauer  
Bucshon  
Canseco  
Clarke (NY)  
Davis (KY)  
Finler  
Hirono

Neal  
Neugebauer  
Noem  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Nunnelee  
Olson  
Oliver  
Owens  
Palazzo  
Pallone  
Pascrell  
Pastor (AZ)  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Peterson  
Petri  
Pingree (ME)  
Pitts  
Platts  
Poe (TX)  
Polis  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price (GA)  
Price (NC)  
Quayle  
Quigley  
Rahall  
Reed  
Rehberg  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Reyes  
Ribble  
Richardson  
Richmond  
Rigell  
Rivera  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross (AR)  
Ross (FL)  
Rothman (NJ)  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Runyan  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Ryan (WI)  
Sánchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Scalise  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schilling  
Schmidt

Holden  
Johnson (GA)  
Landry  
Maloney  
Marino  
McHenry  
Paul

NOT VOTING—19

□ 1727

Mr. CUMMINGS changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:  
Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 185, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. QUAYLE  
The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the

gentleman from Arizona (Mr. QUAYLE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 410, noes 3, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 186]

AYES—410

Ackerman  
Adams  
Aderholt  
Akin  
Alexander  
Altmire  
Amash  
Amodei  
Andrews  
Austria  
Baca  
Bachmann  
Bachus  
Baldwin  
Barletta  
Barrow  
Bartlett  
Barton (TX)  
Bass (CA)  
Bass (NH)  
Becerra  
Benishek  
Berg  
Berkley  
Berman  
Biggart  
Bilbray  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Bonamici  
Bonner  
Bono Mack  
Boren  
Boswell  
Boustany  
Brady (PA)  
Brady (TX)  
Braley (IA)  
Brooks  
Broun (GA)  
Broun (FL)  
Buchanan  
Buerkle  
Burgess  
Burton (IN)  
Butterfield  
Calvert  
Camp  
Campbell  
Cantor  
Capito  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cardoza  
Carnahan  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Carter  
Cassidy  
Castor (FL)  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Chandler  
Chu  
Ciilline  
Clarke (MI)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn

Coble  
Coffman (CO)  
Cohen  
Cole  
Conaway  
Connolly (VA)  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costa  
Costello  
Courtney  
Cravaack  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Critz  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (IL)  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
DeLauro  
Denham  
Denham  
Dent  
DesJarlais  
Deutch  
Diaz-Balart  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Dold  
Donnelly (IN)  
Doyle  
Dreier  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Ellmers  
Emerson  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Farenthold  
Farr  
Fattah  
Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Flake  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Foxy  
Frank (MA)  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Fudge  
Gallegly  
Garamendi

Graves (GA)  
Graves (MO)  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Griffin (AR)  
Griffith (VA)  
Grijalva  
Grimm  
Guinta  
Guthrie  
Gutierrez  
Hahn  
Hall  
Hanabusa  
Hanna  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hastings (FL)  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayworth  
Heck  
Heinrich  
Hensarling  
Herger  
Herrera Beutler  
Higgins  
Himes  
Hinche  
Hinojosa  
Hochul  
Holt  
Honda  
Hoyer  
Huelskamp  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurt  
Israel  
Issa  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson Lee  
(TX)  
Jenkins  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Jordan  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kelly  
Kildee  
Kind

Lee (CA) Paulsen Sensenbrenner  
 Levin Pearce Serrano  
 Lewis (CA) Pelosi Sessions  
 Lewis (GA) Perlmutter Sewell  
 Lipinski Peters Sherman  
 LoBiondo Peterson Shimkus  
 Loebsack Petri Shuler  
 Long Pingree (ME) Shuster  
 Lowey Pitts Simpson  
 Lucas Platts Smith (NE)  
 Luetkemeyer Poe (TX) Smith (NJ)  
 Luján Polis Smith (TX)  
 Lummis Pompeo Smith (WA)  
 Lungren, Daniel Posey Southerland  
 E. Price (GA)  
 Lynch Price (NC) Speier  
 Mack Quayle Stark  
 Manzullo Quigley Stearns  
 Marchant Rahall Stivers  
 Markey Reed Stutzman  
 Matheson Rehberg Sutton  
 Matsui Reichert Terry  
 McCarthy (CA) Renacci Thompson (CA)  
 McCarthy (NY) Reyes Thompson (MS)  
 McCaul Ribble Thompson (PA)  
 McCollum Richardson Thornberry  
 McCotter Richmond Tiberi  
 McDermott Rigell Tierney  
 McGovern Rivera Tipton  
 McIntyre Roby Tonko  
 McKeon Roe (TN) Towns  
 McKinley Rogers (AL) Tsongas  
 McMorris Rogers (KY) Turner (NY)  
 Rodgers Rogers (MI) Turner (OH)  
 McNerney Rohrabacher Upton  
 Meehan Rokita Van Hollen  
 Meeks Rooney Velázquez  
 Mica Ros-Lehtinen Visclosky  
 Michaud Roskam Walberg  
 Miller (FL) Ross (AR) Walden  
 Miller (MI) Ross (FL) Walsh (IL)  
 Miller (NC) Rothman (NJ) Walz (MN)  
 Miller, Gary Roybal-Allard Wasserman  
 Miller, George Royce Schultz  
 Moore Runyan Waters  
 Moran Ruppberger Watt  
 Mulvaney Rush Waxman  
 Murphy (CT) Ryan (OH) Webster  
 Murphy (PA) Ryan (WI) Welch  
 Myrick Sánchez, Linda West  
 Nadler T. Westmoreland  
 Napolitano Sanchez, Loretta Whitfield  
 Neal Sarbanes Wilson (FL)  
 Neugebauer Scalise Wilson (SC)  
 Noem Schakowsky Wittman  
 Nugent Schiff Wolf  
 Nunes Schilling Womack  
 Nunnelee Schmidt Woodall  
 Olson Schock Woolsey  
 Olver Schwartz Yarmuth  
 Owens Schweikert Yoder  
 Palazzo Scott (SC) Young (AK)  
 Pallone Scott (VA) Young (FL)  
 Pascrell Scott, Austin Young (IN)  
 Pastor (AZ) Scott, David

NOES—3

Gohmert Lofgren, Zoe McClintock

NOT VOTING—18

Blumenauer Holden Pence  
 Bucshon Johnson (GA) Rangel  
 Canseco Maloney Schrader  
 Davis (KY) Marino Sires  
 Filner McHenry Slaughter  
 Hirono Paul Sullivan

□ 1731

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 186, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY AMASH

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. AMASH) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 415, noes 0, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 187]

AYES—415

Ackerman Connolly (VA) Guthrie  
 Adams Conyers Gutierrez  
 Aderholt Cooper Hahn  
 Akin Costa Hall  
 Alexander Costello Hanabusa  
 Altmire Courtney Hanna  
 Amash Cravaack Harper  
 Amodei Crawford Harris  
 Andrews Crenshaw Hartzler  
 Austria Critz Hastings (FL)  
 Baca Crowley Hastings (WA)  
 Bachmann Cuellar Hayworth  
 Bachus Culberson Heck  
 Baldwin Cummings Heinrich  
 Barletta Davis (CA) Hensarling  
 Barrow Davis (IL) Herger  
 Bartlett DeFazio Herrera Beutler  
 Barton (TX) DeGette Higgins  
 Bass (CA) DeLauro Himes  
 Bass (NH) Denham Hinchey  
 Becerra Dent Hinojosa  
 Benishek DesJarlais Hochul  
 Berg Deutch Holt  
 Berkeley Diaz-Balart Honda  
 Berman Dicks Hoyer  
 Biggert Dingell Huelskamp  
 Bilbray Doggett Huizenga (MI)  
 Bilirakis Dold Hultgren  
 Bishop (GA) Donnelly (IN) Hunter  
 Bishop (NY) Doyle Hurt  
 Bishop (UT) Dreier Israel  
 Black Duffy Issa  
 Blackburn Duncan (SC) Jackson (IL)  
 Bonamici Duncan (TN) Jackson Lee  
 Bonner Edwards (TX)  
 Bono Mack Ellison Jenkins  
 Boren Ellmers Johnson (IL)  
 Boswell Emerson Johnson (OH)  
 Bustany Engel Johnson, E. B.  
 Brady (PA) Eshoo Johnson, Sam  
 Brady (TX) Farenthold Jones  
 Braley (IA) Farr Jordan  
 Brooks Fattah Kaptur  
 Brown (GA) Fincher Keating  
 Brown (FL) Fitzpatrick Kelly  
 Buchanan Flake Kildee  
 Buerkle Fleischmann Kind  
 Burgess Fleming King (IA)  
 Burton (IN) Flores King (NY)  
 Butterfield Forbes Kingston  
 Calvert Portenberry Kinzinger (IL)  
 Camp Fox Kiseel  
 Campbell Frank (MA) Kline  
 Cantor Franks (AZ) Kucinich  
 Capito Frelinghuysen Labrador  
 Capps Fudge Lamborn  
 Capuano Gallegly Lance  
 Cardoza Garamendi Landry  
 Carnahan Gardner Langevin  
 Carney Garrett Lankford  
 Carson (IN) Gerlach Larsen (WA)  
 Carter Gibbs Larson (CT)  
 Cassidy Gibson Latham  
 Castor (FL) Gingrey (GA) LaTourette  
 Chabot Gohmert Latta  
 Chaffetz Gonzalez Lee (CA)  
 Chandler Goodlatte Levin  
 Chu Gosar Lewis (CA)  
 Cicilline Gowdy Lewis (GA)  
 Clarke (MI) Granger Lipinski  
 Clarke (NY) Graves (GA) LoBiondo  
 Clay Graves (MO) Loebsack  
 Cleaver Green, Al Lofgren, Zoe  
 Clyburn Green, Gene Long  
 Coble Griffin (AR) Lowey  
 Coffman (CO) Griffith (VA) Lucas  
 Cohen Grijalva Luetkemeyer  
 Cole Grimm Luján  
 Conaway Guinta Lummis

Lungren, Daniel Pitts Sewell  
 E. Platts Sherman  
 Lynch Poe (TX) Shimkus  
 Mack Polis Shuler  
 Manzullo Pompeo Shuster  
 Marchant Posey Simpson  
 Markey Price (GA) Smith (NE)  
 Matheson Price (NC) Smith (NJ)  
 Matsui Quayle Smith (TX)  
 McCarthy (CA) Quigley Smith (WA)  
 McCarthy (NY) Rahall Southerland  
 McCaul Reed Speier  
 McClintock Rehberg Stark  
 McCollum Reichert Stearns  
 McCotter Renacci Stivers  
 McDermott Reyes Stutzman  
 McGovern Ribble Sullivan  
 McIntyre Richardson Sutton  
 McKeon Richmond Terry  
 McKinley Rigell Thompson (CA)  
 McMorris Rivera Thompson (MS)  
 Rodgers Roby Thompson (PA)  
 McNerney Roe (TN) Thornberry  
 Meehan Rogers (AL) Tiberi  
 Meeks Rogers (KY) Tierney  
 Mica Rogers (MI) Tipton  
 Michaud Rohrabacher Tonko  
 Miller (FL) Rokita Towns  
 Miller (MI) Rooney Tsongas  
 Miller (NC) Ros-Lehtinen Turner (NY)  
 Miller, Gary Roskam Turner (OH)  
 Miller, George Ross (AR) Upton  
 Moore Ross (FL) Van Hollen  
 Moran Rothman (NJ) Velázquez  
 Mulvaney Roybal-Allard Visclosky  
 Murphy (CT) Royce Walberg  
 Murphy (PA) Runyan Walden  
 Myrick Ruppberger Walsh (IL)  
 Nadler Nadler Rush Walz (MN)  
 Napolitano Ryan (OH) Wasserman  
 Neal Ryan (WI) Schultz  
 Neugebauer Sanchez, Linda Waters  
 Noem T. Watt  
 Nugent Sanchez, Loretta Waxman  
 Nunes Sarbanes Webster  
 Nunnelee Scalise Welch  
 Olson Schakowsky West  
 Olver Schiff Westmoreland  
 Owens Schilling Whitfield  
 Palazzo Palazzo Schmidt Wilson (FL)  
 Pallone Pallone Schock Wilson (SC)  
 Pascrell Pascrell Schrader Wittman  
 Pastor (AZ) Pastor (AZ) Schwartz Wolf  
 Pearce Schweikert Womack  
 Pelosi Scott (SC) Woodall  
 Perlmutter Scott (VA) Woolsey  
 Peters Scott, Austin Yarmuth  
 Peterson Scott, David Yoder  
 Petri Sensenbrenner Young (AK)  
 Pingree (ME) Petri Serrano Young (FL)  
 Sessions Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—16

Blumenauer Holden Pence  
 Bucshon Johnson (GA) Rangel  
 Canseco Maloney Sires  
 Davis (KY) Marino Slaughter  
 Filner McHenry  
 Hirono Paul

□ 1736

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 187, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. MULVANEY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 416, noes 0, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 188]

AYES—416

Ackerman	Courtney	Hastings (WA)
Adams	Cravaack	Hayworth
Aderholt	Crawford	Heck
Akin	Crenshaw	Heinrich
Alexander	Critz	Hensarling
Altmire	Crowley	Herger
Amash	Cuellar	Herrera Beutler
Amodei	Culberson	Higgins
Andrews	Cummings	Himes
Austria	Davis (CA)	Hinchev
Baca	Davis (IL)	Hinojosa
Bachmann	DeFazio	Hochul
Bachus	DeGette	Holt
Baldwin	DeLauro	Honda
Barletta	Denham	Hoyer
Barrow	Dent	Huelskamp
Bartlett	DesJarlais	Huizenga (MI)
Barton (TX)	Deutch	Hultgren
Bass (CA)	Diaz-Balart	Hunter
Bass (NH)	Dicks	Hurt
Becerra	Dingell	Israel
Benishkek	Doggett	Issa
Berg	Dold	Jackson (IL)
Berkley	Donnelly (IN)	Jackson Lee
Berman	Doyle	(TX)
Biggert	Dreier	Jenkins
Bilbray	Duffy	Johnson (GA)
Bilirakis	Duncan (SC)	Johnson (IL)
Bishop (GA)	Duncan (TN)	Johnson (OH)
Bishop (NY)	Edwards	Johnson, E. B.
Bishop (UT)	Ellison	Johnson, Sam
Black	Ellmers	Jones
Blackburn	Emerson	Jordan
Bonamici	Engel	Kaptur
Bonner	Eshoo	Keating
Bono Mack	Farenthold	Kelly
Boren	Farr	Kildee
Boswell	Fattah	Kind
Boustany	Fincher	King (IA)
Brady (PA)	Fitzpatrick	King (NY)
Brady (TX)	Flake	Kingston
Braley (IA)	Fleischmann	Kinzinger (IL)
Brooks	Fleming	Kissell
Broun (GA)	Flores	Kline
Brown (FL)	Forbes	Kucinich
Buchanan	Fortenberry	Labrador
Buerkle	Fox	Lamborn
Burgess	Frank (MA)	Lance
Burton (IN)	Franks (AZ)	Landry
Butterfield	Frelinghuysen	Langevin
Calvert	Fudge	Lankford
Camp	Galleghy	Larsen (WA)
Campbell	Garamendi	Larson (CT)
Cantor	Gardner	Latham
Capito	Garrett	LaTourette
Capps	Gerlach	Latta
Capuano	Gibbs	Lee (CA)
Cardoza	Gibson	Levin
Carnahan	Gingrey (GA)	Lewis (CA)
Carney	Gohmert	Lewis (GA)
Carson (IN)	Gonzalez	Lipinski
Carter	Goodlatte	LoBiondo
Cassidy	Gosar	Loebsack
Castor (FL)	Gowdy	Lofgren, Zoe
Chabot	Granger	Long
Chaffetz	Graves (GA)	Lowey
Chandler	Graves (MO)	Lucas
Chu	Green, Al	Luetkemeyer
Cicilline	Green, Gene	Lujan
Clarke (MI)	Griffin (AR)	Lummis
Clarke (NY)	Griffith (VA)	Lungren, Daniel
Clay	Grijalva	E.
Cleaver	Grimm	Lynch
Clyburn	Guinta	Mack
Coble	Guthrie	Manzullo
Coffman (CO)	Gutierrez	Marchant
Cohen	Hahn	Markey
Cole	Hall	Matheson
Conaway	Hanabusa	Matsui
Connolly (VA)	Hanna	McCarthy (CA)
Conyers	Harper	McCarthy (NY)
Cooper	Harris	McCauley
Costa	Hartzler	McClintock
Costello	Hastings (FL)	McCollum

McCotter	Rahall	Smith (NE)
McDermott	Reed	Smith (NJ)
McGovern	Rehberg	Smith (TX)
McIntyre	Reichert	Smith (WA)
McKeon	Renacci	Southerland
McKinley	Reyes	Speier
McMorris	Ribble	Stark
Rodgers	Richardson	Stearns
McNerney	Richmond	Stivers
Meehan	Rigell	Stutzman
Meeks	Rivera	Sullivan
Mica	Roby	Sutton
Michaud	Roe (TN)	Terry
Miller (FL)	Rogers (AL)	Thompson (CA)
Miller (MI)	Rogers (KY)	Thompson (MS)
Miller (NC)	Rogers (MI)	Thompson (PA)
Miller, Gary	Rohrabacher	Thornberry
Miller, George	Rokita	Tiberi
Moore	Rooney	Tierney
Moran	Ros-Lehtinen	Tipton
Mulvaney	Roskam	Tonko
Murphy (CT)	Ross (AR)	Towns
Murphy (PA)	Ross (FL)	Tsongas
Myrick	Rothman (NJ)	Turner (NY)
Nadler	Roybal-Allard	Turner (OH)
Napolitano	Royce	Turner (OH)
Neal	Runyan	Upton
Neugebauer	Ruppersberger	Van Hollen
Noem	Rush	Velázquez
Nugent	Ryan (OH)	Visclosky
Nunes	Ryan (WI)	Walberg
Nunnelee	Sánchez, Linda	Walden
Olson	T.	Walsh (IL)
Oliver	Sanchez, Loretta	Walz (MN)
Owens	Sarbanes	Wasserman
Palazzo	Scalise	Schultz
Pallone	Schakowsky	Waters
Pascarella	Schiff	Watt
Pastor (AZ)	Schilling	Waxman
Paulsen	Schmidt	Webster
Pearce	Schock	Welch
Pelosi	Schrader	West
Perlmutter	Schwartz	Westmoreland
Peters	Schweikert	Whitfield
Peterson	Scott (SC)	Wilson (FL)
Petri	Scott (VA)	Wilson (SC)
Pingree (ME)	Scott, Austin	Wittman
Pitts	Scott, David	Wolf
Platts	Sensenbrenner	Womack
Poe (TX)	Serrano	Woodall
Polis	Sessions	Woolsey
Pompeo	Sewell	Yarmuth
Pompeo	Sherman	Yoder
Price (GA)	Shimkus	Young (AK)
Price (NC)	Shuler	Young (FL)
Quayle	Shuster	Young (IN)
Quigley	Simpson	

## NOT VOTING—15

Blumenauer	Hirono	Paul
Bucshon	Holden	Pence
Canseco	Maloney	Rangel
Davis (KY)	Marino	Sires
Filner	McHenry	Slaughter

□ 1740

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 188, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. GOODLATTE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 414, noes 1, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 189]

AYES—414

Ackerman	Davis (CA)	Hultgren
Adams	Davis (IL)	Hunter
Aderholt	DeFazio	Hurt
Alexander	DeGette	Israel
Altmire	DeLauro	Issa
Amash	Denham	Jackson (IL)
Amodei	Dent	Jackson Lee
Andrews	DesJarlais	(TX)
Austria	Deutch	Jenkins
Baca	Diaz-Balart	Johnson (GA)
Bachmann	Dicks	Johnson (IL)
Bachus	Dingell	Johnson (OH)
Baldwin	Doggett	Johnson, E. B.
Barletta	Dold	Johnson, Sam
Barrow	Donnelly (IN)	Jones
Becerra	Doyle	Jordan
Benishkek	Dreier	Kaptur
Berg	Duffy	Keating
Berkley	Duncan (SC)	Kelly
Berman	Duncan (TN)	Kildee
Biggert	Edwards	Kind
Bilbray	Ellison	King (IA)
Bilirakis	Ellmers	King (NY)
Bishop (GA)	Emerson	Kingston
Bishop (NY)	Engel	Kinzinger (IL)
Bishop (UT)	Eshoo	Kissell
Black	Farenthold	Kline
Blackburn	Farr	Kucinich
Bonamici	Fattah	Labrador
Bonner	Fincher	Lamborn
Bono Mack	Flake	Lance
Boren	Fitzpatrick	Landry
Boswell	Flame	Langevin
Boustany	Fleischmann	Lankford
Brady (PA)	Fleming	Larsen (WA)
Brady (TX)	Flores	Larson (CT)
Braley (IA)	Forbes	Latham
Brooks	Fortenberry	LaTourette
Broun (GA)	Fox	Latta
Brown (FL)	Fox	Lee (CA)
Buchanan	Frank (MA)	Levin
Buerkle	Frank (AZ)	Lewis (CA)
Burgess	Frank (AZ)	Lewis (GA)
Burton (IN)	Frank (AZ)	Lipinski
Butterfield	Frelinghuysen	LoBiondo
Calvert	Fudge	Loebsack
Camp	Galleghy	Long
Campbell	Garamendi	Lowey
Cantor	Gardner	Lucas
Capito	Garrett	Luetkemeyer
Capps	Gerlach	Lujan
Capuano	Gibbs	Lummis
Cardoza	Gibson	Lungren, Daniel
Carnahan	Gingrey (GA)	E.
Carney	Gohmert	Lynch
Carson (IN)	Gonzalez	Mack
Carter	Goodlatte	Manzullo
Cassidy	Gosar	Marchant
Castor (FL)	Gowdy	Markey
Chabot	Granger	Matheson
Chaffetz	Graves (GA)	Matsui
Chandler	Graves (MO)	McCarthy (CA)
Chu	Green, Al	McCarthy (NY)
Cicilline	Green, Gene	McCollum
Clarke (MI)	Griffin (AR)	McCotter
Clarke (NY)	Griffith (VA)	McDermott
Clay	Grijalva	McGovern
Cleaver	Grimm	McIntyre
Clyburn	Guinta	McKeon
Coble	Guthrie	McKinley
Coffman (CO)	Gutierrez	McMorris
Cohen	Hahn	Rodgers
Cole	Hall	McNerney
Conaway	Hanabusa	Meehan
Connolly (VA)	Hanna	Meeks
Conyers	Harper	Heck
Cooper	Harris	Michaud
Costa	Hartzler	Miller (FL)
Costello	Hastings (FL)	Miller (MI)
		Miller (NC)
		Miller, Gary
		Miller, George
		Moore
		Moran
		Mulvaney
		Holt
		Murphy (CT)
		Murphy (PA)
		Myrick
		Nadler
		Napolitano

Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Olver
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quayle
Quigley
Rahall
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher

NOES—1
Lofgren, Zoe
NOT VOTING—16

Akin
Blumenauer
Bucshon
Canseco
Davis (KY)
Filner
Hirono
Holden
Maloney
Marino
McHenry
Paul
Pence
Rangel
Sires
Slaughter

□ 1744

So the amendment was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:
Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 189, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MR. MULVANEY
The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.
The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 413, noes 3, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 190]
AYES—413
Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Amodei
Andrews
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggart
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonamici
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio

Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quayle
Quigley
Rahall
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)

NOES—3

Dingell
Schrader
Turner (NY)

NOT VOTING—15

Blumenauer
Bucshon
Canseco
Davis (KY)
Filner
Hirono
Holden
Maloney
Marino
McHenry
Paul
Pence
Rangel
Sires
Slaughter

□ 1747

So the amendment was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:
Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 190, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.
The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOODALL) having assumed the chair, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3523) to provide for the sharing of certain cyber threat intelligence and cyber threat information between the intelligence community and cybersecurity entities, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 631, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

#### MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. PERLMUTTER. In its current form, I am.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Perlmutter moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 3523, to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendments:

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

#### SEC. 3. PROTECTING THE PRIVACY OF INTERNET PASSWORDS AND THE CREATIVITY OF THE INTERNET.

Nothing in this Act or the amendments made by this Act shall be construed to—

(1) permit an employer, a prospective employer, or the Federal Government to require the disclosure of a confidential password for a social networking website or a personal account of an employee or job applicant without a court order; or

(2) permit the Federal Government to establish a mechanism to control United States citizens' access to and use of the Internet through the creation of a national Internet firewall similar to the "Great Internet Firewall of China", as determined by the Director of the National Intelligence.

Page 12, line 22, strike "and".

Page 12, line 25, strike the period and insert a semicolon.

Page 12, after line 25, insert the following:

"(G) the number of Americans who have—  
 "(i) been required by employers, prospective employers, or the Federal Government to release confidential passwords for social networking websites; and

"(ii) had personal information released to the Federal Government under this section or obtained in connection with a cybersecurity breach; and

"(H) the impact of the information that has been released or obtained as referred to in subparagraph (G) on privacy, electronic commerce, Internet usage, and online content.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, the House has heard this before. It's very simple, sweet and direct, and I will take a moment and just read it so that everybody has a chance to understand it again. What we're doing is avoiding and prohibiting an employer, as a condition of employment, from demanding a confidential Facebook password—Twitter, Tumblr—or any social media of the like. It reads this way:

Nothing in this act or the amendments made by this act shall be construed to permit an employer, a prospective employer, or the Federal Government to require the disclosure of a confidential password for a social networking Web site or a personal account of an employee or job applicant without a court order; or permit the Federal Government to establish a mechanism to control United States citizens' access to and use of the Internet through the creation of a national Internet firewall, similar to the "Great Internet Firewall of China", as determined by the Director of National Intelligence.

So what this amendment does is two things. It is the final amendment to this bill. There are no more amendments to this bill. I know some people voted against this amendment when it was brought up a couple of weeks ago; and for those of you who regret voting against it, you're going to get a chance to correct that vote. This is something I've been working on with Mr. HEINRICH and Mr. MCHENRY. It just says we're not going to allow as a condition of employment the requirement of a Facebook password or the like. Now, there is a reason for this.

One, there is all sorts of personal information that I may have or that somebody else may have with respect to Facebook or Twitter or LinkedIn, whatever it might be; and they're entitled to have an expectation of privacy, a sense that their freedom of speech—their freedom to peaceably assemble, in effect—is not violated. So that's the first reason.

The second reason is if an employer or the Federal Government poses as somebody, by having their Facebook passwords, then they can impersonate; they can become imposters. It is a two-way exchange of information so that somebody who is completely unrelated to the employment now is communicating with an impostor. That's another reason for this.

The third reason is for the employers, themselves, to avoid liability by learning information that may then cause them to take actions that would violate a protected group. So there are at least three good reasons to do this.

We have precedent in our law, and it is the Employee Polygraph Protection Act of 1988. We said we're not going to allow as a condition of employment the use of lie detectors. You can use background checks, and you can use references. There are plenty of vehicles by which to check out somebody's employment references; but we're not going to allow lie detectors, and we should not allow that the Facebook passwords be given up as a condition of employment. So we have precedent in the law. We don't allow polygraphs or lie detectors as a condition of employment. Let's use what we already have—background checks, references, et cetera.

The second piece of this is that we will not allow the command and control of the Internet or access to the Internet by the United States Government, saying that which is similar:

that we want to avoid what has happened in China, that we want to avoid what has happened in Iran. We don't want the Internet taken down and our access, individuals' access, to the Internet broken.

So there are two pieces to this. One is not allowing the demand of a confidential password and not allowing the government to have the command and control and the ability to take down the Internet, an action similar to what we've seen in other countries.

This is a very simple amendment. It's very straightforward. We've had a lot of amendments that have garnered the support of virtually every Member of this House. This should be one of those. This is the final amendment. I would hope that we would uphold the Constitution by passing this amendment, as well as by making sure that the Internet is available to anyone who wants to use it at any time.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Today, 300,000 times somebody will be trying to get into our credit card companies—300,000 times, one company. In just the last few years, just in defense contractors, foreign nation-states have stolen more intellectual property, which will end up protecting this country, equivalent to 50 times the print collection of our U.S. Library of Congress. Anonymous is attacking businesses, and today attacked Wall Street because they're anti-capitalists. There are people out there today who are literally robbing the future of America for our jobs, our prosperity, and our economic prowess in the world; and they're doing it by design.

A year ago, we set out to try to do something small. If we have some bad software—some bad, malicious virus information—shouldn't we be obligated to share that with the private sector so they can protect themselves? Absolutely.

If we don't do this, a nation-state like China has geared up its military and intelligence services for the very purpose of economically wounding the United States—by draining our intellectual property dry. They have done it by stealing pesticide formulas. They have done it by stealing pharmaceutical formulas. They have done it by stealing intellectual property when it relates to military hardware and then have copied it, and it has cost us a tremendous amount of more money to have had to go back and redesign it.

□ 1800

So we can play games. We can do silly things. This amendment actually does nothing to protect a person's private password at home. Nothing. Not one thing. But it is serving to try to obfuscate and maybe send it back to committee and come back.

This has been a bipartisan bill, and I can't tell you how disappointing this amendment is to me. I have worked with Mr. RUPPERSBERGER and the members of this committee. I have worked with the privacy groups. We've worked with civil libertarians. They threw everything but the kitchen sink at us. By the way, this does nothing, or this would have been thrown at us, too. You know why? Because it doesn't do anything. I get it. Sounds great. You're going to run out and do some bad things with it.

But this is our Nation's defense. This is the last bastion of things we need to do to protect this country. We've done it since 9/11. We did Homeland Security. We've done the Patriot Act. We've done other things that this body and the other body and the President of the United States signed to protect this country, as our Constitution tells us to do for the common defense of this great Nation.

I will tell you something. We can have this debate. We can talk about a bill that does absolutely nothing to protect someone's private password at home, or we can get about the business of trying to give the private sector just a little bit of information to protect people's private information in the comfort of their homes, so that we can protect this Nation from a catastrophic attack.

The director of the national security didn't say "maybe," didn't say, "could happen." They said it will happen.

This is the one small thing we get to do to prepare for a whole bunch of folks out there that want to bring this Nation down.

We ought to stand together today in a bipartisan way. We ought to reject all of the confusion and obfuscation and all of the things that they're saying about this bill that just are not true. We ought to stand here and say, We respected the fact that you kept the government stuff government, and the private stuff private, and you're not mixing it up, and you're not surveilling. You're doing none of those things. You're just sharing some pretty bad information so that they can apply it to their patches that happen on your computer every single day, thousands of times a day, to try to keep viruses off your computer, and that's it.

We've spent a lot of time today trying to go in a different direction. People are upset that there aren't things in the bill. Okay. I mean, the Buffett rule isn't in the bill. I don't think that ought to get a veto threat either.

This is where we are. This is that first small threat.

I'm going to ask all of you to join us today. Reject this red herring, this obfuscation, and stand with America. They need it. There are 3 million businesses with all of the associations telling us, Please, give us that classified secret malware information that your government has so we can protect the people we have as customers and clients. They're begging for it because

they're getting killed every single day. It's happening right this second.

This is our chance to stand up. This was a bipartisan effort. If you really believe in bipartisanship, if you believe that's the future of this Chamber, and that's the dignity of the very Founding Fathers that gave it to us, then today is the day to prove it.

Reject this amendment, stand for America. Support this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clauses 8 and 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of H.R. 3523, if ordered; and suspension of the rules with regard to H.R. 2050, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 183, nays 233, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 191]

YEAS—183

Ackerman	Dingell	Lowey
Altmire	Doggett	Luján
Andrews	Donnelly (IN)	Lynch
Baca	Doyle	Markey
Baldwin	Edwards	Matheson
Barrow	Ellison	Matsui
Bass (CA)	Engel	McCarthy (NY)
Becerra	Eshoo	McCollum
Berkley	Farr	McDermott
Berman	Fattah	McGovern
Bishop (GA)	Frank (MA)	McIntyre
Bishop (NY)	Fudge	McNerney
Bonamici	Garamendi	Meeks
Boren	Gonzalez	Michaud
Boswell	Green, Al	Miller (NC)
Brady (PA)	Green, Gene	Miller, George
Bralley (IA)	Grijalva	Moore
Brown (FL)	Gutierrez	Moran
Butterfield	Hahn	Murphy (CT)
Capps	Hanabusa	Nadler
Capuano	Hastings (FL)	Napolitano
Cardoza	Heinrich	Neal
Carnahan	Higgins	Olver
Carney	Himes	Owens
Carson (IN)	Hinchey	Pallone
Castor (FL)	Hinojosa	Pascrell
Chandler	Hochul	Pastor (AZ)
Chu	Holt	Pelosi
Cicilline	Honda	Perlmutter
Clarke (MI)	Hoyer	Peters
Clarke (NY)	Israel	Peterson
Clay	Jackson (IL)	Pingree (ME)
Cleaver	Jackson Lee	Polis
Clyburn	(TX)	Price (NC)
Cohen	Johnson (GA)	Quigley
Connolly (VA)	Johnson, E. B.	Rahall
Conyers	Jones	Reyes
Cooper	Kaptur	Richardson
Costa	Keating	Richmond
Costello	Kildee	Ross (AR)
Courtney	Kind	Rothman (NJ)
Critz	Kissell	Roybal-Allard
Crowley	Kucinich	Ruppersberger
Cuellar	Langevin	Rush
Cummings	Larsen (WA)	Ryan (OH)
Davis (CA)	Larson (CT)	Sánchez, Linda
Davis (IL)	Lee (CA)	T.
DeFazio	Levin	Sanchez, Loretta
DeGette	Lewis (GA)	Sarbanes
DeLauro	Lipinski	Schakowsky
Deutch	Loeb sack	Schiff
Dicks	Lofgren, Zoe	Schrader

Schwartz	Sutton
Scott (VA)	Thompson (CA)
Scott, David	Thompson (MS)
Serrano	Tierney
Sewell	Tonko
Sherman	Towns
Shuler	Tsongas
Smith (WA)	Van Hollen
Speier	Velázquez
Stark	Visclosky

Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NAYS—233

Adams	Goodlatte	Olson
Aderholt	Gosar	Palazzo
Akin	Gowdy	Paulsen
Alexander	Granger	Pearce
Amash	Graves (GA)	Petri
Amodei	Graves (MO)	Pitts
Austria	Griffin (AR)	Platts
Bachmann	Griffith (VA)	Poe (TX)
Bachus	Grimm	Pompeo
Barletta	Guinta	Posey
Bartlett	Guthrie	Price (GA)
Barton (TX)	Hall	Quayle
Bass (NH)	Hanna	Reed
Benishek	Harper	Rehberg
Berg	Harris	Reichert
Biggert	Hartzler	Renacci
Bilbray	Hastings (WA)	Ribble
Bilirakis	Hayworth	Rigell
Bishop (UT)	Heck	Rivera
Black	Hensarling	Roby
Blackburn	Herger	Roe (TN)
Bonner	Herrera Beutler	Rogers (AL)
Bono Mack	Huelskamp	Rogers (KY)
Boustany	Huizenga (MI)	Rogers (MI)
Brady (TX)	Hultgren	Rohrabacher
Brooks	Hunter	Rokita
Broun (GA)	Hurt	Rooney
Buchanan	Issa	Ros-Lehtinen
Buerkle	Jenkins	Roskam
Burgess	Johnson (IL)	Ross (FL)
Burton (IN)	Johnson (OH)	Royce
Calvert	Johnson, Sam	Runyan
Camp	Jordan	Ryan (WI)
Campbell	Kelly	Scalise
Cantor	King (IA)	Schilling
Capito	King (NY)	Schmidt
Carter	Kingston	Schock
Cassidy	Kinzinger (IL)	Schweikert
Chabot	Kline	Scott (SC)
Chaffetz	Labrador	Scott, Austin
Coble	Lamborn	Sensenbrenner
Coffman (CO)	Lance	Sessions
Cole	Landry	Shimkus
Conaway	Lankford	Shuster
Cravaack	Latham	Simpson
Crawford	LaTourette	Latta
Crenshaw	Lewis (CA)	Smith (NE)
Culberson	Lewis (CA)	Smith (NJ)
Denham	LoBiondo	Smith (TX)
Dent	Long	Southerland
DesJarlais	Lucas	Stearns
Diaz-Balart	Luetkemeyer	Stivers
Dold	Lummis	Stutzman
Dreier	Lungren, Daniel	Sullivan
Duffy	E.	Terry
Duncan (SC)	Mack	Thompson (PA)
Duncan (TN)	Manzullo	Thornberry
Ellmers	Marchant	Tiberi
Emerson	McCarthy (CA)	Tipton
Farenthold	McCaul	Turner (NY)
Fincher	McClintock	Turner (OH)
Fitzpatrick	McCotter	Upton
Flake	McKeon	Walberg
Fleischmann	McKinley	Walden
Fleming	McMorris	Walsh (IL)
Flores	Rodgers	Webster
Forbes	Meehan	West
Fortenberry	Mica	Westmoreland
Fox	Miller (FL)	Whitfield
Franks (AZ)	Miller (MI)	Wilson (SC)
Frelinghuysen	Miller, Gary	Wittman
Gallely	Mulvaney	Wolf
Gardner	Murphy (PA)	Womack
Garrett	Myrick	Woodall
Gerlach	Neugebauer	Yoder
Gibbs	Noem	Young (AK)
Gibson	Nugent	Young (FL)
Gingrey (GA)	Nunes	Young (IN)
Gohmert	Nunnelee	

NOT VOTING—15

Blumenauer	Hirono	Paul
Bucshon	Holden	Pence
Canseco	Maloney	Rangel
Davis (KY)	Marino	Sires
Filner	McHenry	Slaughter

□ 1823

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 191, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

## RECORDED VOTE

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 248, noes 168, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 192]

AYES—248

Adams	Dicks	Kissell
Aderholt	Dold	Kline
Alexander	Donnelly (IN)	Labrador
Altmire	Dreier	Lamborn
Amodel	Duffy	Lance
Austria	Duncan (SC)	Langevin
Bachmann	Duncan (TN)	Lankford
Bachus	Ellmers	Larsen (WA)
Barletta	Fincher	Latham
Barrow	Fitzpatrick	LaTourette
Bartlett	Flake	Latta
Bass (NH)	Fleischmann	Lewis (CA)
Benishkek	Flores	Lipinski
Berg	Forbes	LoBiondo
Biggert	Fortenberry	Long
Bilbray	Fox	Lucas
Billirakis	Franks (AZ)	Luetkemeyer
Bishop (GA)	Frelinghuysen	Lummis
Bishop (NY)	Galleghy	Lungren, Daniel
Black	Garamendi	E.
Blackburn	Gardner	Manullo
Bonner	Garrett	Matheson
Bono Mack	Gerlach	McCarthy (CA)
Boren	Gibbs	McCarthy (NY)
Boswell	Gingrey (GA)	McCaul
Boustany	Gonzalez	McIntyre
Brady (TX)	Goodlatte	McKeon
Broun (GA)	Gowdy	McKinley
Buchanan	Granger	McMorris
Buerkle	Graves (GA)	Rodgers
Burgess	Graves (MO)	Meehan
Burton (IN)	Griffin (AR)	Mica
Butterfield	Griffith (VA)	Miller (FL)
Calvert	Grimm	Miller (MI)
Camp	Guinta	Miller, Gary
Campbell	Guthrie	Moran
Cantor	Hanabusa	Mulvaney
Capito	Hanna	Murphy (PA)
Cardoza	Harper	Myrick
Carney	Harris	Neugebauer
Carter	Hartzler	Noem
Cassidy	Hastings (WA)	Nugent
Castor (FL)	Hayworth	Nunes
Chabot	Heck	Nunnelee
Chaffetz	Hensarling	Olson
Chandler	Herger	Owens
Clyburn	Herrera Beutler	Palazzo
Coble	Hochul	Paulsen
Coffman (CO)	Huelskamp	Peterson
Cole	Huizenga (MI)	Petri
Conaway	Hultgren	Pitts
Connolly (VA)	Hunter	Platts
Cooper	Hurt	Poe (TX)
Costa	Israel	Pompeo
Cravaack	Issa	Price (GA)
Crawford	Jenkins	Quayle
Crenshaw	Johnson (OH)	Reed
Critz	Johnson, Sam	Reichert
Cuellar	Jordan	Renacci
Culberson	Kelly	Ribble
Denham	King (IA)	Rivera
Dent	King (NY)	Roby
DesJarlais	Kingston	Roe (TN)
Diaz-Balart	Kinzinger (IL)	Rogers (AL)

Rogers (KY)	Sessions	Turner (NY)
Rogers (MI)	Shimkus	Turner (OH)
Rokita	Shuler	Upton
Rooney	Shuster	Walberg
Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (NE)	Walden
Roskam	Smith (NJ)	Webster
Ross (AR)	Smith (TX)	West
Ross (FL)	Smith (WA)	Westmoreland
Royce	Southerland	Whitfield
Runyan	Stearns	Wilson (SC)
Ruppersberger	Stivers	Wittman
Ryan (WI)	Stutzman	Wolf
Scalise	Sullivan	Womack
Schilling	Terry	Woodall
Schmidt	Thompson (CA)	Yoder
Schock	Thompson (PA)	Young (AK)
Schrader	Thornberry	Young (FL)
Scott (SC)	Tiberi	Young (IN)
Scott, Austin	Tipton	
Scott, David	Towns	

## NOES—168

Ackerman	Green, Gene	Pascrell
Akin	Grijalva	Pastor (AZ)
Amash	Gutierrez	Pearce
Andrews	Hahn	Pelosi
Baca	Hall	Perlmutter
Baldwin	Hastings (FL)	Peters
Barton (TX)	Heinrich	Pingree (ME)
Bass (CA)	Higgins	Polis
Becerra	Himes	Posey
Berkley	Hinchee	Price (NC)
Berman	Hinojosa	Quigley
Bishop (UT)	Holt	Rahall
Bonamici	Honda	Rehberg
Brady (PA)	Hoyer	Reyes
Braley (IA)	Jackson (IL)	Richardson
Brooks	Jackson Lee	Richmond
Brown (FL)	(TX)	Rigell
Capps	Johnson (GA)	Rohrabacher
Capuano	Johnson (IL)	Rothman (NJ)
Carnahan	Johnson, E. B.	Roybal-Allard
Carson (IN)	Jones	Rush
Chu	Kaptur	Ryan (OH)
Cicilline	Keating	Sanchez, Linda
Clarke (MI)	Kildee	T.
Clarke (NY)	Kind	Sanchez, Loretta
Clay	Kucinich	Sarbanes
Cleaver	Landry	Schakowsky
Cohen	Larson (CT)	Schiff
Conyers	Lee (CA)	Schwartz
Costello	Levin	Schweikert
Courtney	Lewis (GA)	Scott (VA)
Crowley	Loeback	Sensenbrenner
Cummings	Lofgren, Zoe	Serrano
Davis (CA)	Lowey	Sewell
Davis (IL)	Lujan	Sherman
DeFazio	Lynch	Simpson
DeGette	Mack	Speier
DeLauro	Marchant	Stark
Deutch	Markey	Sutton
Dingell	Matsui	Thompson (MS)
Doggett	McClintock	Tierney
Doyle	McCollum	Tonko
Edwards	McCotter	Tsongas
Ellison	McDermott	Van Hollen
Emerson	McGovern	Velázquez
Engel	McNerney	Visclosky
Eshoo	Meeke	Walsh (IL)
Farenthold	Michaud	Walz (MN)
Farr	Miller (NC)	Wasserman
Fattah	Miller, George	Schultz
Fleming	Moore	Waters
Frank (MA)	Murphy (CT)	Watt
Fudge	Nadler	Waxman
Gibson	Napolitano	Welch
Gohmert	Neal	Wilson (FL)
Gosar	Olver	Woolsey
Green, Al	Pallone	Yarmuth

## NOT VOTING—15

Blumenauer	Hirono	Paul
Bucshon	Holden	Pence
Canseco	Maloney	Rangel
Davis (KY)	Marino	Sires
Filner	McHenry	Slaughter

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1831

Mr. HOYER changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. TIPTON changed his vote from "no" to aye."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 192, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall vote Nos. 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, and 192. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on rollcall vote Nos. 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, and 191. I would have voted "no" on rollcall vote Nos. 182, 183, and 192.

## IDAHO WILDERNESS WATER RESOURCES PROTECTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (H.R. 2050) to authorize the continued use of certain water diversions located on National Forest System land in the Frank Church-River of No Return Wilderness and the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

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.

## AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN EN-GROSSMENT OF H.R. 3523, CYBER INTELLIGENCE SHARING AND PROTECTION ACT

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the bill, H.R. 3523, the Clerk be authorized to make such technical and conforming changes as necessary to reflect the actions of the House.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of H.R. 3523, the Clerk be authorized to make the change that I have placed at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. NOEM). The Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert "deny access to or" before "degrade" in each place it appears.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER  
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on the motion 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.

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken later.

FEDERAL INFORMATION SECURITY  
AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2012

Mr. ISSA. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4257) to amend chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, to revise requirements relating to Federal information security, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.  
The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4257

*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 “Federal Information Security Amendments Act of 2012”.

**SEC. 2. COORDINATION OF FEDERAL INFORMATION POLICY.**

Chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, is amended by striking subchapters II and III and inserting the following:

“SUBCHAPTER II—INFORMATION  
SECURITY

**“§ 3551. Purposes**

“The purposes of this subchapter are to—

“(1) provide a comprehensive framework for ensuring the effectiveness of information security controls over information resources that support Federal operations and assets;

“(2) recognize the highly networked nature of the current Federal computing environment and provide effective Governmentwide management and oversight of the related information security risks, including coordination of information security efforts throughout the civilian, national security, and law enforcement communities assets;

“(3) provide for development and maintenance of minimum controls required to protect Federal information and information systems;

“(4) provide a mechanism for improved oversight of Federal agency information security programs and systems through a focus on automated and continuous monitoring of agency information systems and regular threat assessments;

“(5) acknowledge that commercially developed information security products offer advanced, dynamic, robust, and effective information security solutions, reflecting market solutions for the protection of critical information systems important to the national defense and economic security of the Nation that are designed, built, and operated by the private sector; and

“(6) recognize that the selection of specific technical hardware and software information security solutions should be left to individual agencies from among commercially developed products.

**“§ 3552. Definitions**

“(a) SECTION 3502 DEFINITIONS.—Except as provided under subsection (b), the definitions under section 3502 shall apply to this subchapter.

“(b) ADDITIONAL DEFINITIONS.—In this subchapter:

“(1) ADEQUATE SECURITY.—The term ‘adequate security’ means security commensurate with the risk and magnitude of the harm resulting from the unauthorized access to or loss, misuse, destruction, or modification of information.

“(2) AUTOMATED AND CONTINUOUS MONITORING.—The term ‘automated and continuous monitoring’ means monitoring, with minimal human involvement, through an uninterrupted, ongoing real time, or near real-time process used to determine if the complete set of planned, required, and deployed security controls within an information system continue to be effective over time with rapidly changing information technology and threat development.

“(3) INCIDENT.—The term ‘incident’ means an occurrence that actually or potentially jeopardizes the confidentiality, integrity, or availability of an information system, or the information the system processes, stores, or transmits or that constitutes a violation or imminent threat of violation of security policies, security procedures, or acceptable use policies.

“(4) INFORMATION SECURITY.—The term ‘information security’ means protecting information and information systems from unauthorized access, use, disclosure, disruption, modification, or destruction in order to provide—

“(A) integrity, which means guarding against improper information modification or destruction, and includes ensuring information nonrepudiation and authenticity;

“(B) confidentiality, which means preserving authorized restrictions on access and disclosure, including means for protecting personal privacy and proprietary information; and

“(C) availability, which means ensuring timely and reliable access to and use of information.

“(5) INFORMATION SYSTEM.—The term ‘information system’ means a discrete set of information resources organized for the collection, processing, maintenance, use, sharing, dissemination, or disposition of information and includes—

“(A) computers and computer networks;

“(B) ancillary equipment;

“(C) software, firmware, and related procedures;

“(D) services, including support services; and

“(E) related resources.

“(6) INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY.—The term ‘information technology’ has the meaning given that term in section 11101 of title 40.

“(7) NATIONAL SECURITY SYSTEM.—

“(A) DEFINITION.—The term ‘national security system’ means any information system (including any telecommunications system) used or operated by an agency or by a contractor of an agency, or other organization on behalf of an agency—

“(i) the function, operation, or use of which—

“(I) involves intelligence activities;

“(II) involves cryptologic activities related to national security;

“(III) involves command and control of military forces;

“(IV) involves equipment that is an integral part of a weapon or weapons system; or

“(V) subject to subparagraph (B), is critical to the direct fulfillment of military or intelligence missions; or

“(ii) is protected at all times by procedures established for information that have been specifically authorized under criteria established by an Executive order or an Act of Congress to be kept classified in the interest of national defense or foreign policy.

“(B) EXCEPTION.—Subparagraph (A)(i)(V) does not include a system that is to be used for routine administrative and business applications (including payroll, finance, logistics, and personnel management applications).

“(8) THREAT ASSESSMENT.—The term ‘threat assessment’ means the formal description and evaluation of threat to an information system.

**“§ 3553. Authority and functions of the Director**

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall oversee agency information security policies and practices, including—

“(1) developing and overseeing the implementation of policies, principles, standards, and guidelines on information security, including through ensuring timely agency adoption of and compliance with standards promulgated under section 11331 of title 40;

“(2) requiring agencies, consistent with the standards promulgated under such section 11331 and the requirements of this subchapter, to identify and provide information security protections commensurate with the risk and magnitude of the harm resulting from the unauthorized access, use, disclosure, disruption, modification, or destruction of—

“(A) information collected or maintained by or on behalf of an agency; or

“(B) information systems used or operated by an agency or by a contractor of an agency or other organization on behalf of an agency;

“(3) coordinating the development of standards and guidelines under section 20 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278g-3) with agencies and offices operating or exercising control of national security systems (including the National Security Agency) to assure, to the maximum extent feasible, that such standards and guidelines are complementary with standards and guidelines developed for national security systems;

“(4) overseeing agency compliance with the requirements of this subchapter, including through any authorized action under section 11303 of title 40, to enforce accountability for compliance with such requirements;

“(5) reviewing at least annually, and approving or disapproving, agency information security programs required under section 3554(b);

“(6) coordinating information security policies and procedures with related information resources management policies and procedures;

“(7) overseeing the operation of the Federal information security incident center required under section 3555; and

“(8) reporting to Congress no later than March 1 of each year on agency compliance with the requirements of this subchapter, including—

“(A) an assessment of the development, promulgation, and adoption of, and compliance with, standards developed under section 20 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278g-3) and promulgated under section 11331 of title 40;

“(B) significant deficiencies in agency information security practices;

“(C) planned remedial action to address such deficiencies; and

“(D) a summary of, and the views of the Director on, the report prepared by the National Institute of Standards and Technology under section 20(d)(10) of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278g-3).

“(b) NATIONAL SECURITY SYSTEMS.—Except for the authorities described in paragraphs (4) and (8) of subsection (a), the authorities of the Director under this section shall not apply to national security systems.

“(c) DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY SYSTEMS.—(1) The authorities of the Director described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a) shall be delegated to the Secretary of Defense in the case of systems described in paragraph (2) and to the Director of Central Intelligence in the case of systems described in paragraph (3).

“(2) The systems described in this paragraph are systems that are operated by the Department of Defense, a contractor of the Department of Defense, or another entity on behalf of the Department of Defense that processes any information the unauthorized access, use, disclosure, disruption, modification, or destruction of which would have a debilitating impact on the mission of the Department of Defense.

“(3) The systems described in this paragraph are systems that are operated by the Central Intelligence Agency, a contractor of the Central Intelligence Agency, or another entity on behalf of the Central Intelligence Agency that processes any information the unauthorized access, use, disclosure, disruption, modification, or destruction of which would have a debilitating impact on the mission of the Central Intelligence Agency.

#### “§ 3554. Agency responsibilities

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The head of each agency shall—

“(1) be responsible for—

“(A) providing information security protections commensurate with the risk and magnitude of the harm resulting from unauthorized access, use, disclosure, disruption, modification, or destruction of—

“(i) information collected or maintained by or on behalf of the agency; and

“(ii) information systems used or operated by an agency or by a contractor of an agency or other organization on behalf of an agency;

“(B) complying with the requirements of this subchapter and related policies, procedures, standards, and guidelines, including—

“(i) information security standards and guidelines promulgated under section 11331 of title 40 and section 20 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278g-3);

“(ii) information security standards and guidelines for national security systems issued in accordance with law and as directed by the President; and

“(iii) ensuring the standards implemented for information systems and national security systems of the agency are complementary and uniform, to the extent practicable;

“(C) ensuring that information security management processes are integrated with agency strategic and operational planning and budget processes, including policies, procedures, and practices described in subsection (c)(2);

“(D) as appropriate, maintaining secure facilities that have the capability of accessing, sending, receiving, and storing classified information;

“(E) maintaining a sufficient number of personnel with security clearances, at the appropriate levels, to access, send, receive and analyze classified information to carry out the responsibilities of this subchapter; and

“(F) ensuring that information security performance indicators and measures are included in the annual performance evaluations of all managers, senior managers, senior executive service personnel, and political appointees;

“(2) ensure that senior agency officials provide information security for the information and information systems that support the operations and assets under their control, including through—

“(A) assessing the risk and magnitude of the harm that could result from the unau-

thorized access, use, disclosure, disruption, modification, or destruction of such information or information system;

“(B) determining the levels of information security appropriate to protect such information and information systems in accordance with policies, principles, standards, and guidelines promulgated under section 11331 of title 40 and section 20 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278g-3) for information security classifications and related requirements;

“(C) implementing policies and procedures to cost effectively reduce risks to an acceptable level;

“(D) with a frequency sufficient to support risk-based security decisions, testing and evaluating information security controls and techniques to ensure that such controls and techniques are effectively implemented and operated; and

“(E) with a frequency sufficient to support risk-based security decisions, conducting threat assessments by monitoring information systems, identifying potential system vulnerabilities, and reporting security incidents in accordance with paragraph (3)(A)(v);

“(3) delegate to the Chief Information Officer or equivalent (or a senior agency official who reports to the Chief Information Officer or equivalent), who is designated as the ‘Chief Information Security Officer’, the authority and primary responsibility to develop, implement, and oversee an agencywide information security program to ensure and enforce compliance with the requirements imposed on the agency under this subchapter, including—

“(A) overseeing the establishment and maintenance of a security operations capability that through automated and continuous monitoring, when possible, can—

“(i) detect, report, respond to, contain, and mitigate incidents that impair information security and agency information systems, in accordance with policy provided by the Director;

“(ii) commensurate with the risk to information security, monitor and mitigate the vulnerabilities of every information system within the agency;

“(iii) continually evaluate risks posed to information collected or maintained by or on behalf of the agency and information systems and hold senior agency officials accountable for ensuring information security;

“(iv) collaborate with the Director and appropriate public and private sector security operations centers to detect, report, respond to, contain, and mitigate incidents that impact the security of information and information systems that extend beyond the control of the agency; and

“(v) report any incident described under clauses (i) and (ii) to the Federal information security incident center, to other appropriate security operations centers, and to the Inspector General of the agency, to the extent practicable, within 24 hours after discovery of the incident, but no later than 48 hours after such discovery;

“(B) developing, maintaining, and overseeing an agencywide information security program as required by subsection (b);

“(C) developing, maintaining, and overseeing information security policies, procedures, and control techniques to address all applicable requirements, including those issued under section 11331 of title 40;

“(D) training and overseeing personnel with significant responsibilities for information security with respect to such responsibilities; and

“(E) assisting senior agency officials concerning their responsibilities under paragraph (2);

“(4) ensure that the agency has a sufficient number of trained and cleared personnel to

assist the agency in complying with the requirements of this subchapter, other applicable laws, and related policies, procedures, standards, and guidelines;

“(5) ensure that the Chief Information Security Officer, in consultation with other senior agency officials, reports periodically, but not less than annually, to the agency head on—

“(A) the effectiveness of the agency information security program;

“(B) information derived from automated and continuous monitoring, when possible, and threat assessments; and

“(C) the progress of remedial actions;

“(6) ensure that the Chief Information Security Officer possesses the necessary qualifications, including education, training, experience, and the security clearance required to administer the functions described under this subchapter; and has information security duties as the primary duty of that official; and

“(7) ensure that components of that agency establish and maintain an automated reporting mechanism that allows the Chief Information Security Officer with responsibility for the entire agency, and all components thereof, to implement, monitor, and hold senior agency officers accountable for the implementation of appropriate security policies, procedures, and controls of agency components.

“(b) AGENCY PROGRAM.—Each agency shall develop, document, and implement an agencywide information security program, approved by the Director and consistent with components across and within agencies, to provide information security for the information and information systems that support the operations and assets of the agency, including those provided or managed by another agency, contractor, or other source, that includes—

“(1) automated and continuous monitoring, when possible, of the risk and magnitude of the harm that could result from the disruption or unauthorized access, use, disclosure, modification, or destruction of information and information systems that support the operations and assets of the agency;

“(2) consistent with guidance developed under section 11331 of title 40, vulnerability assessments and penetration tests commensurate with the risk posed to agency information systems;

“(3) policies and procedures that—

“(A) cost effectively reduce information security risks to an acceptable level;

“(B) ensure compliance with—

“(i) the requirements of this subchapter;

“(ii) policies and procedures as may be prescribed by the Director, and information security standards promulgated pursuant to section 11331 of title 40;

“(iii) minimally acceptable system configuration requirements, as determined by the Director; and

“(iv) any other applicable requirements, including—

“(I) standards and guidelines for national security systems issued in accordance with law and as directed by the President; and

“(II) the National Institute of Standards and Technology standards and guidance;

“(C) develop, maintain, and oversee information security policies, procedures, and control techniques to address all applicable requirements, including those promulgated pursuant section 11331 of title 40; and

“(D) ensure the oversight and training of personnel with significant responsibilities for information security with respect to such responsibilities;

“(4) with a frequency sufficient to support risk-based security decisions, automated and continuous monitoring, when possible, for

testing and evaluation of the effectiveness and compliance of information security policies, procedures, and practices, including—

“(A) controls of every information system identified in the inventory required under section 3505(c); and

“(B) controls relied on for an evaluation under this section;

“(5) a process for planning, implementing, evaluating, and documenting remedial action to address any deficiencies in the information security policies, procedures, and practices of the agency;

“(6) with a frequency sufficient to support risk-based security decisions, automated and continuous monitoring, when possible, for detecting, reporting, and responding to security incidents, consistent with standards and guidelines issued by the National Institute of Standards and Technology, including—

“(A) mitigating risks associated with such incidents before substantial damage is done;

“(B) notifying and consulting with the Federal information security incident center and other appropriate security operations response centers; and

“(C) notifying and consulting with, as appropriate—

“(i) law enforcement agencies and relevant Offices of Inspectors General; and

“(ii) any other agency, office, or entity, in accordance with law or as directed by the President; and

“(7) plans and procedures to ensure continuity of operations for information systems that support the operations and assets of the agency.

“(c) AGENCY REPORTING.—Each agency shall—

“(1) submit an annual report on the adequacy and effectiveness of information security policies, procedures, and practices, and compliance with the requirements of this subchapter, including compliance with each requirement of subsection (b) to—

“(A) the Director;

“(B) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate;

“(C) the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives;

“(D) other appropriate authorization and appropriations committees of Congress; and

“(E) the Comptroller General;

“(2) address the adequacy and effectiveness of information security policies, procedures, and practices in plans and reports relating to—

“(A) annual agency budgets;

“(B) information resources management of this subchapter;

“(C) information technology management under this chapter;

“(D) program performance under sections 1105 and 1115 through 1119 of title 31, and sections 2801 and 2805 of title 39;

“(E) financial management under chapter 9 of title 31, and the Chief Financial Officers Act of 1990 (31 U.S.C. 501 note; Public Law 101-576);

“(F) financial management systems under the Federal Financial Management Improvement Act of 1996 (31 U.S.C. 3512 note); and

“(G) internal accounting and administrative controls under section 3512 of title 31; and

“(3) report any significant deficiency in a policy, procedure, or practice identified under paragraph (1) or (2)—

“(A) as a material weakness in reporting under section 3512 of title 31; and

“(B) if relating to financial management systems, as an instance of a lack of substantial compliance under the Federal Financial Management Improvement Act of 1996 (31 U.S.C. 3512 note).

“§ 3555. Federal information security incident center

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall ensure the operation of a central Federal information security incident center to—

“(1) provide timely technical assistance to operators of agency information systems regarding security incidents, including guidance on detecting and handling information security incidents;

“(2) compile and analyze information about incidents that threaten information security;

“(3) inform operators of agency information systems about current and potential information security threats, and vulnerabilities; and

“(4) consult with the National Institute of Standards and Technology, agencies or offices operating or exercising control of national security systems (including the National Security Agency), and such other agencies or offices in accordance with law and as directed by the President regarding information security incidents and related matters.

“(b) NATIONAL SECURITY SYSTEMS.—Each agency operating or exercising control of a national security system shall share information about information security incidents, threats, and vulnerabilities with the Federal information security incident center to the extent consistent with standards and guidelines for national security systems, issued in accordance with law and as directed by the President.

“(c) REVIEW AND APPROVAL.—The Director shall review and approve the policies, procedures, and guidance established in this subchapter to ensure that the incident center has the capability to effectively and efficiently detect, correlate, respond to, contain, mitigate, and remediate incidents that impair the adequate security of the information systems of more than one agency. To the extent practicable, the capability shall be continuous and technically automated.

“§ 3556. National security systems

“The head of each agency operating or exercising control of a national security system shall be responsible for ensuring that the agency—

“(1) provides information security protections commensurate with the risk and magnitude of the harm resulting from the unauthorized access, use, disclosure, disruption, modification, or destruction of the information contained in such system;

“(2) implements information security policies and practices as required by standards and guidelines for national security systems, issued in accordance with law and as directed by the President; and

“(3) complies with the requirements of this subchapter.”.

SEC. 3. TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) TABLE OF SECTIONS IN TITLE 44.—The table of sections for chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, is amended by striking the matter relating to subchapters II and III and inserting the following:

“SUBCHAPTER II—INFORMATION SECURITY

“Sec.

“3551. Purposes.

“3552. Definitions.

“3553. Authority and functions of the Director.

“3554. Agency responsibilities.

“3555. Federal information security incident center.

“3556. National security systems.”.

(b) OTHER REFERENCES.—

(1) Section 1001(c)(1)(A) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 511(c)(1)(A)) is amended by striking “section 3532(3)” and inserting “section 3552(b)”.

(2) Section 2222(j)(5) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking “section 3542(b)(2)” and inserting “section 3552(b)”.

(3) Section 2223(c)(3) of title 10, United States Code, is amended, by striking “section 3542(b)(2)” and inserting “section 3552(b)”.

(4) Section 2315 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking “section 3542(b)(2)” and inserting “section 3552(b)”.

(5) Section 20 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278g-3) is amended—

(A) in subsections (a)(2) and (e)(5), by striking “section 3532(b)(2)” and inserting “section 3552(b)”;

(B) in subsection (e)(2), by striking “section 3532(1)” and inserting “section 3552(b)”.

(6) Section 8(d)(1) of the Cyber Security Research and Development Act (15 U.S.C. 7406(d)(1)) is amended by striking “section 3534(b)” and inserting “section 3554(b)”.

SEC. 4. NO ADDITIONAL FUNDS AUTHORIZED.

No additional funds are authorized to carry out the requirements of section 3554 of title 44, United States Code, as amended by section 2 of this Act. Such requirements shall be carried out using amounts otherwise authorized or appropriated.

SEC. 5. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act (including the amendments made by this Act) shall take effect 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ISSA. Madam 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 the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, cybersecurity threats represent one of the most serious national security and economic challenges we face as a Nation. Whether it's criminal hackers, organized crime, terrorist networks or national states, our Nation is under siege from dangerous cybersecurity threats that grow daily in frequency and sophistication.

□ 1840

It is critical that the Federal Government address cybersecurity threats in a manner that keeps pace with the Nation's growing dependence on technology. The President himself recently stated: “Cybersecurity is a challenge that we as a government or as a country are not adequately prepared to counter.”

Madam Speaker, it is essential that we, in fact, change that here today.

Current law does not adequately address the nature of today's cybersecurity threats. Since the enactment in 2002 of the Federal Information Security Management Act, or FISMA, it

has become a check-the-box compliance activity that all too often has little to do with minimizing security threats, and yet the Government Accountability Office recently found that security incidents among 24 key agencies increased more than 650 percent during the last 5 years.

To address the rising challenge posed by cyberthreats, Ranking Member CUMMINGS and I introduced H.R. 4257, the Federal Information Security Amendments Act of 2012. The bill aims to harness the last decade of technological innovation in securing the Federal information systems. It amends FISMA to move beyond the check-the-box compliance mentality. It enhances the current framework for securing Federal information technology systems.

Our bill calls for automated and continuous monitoring of government information systems. And it ensures that control monitoring finally incorporates regular threat assessment and—Madam Speaker, this is the most important part of what we do—continuous monitoring and constant threat assessments so that never again will we find that the incidents are going up double digits every month in some cases.

The bill also reaffirms the role of the Office of Management and Budget, or OMB, with respect to FISMA, recognizing that the budgetary leverage of the Executive Office of the President is necessary to ensure agencies are focused on effective security of its IT systems.

While our bill does not include new requirements, restrictions, or mandates on private or non-Federal computer systems, H.R. 4257 does highlight the need for stronger public-private partnerships. Through our Web site, [keepthewebopen.com](http://keepthewebopen.com), our bill has been vetted by the American people. It has also received strong support from cybersecurity experts and industry, including the Information Technology Industry Council and the Business Software Alliance.

I'd like to thank my ranking member, Mr. CUMMINGS, for a one-on-one equal partnership with me in the efforts to address the growing threat for cybersecurity. He has led the way on his side of the aisle, and I have been honored to serve on my side. We have encouraged all Members to support this timely legislation. We recognize that some things are too important to be partisan. This certainly is one of them. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, first of all, I'd like to express my appreciation to the chairman of our committee for his kind words and for his cooperation. I start by thanking him for working with me and my staff to make this a bipartisan effort, and it is truly a bipartisan effort. From the beginning, we agreed that we did not want to make securing

our Federal information systems a partisan issue and that securing our Nation against a cyberattack is an issue that transcends any party lines. This bill is evidence of the good work that we can do when we work together to address an important issue like cybersecurity.

Not only does this bill enjoy bipartisan support, but it is noncontroversial. Last week, the bill was marked up in committee and passed on a voice vote. The only amendments considered made constructive changes to the bill that were recommended by the National Institute of Standards and Technology and the Government Accountability Office. These changes enjoyed universal support in committee.

This legislation will ensure that Federal agencies use a risk-based approach to defend against cyberattacks and protect government information from being compromised by our adversaries. The bill would make key changes to help protect our Federal information systems from cyberattacks. It would shift the Federal Government to a system of continuous monitoring of information systems, streamline reporting requirements, and ensure that agencies take a smart, risk-based approach to securing networks.

This bill will continue to authorize the Office of Management and Budget to set Federal policy for information security. This is important because we need to hold all agencies accountable for developing appropriate standards and living up to them. However, nothing in this bill would prevent the Department of Homeland Security from continuing the great work it is doing to protect our Nation against potential cyberattacks.

The Department has dramatically expanded its cybersecurity workforce, and it has built the National Cybersecurity and Communications Integration Center to serve as Federal Government's cybersecurity command center. This command center is a vital part of our efforts to protect Federal information systems.

Earlier this month, the head of U.S. Cyber Command, General Keith Alexander, testified that securing our Nation against cyberthreats is one of our biggest national security challenges. Securing our Federal information systems is a critical component of addressing this challenge, and I urge my colleagues to join me and our chairman in supporting this legislation.

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

Mr. ISSA. Madam Speaker, we have a speaker on the other side for a colloquy, so I'd reserve at this time to allow him to go next.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I want to thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. I thank my friend from Maryland, the distinguished ranking member.

I want to thank Chairman ISSA and appreciate the work of him and the ranking member, Mr. CUMMINGS, and their staff on this legislation, which I think is a thoughtful, bipartisan update to an information security bill actually written by my predecessor and the chairman's, Tom Davis of Virginia.

The FISMA Amendments Act transitions from compliance to performance metrics to address major shortcomings in Federal agency cybersecurity implementation. Of course, when considering the performance of Federal agencies, it's a natural extension to question the relationship between the executive branch and those agencies and the relationship among technology and cybersecurity-related positions within the executive branch.

I appreciate President Obama's focus on technology, particularly the chief information officer's 25-point plan, but I'm concerned that the current ad hoc nature of the CIO, CTO, and Cybersecurity coordinator could create certain risk and continuity of operations challenges when we look out to further administrations. I would ask Chairman ISSA if he shares those concerns.

I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ISSA. I thank the gentleman. I do share those concerns and appreciate the gentleman's work on this.

Proper organization of the executive branch is essential to the successful long-term management of technology, and particularly cybersecurity.

This policy is going to require additional work. FISMA is not the end but, in fact, a starting point; and I look forward to working with the gentleman to make sure that as we work with the executive branch, including OMB, that we get it right and we keep the focus where it needs to be on all the agencies and bringing them together.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman and look forward to working with him and the ranking member, as well as Mr. LANGEVIN of Rhode Island, who has been a leader on this subject, to advance legislation that will address executive branch organization in the context of cybersecurity. With the right framework, I believe the current and future administrations will be able to more efficiently implement these FISMA reforms and other related legislation. Given its jurisdiction, the Oversight and Government Reform Committee is the appropriate venue to develop such legislation, and I look forward to working with the committee chair and ranking member to advance it.

□ 1850

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

Mr. LANGEVIN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise to engage in a colloquy with my colleague and friend, the chairman of the Committee on

Oversight and Government Reform, Mr. ISSA.

I'd first like to thank the chairman for his hard work. His efforts to update the Federal Information Security Management Act have been commendably inclusive and bipartisan, and I want to thank him and his staff, as well as Mr. CUMMINGS and Mr. CONNOLLY and their staff, for all the outreach and good faith negotiation that's occurred during the crafting of this legislation.

There can be no question that the FISMA reform language before the House today is both sorely needed and long overdue. To this end, together with my good friend and our former colleague, Ms. Watson, I introduced an amendment that passed the House overwhelmingly last Congress during consideration of the FY 2011 National Defense Authorization Act.

That amendment, which was, unfortunately, stripped out during conference with the Senate, would have made important updates to FISMA, in addition to establishing a National Office for Cyberspace in the Executive Office of the President.

Such an office has been recommended by the Obama administration's 60-Day Cyberspace Policy Review, public-private sector working groups such as the CSIS Commission on Cybersecurity for the 44th Presidency, which I cochaired with my good friend, Mr. McCAUL, and the GAO, as a response to security deficiencies throughout the Federal Government.

While I applaud my friend for delivering on the need for FISMA reform, I'd like to ask the chairman if he gave thought to such organizational changes within the executive branch and, in particular, an organization like a National Office for Cyberspace during the drafting of this legislation.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. ISSA. I thank the gentleman. And yes, we did. Your leadership on cybersecurity matters, including FISMA reform, have been essential.

When you and I served on the Select Intelligence Committee, I recognized that you put more time and effort into the behind-the-door work than any of us. And, in fact, you and I share some of the challenges that we faced with the DNI and other earlier organizations.

But I share with you that your suggestions on how we can, in fact, find single-point accountability in future legislation, in concert with this administration, is essential. I look forward to working with you on exactly that. I know of no other partner I could have on the other side of the aisle that is more prepared to do it, and I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LANGEVIN. I thank the gentleman for that. In that spirit, I'd like to encourage the gentleman to continue in this open and bipartisan fashion. I'd like to ask if you would be interested in working together on such subsequent legislation, along with Mr. CUMMINGS and Mr. CONNOLLY, who have

been so involved and thoughtful on this issue.

I believe that such legislation should include strong, centralized oversight to protect our Nation's critical infrastructure, including budgetary oversight powers, while remaining accountable to Congress.

Mr. ISSA. I couldn't agree with the gentleman more. Your work with our staff has been essential. I look forward to doing exactly that, and I think we have to have that ongoing effort to get to there.

I saw the ranking member's head also shaking. I know that we will both look forward to working with you on a bipartisan basis.

Mr. LANGEVIN. I thank the gentleman for that, and I look forward to working with my good friend to ensure that our Federal Government is properly addressing this critically important issue.

Mr. ISSA. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my colleague and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ), the chairman of the subcommittee that has done so much on, in fact, cybersecurity.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Madam Speaker, I appreciate Chairman ISSA and his foresight and leadership on this issue in driving this forward. This is so, so important to our country and our nation, and for the Federal Government to operate properly.

Madam Speaker, I also want to thank and recognize the ranking member, Mr. CUMMINGS, his unparalleled support and need and just patriotism for what's good for this Nation, working together in a bipartisan way. This is what I think the American people want, and this is what they get in this bill.

I also want to share the fact that cybersecurity is a real threat. It's a threat to the mom who's got the computer sitting in there in the kitchen, and the kids are going in every direction, to the most secure infrastructure we have in our Federal Government. It is imperative that we get this right, because everything from a guy in a van down by the river to nation-states, our country is under a constant bombardment and attack, for our intellectual property, to trade secrets, to what's going on in this government.

And while this is focused on what our government is doing and how it's organized, it updates the law so that we have the right provisions at the right place, and we're doing the right things. We have to be vigilant as a people. So this is focused, not—it doesn't give a new mandate. There's no new mandate upon the American people. There's no mandate upon businesses.

What this does is get the structure for what should happen in the Federal Government right, and updating and doing things like continuous monitoring, vulnerability assessments and penetration tests that are done within the Federal Government. It requires a chief information security officer within these different agencies, and it fo-

cuses these efforts upon the Director of OMB.

By really putting the focal point on the executive branch within the White House, you will get a much better response, because everything, from the Bureau of Indian Affairs to the Department of Defense and everywhere in between, we have to make sure that our systems are updated because the threat is constant, it is real, it is 24/7. And without these updates, without the constant monitoring, without these types of things, we will be doing a disservice to the American people, and we will not be living up to the commitment that we have to make sure that these networks are as secure as they possibly can be.

This is something that will be with us, not just for the next 6 months, not just for the next year, but for the foreseeable future. And Madam Speaker, that's why I'm so enthusiastic about this bill. I appreciate the bipartisan nature in which it was done. And I certainly appreciate Chairman ISSA and his leadership on this. I'm glad to be part of it.

I would encourage my colleagues to vote in favor of this bill.

Mr. CUMMINGS. We don't have any additional speakers. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ISSA. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) who coordinated so much of the work that we're doing today from multiple committees.

Mr. THORNBERRY. I thank Chairman ISSA for yielding. Madam Speaker, I want to commend the chairman and the ranking member for working together and bringing this important bill to the floor.

I also want to commend the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ), who was a member of our task force and, as the chairman noted, has done so much work on this.

Madam Speaker, this is an important bill on cybersecurity. The FISMA law passed in 2002 needs to be updated. The growth in the number and sophistication of the threats has not been matched by our response, and so laws and policies are increasingly outdated and not able to keep up with the threats faced by Federal networks as well as private sector networks.

And this bill requires continuous monitoring, as you have heard. The threat is dynamic. It changes. It doesn't work anymore to just check a box and say, I've done this. You have to have that continuous monitoring of what's happening within your networks. That's important for defense of the Federal Government, but it's also important to be an example for the rest of the country. And in cybersecurity, it seems to me, it's particularly important for the Federal Government to lead by example.

I also want to just say that this is an example of an issue, a part of cybersecurity, on which everybody agrees needs to happen, and this committee

has brought a bipartisan answer. We cannot allow differences that may exist between this body and the other body on other cybersecurity issues prevent us from taking action, getting something accomplished on something that everybody agrees on.

This is one of the things everybody agrees needs to happen. Information-sharing, everybody agrees on. Research and development that we'll have tomorrow on the floor, everybody agrees needs to happen.

I appreciate the work of this committee. It's an important bill. It will help make the Nation more secure, as well as this government, and I hope all Members will support it.

Mr. ISSA. Madam Speaker, at this time I have no other speakers, and I'm prepared to close.

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

Madam Speaker, I want to associate myself with all the words that have been said by both sides this evening, because we understand that cybersecurity is so very, very important to our Nation. We often look back to 9/11 and we think about what happened in that very short time, and how it disrupted our entire Nation, taking planes out of the air, causing our world to at least pause.

□ 1900

We saw the damage that was done in a matter of a few minutes.

Cybersecurity and the cyberthreat is just as great, if not far greater, and can happen very, very quickly. A cyberattack can take place very, very quickly, and it is something that we must do everything in our power to protect ourselves against. This bill does not solve all the problems, but it certainly leads us in the right direction.

Again, I want to thank the chairman. I want to thank everybody involved for the bipartisan effort and for making the security of our Nation our number one priority.

With that, I urge all of the Members to vote for this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ISSA. Madam Speaker, in closing, I urge all Members to support the passage of this bill, H.R. 4257, as amended. I want to make one closing statement.

Often we talk about cybersecurity, and people think just about the Internet. We sit here in a room that is essentially windowless. I've been in this room when the lights are out. It is very, very dark. We would have a hard time finding our way out. Yet the very essence of keeping the grid up requires computers to talk to each other. Our phone systems, our lights, our power, our sewage, our water all depend today on interoperable computer systems that span the entire country and, in many cases, the entire world.

So, as people realize the government-to-government relationship and, par-

ticularly, the public-private partnerships that this bill encourages and asks the Office of Management and Budget to assure occur, we are doing so, of course, in order to maintain a reliable Internet; but much more importantly, the fundamentals of the very electricity that powers the Internet must be maintained and protected. I believe we've gone a long way today in the passage of this bill. I urge its passage.

I thank the gentleman from Maryland for his leadership on this important matter.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank Chairman ISSA for the hard work that he and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform has undertaken in the development of H.R. 4257, the Federal Information Security Amendments Act of 2012.

This bill updates and improves the decade old Federal Information Security and Management Act (FISMA). FISMA currently requires each Federal agency to develop, document, and implement an agency-wide program to provide information security for their systems.

The Science, Space, and Technology Committee receives annual FISMA reports from each Federal agency. These reports detail the management and security of each agency's information technology resources, and the actions necessary to ensure the effectiveness of the government's information security policies.

The Science, Space, and Technology Committee monitors these reports to review the cybersecurity standards and guidelines that the National Institute of Standards and Technology sets for Federal information systems. These standards and guidelines are particularly important because along with agency use, the same standards and guidelines are frequently adopted on a voluntary basis by many organizations in the private sector. The Committee will continue to receive and review these annual FISMA reports from Federal agencies, and will provide continued oversight of NIST's role in FISMA process.

H.R. 4257 takes an important step forward in the protection of the government's information technology resources by establishing a mechanism for stronger oversight. The bill ensures implementation of new developments in technological innovation, including automated and continuous monitoring of cybersecurity threats as well as regular threat assessments.

Our Federal agencies depend on FISMA to guide them to protect federal networks. Officials are already working to integrate some of the concepts proposed by H.R. 4257, such as continuous monitoring, into the management of information systems. I am encouraged that this bill will help agencies more easily comply with the latest cybersecurity standards and guidelines set forth by NIST.

H.R. 4257 is a good bill that represents another critical piece in Congress's overall efforts to address the Nation's cybersecurity needs. There are additional tweaks that could make the bill even better, and I look forward to working with Mr. ISSA as the bill moves through the process to address remaining issues to our mutual satisfaction.

I support the passage of H.R. 4257 and encourage my colleagues to do the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr.

ISSA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4257, 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.

#### HATERS OF RELIGION

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, in the quiet town of Woonsocket, Rhode Island, a 91-year-old memorial honoring hometown soldiers stands tall outside a local fire station. A stone bottom statue with a cross on top immortalizes the fallen heroes who sacrificed so much for our country. For decades, the memorial has stood in the shadows of the fire station with no complaints from local residents.

But a group of out-of-towners, not from Woonsocket, not even from Rhode Island, but from 1,000 miles away in Wisconsin, have self-righteously objected to the cross on top of the 91-year-old memorial. The antireligious hate group demands that the cross be removed. They also demand that the firefighters' prayer and angel from the Woonsocket Fire Department Web site be removed.

Madam Speaker, the firefighter prayer asks God to give them "strength to save lives" and to protect the families of the firefighters.

County officials will not succumb to the intimidation tactics of the bigoted group. The mayor has said he will not remove the cross under any circumstances because the Constitution protects the free exercise of religion whether this hate group likes it or not.

And that's just the way it is.

#### PAYCHECK FAIRNESS

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

Ms. BERKLEY. Madam Speaker, it's hard to believe that in the 21st century women in Nevada are still making only 83 cents for every dollar that a man makes.

What does that mean in real terms? It means a difference of \$7,326 a year. It is not fair. In most cases, working women in Nevada are either the primary or the sole breadwinners of their families.

That's why I'm calling on the Speaker to follow the Senate's lead and to schedule a vote on the Paycheck Fairness Act, which is legislation that will help close the unacceptable wage gap between men and women in this country. Unfortunately, far too many in the House and the Senate are still living in the Dark Ages when it comes to basic fairness for women.

Women in Nevada are still shaking their heads in disbelief that in the year

2012 one of the major debates in this Congress has been whether to restrict access to birth control, and now there are those in the House and Senate who have voted time and time again against enforcing equal pay for equal work.

It is time for this Congress to join the rest of us in the 21st century. Let's get the paycheck fairness bill on the floor, and let's vote "yes."

IN HONOR OF LANCE CORPORAL  
CODY EVANS

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

Mr. FLEISCHMANN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor an outstanding young man from my district who I've recently had the pleasure of getting to know. Lance Corporal Cody Evans of Speedwell, Tennessee, serves in the United States Marine Corps as a combat engineer, one of the most dangerous jobs in the military.

While serving in Afghanistan, Lance Corporal Evans stepped on a pressure plate while sweeping for IEDs, nearly losing his life. He lost both legs and suffered numerous other injuries. I met Lance Corporal Evans in January of this year in a visit to Walter Reed. To say that I was impressed by this young man's spirit and resilience would be an understatement. Cody has the spirit of a fighter, a spirit that has led to his continued recovery.

No mention of Cody would be complete without mentioning his mother, Regina, who has been with him constantly. Her dedication to her son is incredible.

As a Nation, we must recognize those who serve, who have the character and commitment to risk their lives so that we may sleep peacefully at home. Cody Evans deserves this recognition, which is why it is my honor to ask that this poem penned by Albert Caswell be placed into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I . . .  
I Volunteered. . .  
But, to do my very best. . .  
As I so raised my hand like all of the rest!  
Patriots, who over the years our nation have so blessed!  
As I so went off to war, but for the greater good like all of the rest!  
Men of steel, whose hearts so chose to crest!  
As Cody, you so watched your brothers die!  
While, holding them in your arms as you began to cry. . .  
And oh yes you Cody, you have so proudly worn. . .  
Those most magnificent shades of green, that uniform!  
Because, to be A United States Marine. . . you were born!  
For you'd much rather die for something, than live for nothing at all!  
As why Cody you so answered that most noble of all calls!  
That Call To Arms, That Call To War. . . while standing tall!  
As you almost died, oh yes a couple of times. . .  
While, there on the very edge of death you so lie!  
As you could have given up, but instead you chose to rise. . .

As your newest mountain you were about to climb!  
Because, Cody you Volunteered for that fight!  
Yea Cody, because you're from Tennessee where men with brave hearts ever burn bright!  
Who, In Strength In Honor do so believe!  
Where them and their families are as strong as Hickory trees!  
And all in our Country Tis of Thee, they do so believe!  
This Volunteer from Tennessee!  
As yes you have lost your two strong fine legs, but you won't moan and you won't beg!  
Because, that's just The Volunteer all in you!  
In fact Andrew Jackson Cody, would be so proud of you!  
All because of what upon the battlefield of honor, into what you so grew. . .  
For surely Cody you had one of the toughest jobs of that war. . .  
As a Combat Engineer, where every new step meant but death for sure!  
Something that so demanded such faith and nerves of steel!  
As you and your brothers so fought and died for was right and what was real!  
And still somehow on this very day, your strength and will to so come back from the dead so impresses me!  
To So Teach Us All!  
To So Beseech Us All!  
To So Reach Us All!  
To This Our Nation To So Bless!  
For you are but The Toast of Tennessee!  
But, in Heaven you need not arms or even legs!  
And that is where you are going Cody one fine day!  
And if ever I had a son!  
I wish he could but shine just half as bright, as this great one!  
This United States Marine!  
Who embodies the very heart of Tennessee!  
Who so Volunteered, all for this our Country Tis of Thee!  
As you so Volunteered to make America Safe and Free!  
I could do a million great things, but such light to this our world I could never bring!  
As you are a most magnificent United States Marine!  
All in what your fine life has said, and so means!  
Moments are all we have to so make a difference in all we have!  
To bring our light, to fight the bad!  
Cody, to be an American. . . you make me so proud to be!  
For you are one of her greatest of all sons, Ooh. . . Rah, a Shining Son of Tennessee. . .  
If it were not for Heroes like you and Volunteers, where would this nation be?  
—By Albert Carey Caswell.

ENERGY ISSUES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. POE of Texas. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Tonight, I and other Members of the House are going to talk about energy issues in the United States.

Probably a timely thing to start with are the recent comments by one of the individuals who works for the Environ-

mental Protection Agency, the EPA. The more we learn about the EPA, the more we learn that they are hostile to real American energy for various reasons. Let me give you some historical perspective that makes this continuous assault on the oil and gas industry make sense to us now in 2012.

It seems that back in 2010, 2 years ago, EPA Region 6 Administrator Al Armendariz stood up on his bureaucratic pedestal of power and spelled out the true intentions that he had and the goals of the EPA. He declared that the EPA—and he declared this from his marble palace here in Washington, D.C.—that the EPA would target the oil and gas industry, calling it an "enforcement priority" as if, Madam Speaker, the oil and gas industry were made up of criminals.

He went on:

I was in a meeting once, and I gave an analogy to my staff about my philosophy of enforcement, and I think it was probably a little crude and maybe not appropriate for the meeting, but I'll go ahead and tell you what I said.

And here is what he said, Madam Speaker:

It was kind of like how the Romans used to do—you know, conquer villages in the Mediterranean. They'd go into a little Turkish town somewhere. They'd find the first five guys they saw, and they'd crucify them.

That's right—they would crucify them—as if he is advocating crucifying the oil and gas industry. What a thing to say from somebody who works for the Federal Government.

He said he would make examples out of the people in the oil and gas industry. Probably unknown to him, his speech was all caught on videotape that recently surfaced. In fact, it was on the Internet YouTube last night; but today, mysteriously, it seems to have disappeared and is no longer on YouTube. That was in 2010.

These comments help us to understand the EPA's belligerent attitude against energy—American energy—against the oil and gas industry. What came after was one of the most aggressive assaults on the oil and gas industry we've ever seen. As a Wall Street Journal editorial once said, the EPA is at war with Texas. I think the EPA probably should change their name to the War Department because they are at war with America's energy. They certainly aren't concerned as much about the environment as they are about putting American energy out of business.

The oil and gas industry supports 9.2 million jobs in the United States. I wonder how many of those workers Mr. Armendariz wants to crucify all in the name of his political agenda.

Madam Speaker, we need a fair EPA, one that brings a balanced approach to the environment and to our energy industry. An attack on the energy industry is an attack, really, on the American people and American jobs. Mr. Armendariz seems to be at war with America. He does not want to really

help the oil and gas industry become environmentally safe. It seems to me he wants to kill it, and the effort will kill American jobs, kill our energy, and kill our national security.

The video also shows he is not concerned about real science, not about true environmental science or, really, the facts. He just hates the oil and gas industry. So, Madam Speaker, he needs to go. He needs to be replaced with someone who cares more about the environment than personal crusades against industry.

□ 1910

Madam Speaker, I would like to place in the RECORD the Forbes article that was published today regarding the EPA official that I just mentioned.

[From Forbes, Apr. 26, 2012]

**EPA OFFICIAL NOT ONLY TOUTED  
'CRUCIFYING' OIL COMPANIES, HE TRIED IT**

Confirming what many in the industry long suspected, a video surfaced Wednesday in which Al Armendariz, an official at the Environmental Protection Agency, promotes the idea of crucifying oil companies. Armendariz heads up the EPA's region 6 office, which is based in Dallas and responsible for oversight of Texas and surrounding states. The former professor at Southern Methodist University was appointed by President Obama in November 2009.

In a talk to colleagues about methods of EPA enforcement, Armendariz can be seen saying, "The Romans used to conquer little villages in the Mediterranean. They'd go into a little Turkish town somewhere, they'd find the first five guys they saw and they would crucify them. And then you know that town was really easy to manage for the next few years."

Range was among the first to discover the potential of the Marcellus Shale gas field of Pennsylvania—the biggest gas field in America and one of the biggest in the world. Armendariz's office declared in an emergency order that Range's drilling activity had contaminated groundwater in Parker County, Texas. Armendariz's office insisted that Range's hydraulic fracturing activity had caused the pollution and ordered Range to remediate the water. The EPA's case against Range was catnip for the environmental fracktivists who insist with religious zealotry that fracking is evil. Range insisted from the beginning that there was no substance to the allegations.

The Armendariz video (which appears to have been taken off YouTube late last night) was shot around the same time he was preparing the action against Range. Here's the highlights of what he said.

The Romans used to conquer little villages in the Mediterranean. They'd go into a little Turkish town somewhere, they'd find the first five guys they saw and they would crucify them. And then you know that town was really easy to manage for the next few years.

And so you make examples out of people who are in this case not compliant with the law. Find people who are not compliant with the law, and you hit them as hard as you can and you make examples out of them, and there is a deterrent effect there. And, companies that are smart see that, they don't want to play that game, and they decide at that point that it's time to clean up.

And, that won't happen unless you have somebody out there making examples of people. So you go out, you look at an industry, you find people violating the law, you go aggressively after them. And we do have some pretty effective enforcement tools. Compliance can get very high, very, very quickly.

That's what these companies respond to is both their public image but also financial pressure. So you put some financial pressure on a company, you get other people in that industry to clean up very quickly.

The former professor at Southern Methodist University is a diehard environmentalist, having grown up in El Paso near a copper smelter that reportedly belched arsenic-laced clouds into the air. (Here's a profile of him in the Dallas Observer.) Texas Monthly called him one of the 25 most powerful Texans, while the Houston Chronicle said he's "the most feared environmentalist in the state."

Never mind that he couldn't prove jack against Range. For a year and a half EPA bickered over the issue, both with Range and with the Texas Railroad Commission, which regulates oil and gas drilling and did its own scientific study of Range's wells and found no evidence that they polluted anything. In recent months a federal judge slapped the EPA, decreeing that the agency was required to actually do some scientific investigation of wells before penalizing the companies that drilled them. Finally in March the EPA withdrew its emergency order and a federal court dismissed the EPA's case.

David Porter, a commissioner on the Texas Railroad Commission, wasn't impressed. "Today the EPA finally made a decision based on science and fact versus playing politics with the Texas economy. The EPA's withdrawal of the emergency order against Range Resources upholds the Railroad Commission Final Order that I signed concluding that Range is not responsible for any water contamination in Parker County. Al Armendariz and the EPA's Region Six office are guilty of fear mongering, gross negligence and severe mishandling of this case. I hope to see drastic changes made in the way the regional office conducts business in the future—starting with the termination of Al Armendariz."

After an outcry emerged over the video on Wednesday, Armendariz apologized for his statements Wednesday night, reportedly saying: "I apologize to those I have offended and regret my poor choice of words. It was an offensive and inaccurate way to portray our efforts to address potential violations of our nation's environmental laws. I am and have always been committed to fair and vigorous enforcement of those laws."

He ought to resign as well. His comments in the video are proof that facts and science don't matter to him, that he's already made up his mind that the industry he has regulatory power over is evil. When you lose faith in the impartiality of regulators every action they take is tainted. He's the boy who cried wolf.

I want to continue my comments about America's energy by talking a little bit about gasoline and gasoline prices.

I ask Members, people back in Texas, in southeast Texas where I live, how rising gasoline prices have affected them personally, and I want to give the House the benefit of some of those statements made by American people about the high cost of gasoline and maybe some things that we can do about the high cost of gasoline.

Here's what they've said, and I'll take them one at a time.

One individual from southeast Texas says:

I spend more money on gasoline than I do on groceries.

Another:

Living in Texas requires driving greater distances to get anything. We have no choice

but to purchase gas, and it definitely cuts into our food budget.

You see, Madam Speaker, west of the Mississippi there are vast places, as the Speaker knows, where people roam and live in the rural areas, and it takes them a long time to get from point A to point B, especially when they're going to work sometimes, whether they work on the ranch or whether they work in small towns in America.

So, because of that greater distance, a lot of Americans don't realize that the only mode of transportation for some Americans is to drive a vehicle. That's how they get to work. They don't drive subways. They don't ride bicycles. They don't have the opportunity to walk to work because they live in the vastness of the West.

I'll continue:

Seventy percent of all business requires people to have discretionary income that's being siphoned off by higher gas, taxes, fees, and it's only getting worse because of high gasoline prices.

Another says:

As a retiree, high gasoline prices affects everything I do. Travel, possible vacation plans are no longer being discussed in our family. Anything I do is planned well so as to cut down on how much I drive. What I buy, because it is priced so high in the stores. The price in stores has tripled because stores are having to pay higher fuel prices to get their products to market.

Another one says:

I drive for a living, and it hurts.

Another Texan has written me and said:

I drive 175 miles round trip to work every day. I work for the Corps of Engineers, and the government doesn't give me one red cent for gasoline. It costs me \$900 a month for gasoline that I used to could use somewhere else.

Amazing number: \$900. In some cases, that's how much people pay on the rent on their house or an apartment. Yet we have one American doing his job working for the people of this country spending that much money just on gasoline.

Another individual wrote me and he said:

I can't afford to commute. But by my long hours as a businessowner, it makes it impossible to take mass transit or a carpool. So I have no alternative since I have no carpool, no mass transit, but I have to drive to get to work because I'm a businessowner, and the gasoline is driving me out of business.

Another one has said:

I drive 75 miles a day round trip for work, plus I pay \$7 in tolls. Yeah, it's hurting. I love my job, but it's getting to the point that what money I make is going straight back into the gas tank.

Another citizen has said:

I drive a 2000 Ford F-150 as my work vehicle. It's draining my wallet, but I need a full-size truck for my job.

Once again, in the West, a lot of folks drive pickup trucks. They don't only just drive them to work. That is their work vehicle. They use that in their job. It is their office. They don't have the luxury as some do to work in tall

skyscrapers and an office, as we consider an office. Their truck is their vehicle, and the F-150 is the standard-operating vehicle, at least in Texas and other parts of the country. By the way, it's the number one selling vehicle in the United States.

But Americans need to understand, and the government needs to understand, that's what Americans drive. That is their work vehicle in many cases. High gasoline prices affect their quality of life, and maybe we, as a body, ought to do something about gasoline that is now \$4 a gallon.

Another citizen told me:

Last month I spent \$600 on gas for my truck versus just \$300 a few years ago. Customers don't understand that the materials are going up due to the rising costs and the suppliers are raising the price to recoup the loss due to fuel prices skyrocketing.

What we pay at the grocery store or at any store where we do business, for a product, part of the cost of that product is getting it to market so Americans can buy it. It's costing more to get goods and services to market because of gasoline prices, and, of course, gasoline prices affect the price of goods, and therefore that is passed on to the consumer, to people in America who live here.

Another one says:

Where do I begin? I hated it, but I had to go from a 4Runner to a Corolla to handle my commute to work every day.

Another one said:

Since 2010, my food bill has gone from \$95 a week for a full cart to \$130 per week for half a cart of groceries. We are making more but keeping less. High gasoline prices affect my quality of life.

Another one says:

I have spent less on food so I could fill up three times a week at approximately \$75 to \$80 a tank.

Another citizen wrote me his concerns:

I had to find another job closer to home because it's getting ridiculous, the cost of gasoline.

An individual who uses his truck in his business said this:

I drive a hot-shot delivery truck, and I have to pay my own fuel. We do get a fuel surcharge, but it does not even come close to paying for the fuel. I spend \$200 to \$250 a week on fuel over what the surcharge pays me, and it's killing me.

That's what Americans are saying about gasoline prices. These are people who work every day, support their families. Yet gasoline affects them in personal ways.

Another individual wrote me about his religion is being affected, his religious commitment is being affected by the cost of gasoline. Here's what he says:

Because the church my family and I attend is 30 minutes away, we've chosen to attend Wednesday night church services closer to home. Also, we've had to give up two church service meetings during the week. It's upsetting for my fellow members to ask me on Sundays if I've left the church. It's also harder to maintain those close ties not seeing fellow members but once a week, and it's all due to high gasoline prices.

Another southeast Texan writes this comment to me:

We certainly have less "disposable income," as the phrase goes, and that means less money to spend in various businesses in our city because of the high cost it costs my family to buy gasoline.

Another one says this:

I've cut out everything extra, dine out less, fewer trips, stay at home for entertainment, prices of food have tripled, and I stretch leftovers as far as possible because of gas prices.

Another citizen and neighbor says:

I only drive where I have to. I shop at Kroger to get extra cents off of gas.

The Kroger grocery store gives people the deduction if they buy gasoline from Kroger, and they have the little Kroger card:

We just stay at home more than ever.

And a fisherman says this:

I am a commercial fisherman. Gas prices hurt at the pump and it has in turn driven up the prices for supplies. It's even driven up the price and cost of bait.

Another one lastly makes this comment:

It's just hard to make it these days.

So gasoline prices, which we're not talking a whole lot about now, some Americans have just accepted it as the new normal. I refuse to do that. I refuse to accept high gasoline prices.

□ 1920

I'm old enough to remember when gasoline cost—I don't want to shock the Speaker, because you're a whole lot younger than I am. I remember when I could fill up my Chevy II Super Sport in the early seventies for 26 cents a gallon. I know that shocks you, but gasoline prices have gone up. Of course in my generation, as Mr. BURTON from Indiana knows, when gasoline hit 30 cents a gallon, we all were shocked about it. Now we're paying \$4 a gallon.

We don't have to accept that. The reason we don't have to accept it is because sitting over here are America's natural resources, our God-given natural resources, just waiting to be developed. But as I mentioned earlier, we've got these bureaucrats down the street in their marble palaces called the EPA, and they regulate more than just light bulbs. They're regulating the oil and gas industry out of business, and I think it's a personal vendetta that they have for some reason.

There are things we should do, things we can do, and it's important that we discuss those. And we'll continue to discuss those tonight with my colleagues.

I do want to yield to my friend and colleague, Mr. BURTON from Indiana, for as much time as he wishes to consume.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. First of all, I want to thank my good friend Congressman POE of Texas for putting a face on the problem of high energy prices and high gasoline prices.

I listened to all of the things that you were reading there from your constituents about not being able to go to

work or buying huge amounts of gas two or three times a week, and it just breaks your heart. You know, I went to the store the other night and I bought two oranges. They were on sale at a dollar a piece. Two oranges for a dollar a piece. The reason for that is not just because they're growing them and it's costing more; it's because the transportation by diesel trucks and gasoline-powered trucks has gone up so much that they have to pass that onto the consumers with higher prices. If you talk to any man or woman who goes to the store, they'll tell you that they're feeling it when they buy their groceries, as well as at the gas pump.

I'd like to tell you a little story real quickly. You'll find this humorous because you talked about gasoline being 20-some cents when you were a little bit younger. I presume it was a little bit younger.

We were on a trip with some friends of ours, and we went to an island down off the coast of Florida in the Caribbean. This friend of mine and I, we rented two little motor scooters to go out to the corner of the island. Gasoline on the island was very high; it was 50 cents a gallon. He says, I'm not paying 50 cents a gallon for gasoline. So we took what we had in the cycles and we rode out there, and he ran out the gasoline. We had to get a coffee can and turn one cycle upside down to get enough gas in his cycle to get back. Well, we couldn't get my cycle turned back on. So he tried to pull me and my motorcycle, with my wife on the back, with a string back to the hotel room where we were staying, and we couldn't do it. It about broke my finger off.

So they left me at a Portuguese gasoline station where nobody spoke English, and they didn't understand a thing I was saying. My face was burned to a pulp from the sun, and I ended up not getting back until late that night with an almost third-degree burn because he wouldn't pay 50 cents for a gallon of gas. Imagine what he would think today at having to pay \$4 for a gallon of gas. The poor guy would just die.

Let me just look at this chart. My colleague was talking just a moment ago—and I wish all of the people in America, if I could talk to them, could see this chart. It shows that back in the early part of the Obama administration, gasoline was about \$2.68 a gallon, and now in some parts of the country it is over \$4 a gallon. It's killing the economy, it's killing people who have to go to work, as Congressman POE said, and we have the resources to deal with it.

The thing I wanted to talk about real quickly was—and I talked to Congressman POE about this—Interior Secretary Salazar, as well as the head of the EPA and the Energy Department, are having an all-out assault on Members of Congress who are pointing out that we have energy in this country that can be tapped to lower the price of

energy. They're attacking us, saying that we're just raising red herrings and not dealing with the problems as we should. I want to read this to you. Mr. Salazar, the head of the Interior Department says:

It's in this imagined energy world where we see this growing and continued divide in the energy debate in America. But the divide is not among ordinary Americans; it is between some people here in Washington, D.C.

I guess they mean you and me, Congressman POE.

He said:

It's a divide between the real energy world that we work on every day and the imagined, fairytale world.

And the President of the United States has said on a number of occasions that we're doing more drilling right now than we ever have and that the American people are being misled.

In addition to the chart I have on gasoline prices, I brought this chart down. This chart, Congressman POE, shows the number of applications for permits to drill and how they've been affected since the Obama administration has taken place. So I just want to go through these facts. If the President were paying attention, and if I were talking to him—but I know I can't—if I were talking to him, I would say, Mr. President, these are the facts. And I don't know who's giving you these facts down there at the White House, but, Mr. President, you ought to take a look at these facts because they're accurate.

First of all, according to the American Petroleum Institute, the number of new permits to drill issued by the Bureau of Land Management is down by 40 percent, from an average of over 6,400 permits in 2007 and 2008 to an average of 3,962 in 2009 to 2010. That's down by almost 40 percent. We're not drilling where we can. They're not issuing the permits.

During this same period, the number of new wells drilled on Federal land have declined. The number of oil wells have gone down by 40 percent, and the number of new Federal oil and gas leases issued by the Bureau of Land Management is down by almost 50 percent. Is it any wonder we're not going after our resources, we're depending on the Saudis, the people in South America and Venezuela, many of whom don't like us very much? As a result, we're paying more and more and more at the pump.

President Obama says that oil production is at an all-time high during his administration. However, the fact is oil production on Federal land fell by 11 percent last year, and oil production on private and State-owned land—where they couldn't touch it—did go up a little bit. That's what he's talking about. Where the government has control over permits, they're not letting us drill.

Federal lands hold an estimated 116 billion barrels of recoverable oil, enough to produce gasoline for 65 billion cars and fuel oil for 3.2 million

households for 60 years. Western oil shale deposits alone are estimated to contain up to five times the amount of Saudi oil reserves. Seventy percent of this oil shale is on Federal land, and we can't get to it because the President and his administration will not let us.

According to a recent CRS report, there are over 21.6 million acres of land leased by the Federal Government that are not currently producing oil or that have not been approved for exploration. Returning to the levels of 2007 and 2008, when the administration started, Federal leasing and permitting levels would have projected an increase of 7 million to 13 million barrels per year of domestic oil production, but they cut it back.

According to the American Petroleum Institute, an estimated 12,000 to 30,000 American jobs would be created in energy producing Western States over the next 4 years if we just went back to where we were drilling in 2007 and 2008. Furthermore, the Keystone XL pipeline, which the President has stopped dead, would bring to our economy thousands of new jobs and transport 830,000 barrels of oil to American refineries, which would be converted into oil and gasoline that would help this economy and lower gas prices.

With gas prices, as my colleague said, very, very high at over \$4 a gallon—and in some places here in Washington, it was up to \$5 a gallon not too long ago. With gas prices that high and affecting every American, it's clear that the United States needs to become more energy independent and signal to the world that the U.S. is open to production. If we started drilling where we can and exploring where we can, make no mistake, the people who sell oil to us will lower the price because they want to be competitive and they don't want to lose market share.

Whether it's the administration dragging its heels on approving permits for offshore drilling or drilling on Federal land, not opening up land for exploration, or not approving the Keystone pipeline, the Obama administration's policies are failing everyday Americans and costing millions in potential government revenue and thousands of new jobs.

□ 1930

So no matter what the administration people are saying, like Mr. Salazar or the EPA or the Energy Department, the fact is we have enough energy in this country to move toward energy independence over the next 5 to 10 years. But this administration wants to go to new sources of energy like windmills and solar panels and geothermal and nuclear. And all those things are important, but while we're starting to transition to new sources of energy, we need to use the energy that we have, which would lower the cost of energy to the average citizen and lower the price of gasoline so people, as Mr. POE has said, could get to work and live a competent, fair, friendly life.

With that, Mr. POE, thank you so much for giving me this time. I'm a big admirer of yours.

Mr. POE of Texas. Thank you, Mr. BURTON, for your comments. I appreciate the gentleman from Indiana.

Several comments about what you said are important. The administration, the government, says drilling is up in the United States. That is true. But drilling on Federal lands is not up.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Down 11 percent.

Mr. POE of Texas. The drilling is taking place on State-owned property or private property, but other lands other than Federal lands. If it wasn't for that, drilling would be down in the United States. If we go back to the Gulf of Mexico, the same situation we have in the Gulf of Mexico has been ever since the BP incident.

Permitting is taking too long. It takes a record amount of days, sometimes months, to issue a permit in the deep water and in the shallow water. The shallow water guys operate with a very small amount of capital. They can't stay and wait around for the government to make a decision on a permit or not, so they aren't able to drill. In the deep water, those deepwater wells, those rigs, they cost \$100,000 a day whether they're operating or they're sitting there, and that's why some of them have left the Gulf of Mexico to never return. They've gone down to South America; they've gone to off the coast of Africa, to drill where countries are friendlier to the drilling safely off of their coast.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. If I might, we sent \$3 billion of American taxpayers' money to Brazil at a time when we have almost a \$16 trillion national debt, and they're drilling in deepwater areas like we would be drilling in off the coast of Mexico. But we can't drill there because of the oil spill and because we can't get permits, so we're sending our taxpayers' dollars down to Brazil so they can do what we can't.

Mr. POE of Texas. If the gentleman will yield, we're not only sending money down there to develop their oil industry, when they develop it, we're going to buy their oil back. So we're paying them twice.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. That's right.

Mr. POE of Texas. Which doesn't make a whole lot of sense to me.

Now, I don't know and I don't really suspect that drilling would be the only answer for raising or lowering the gasoline prices, but it's one factor because of supply and demand. It's not the only factor, but it's one of those. It just seems to me that the United States is the only major power in the world that has an energy policy that is: We're not going to drill in the United States for all these reasons, but we want you to drill in your country your natural resources and we'll buy them from you. It seems a little bit arrogant on our part as a Nation.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Let me just say that Sarah Palin, whom everybody

in this country knows, she will tell you, and she's told people all across the country when she speaks, that they have a huge amount of oil in the ANWR and other parts of Alaska, and because of the radical environmentalist groups in this country, they can't drill up there.

Now, I've been up there. I was up there with DON YOUNG. We saw the oil pipeline. If you look at the ANWR, there's nothing up there. You're not going to hurt any of the animals. There's a lot of bugs. There's a lot of vermin up there. But you're not going to hurt the animals by drilling up there, and it's certainly not going to hurt the environment. But it would help if we could bring that oil—millions of barrels of oil—down to the lower 48 States. It would have a tremendous impact, in my opinion, as well as you've said, off the Gulf of Mexico and off the Continental Shelf. We could really move toward energy independence over a period of the next 5 to 10 years. Like you said, it wouldn't happen immediately, but it would be a giant step in the right direction.

Mr. POE of Texas. If the gentleman will yield, as you mentioned about ANWR in Alaska, years ago we came up with this idea of a pipeline from Alaska bringing crude oil into the United States, and the same people that opposed that pipeline still exist today and are opposing the Keystone Pipeline. It took years for the vetting of the environmental lobby to finally be put to rest. They were concerned about the caribou. Of course, I think the caribou are doing quite well now. Finally, Congress decided not to wait on that administration and go ahead and make an approval. But Congress went ahead and approved the Alaska pipeline on its own, which became law in spite of the administration. It didn't wait for its approval. And now we know the rest of the story—it's a success 25 years later. And that's what Congress needs to do with the Keystone Pipeline.

No one has ever accused Canada of being environmentally insensitive. Their regulations are as tough as the EPA's—or even stronger. But yet they've developed a way that they can bring crude oil through a pipeline down to southeast Texas—Port Arthur, my district—in a safe, environmental way, and also one of the newest and finest pipelines. But the administration says, Not so fast. And it's unfortunate because the jobs will stay in America. Create that pipeline. Canada is not a Middle Eastern dictatorship. They're kind of a normal country.

We should approve that as soon as possible. I understand the concern in Nebraska. I'm glad to see the folks in Nebraska are working with TransCanada to reroute that 60 miles so there are no environmental issues and get this pipeline approved and start shipping that crude oil down to southeast Texas so we can use it in the United States.

It would seem to me that the United States should maybe think about this

type of energy policy: we should drill safely in the United States for oil and natural gas. And I say "safely" because that is important. But we should also partner with the countries next to us—the Canadians to the north, who have natural resources, and the Mexicans to the south, who have an abundance of natural resources—and the three of us work together on a North American OPEC-type philosophy and be energy independent. Not just energy independent, but it will help out our national security.

And if we do that, if we work with Canada, Mexico, drill in the United States, where it's safe, we can make the Middle East irrelevant. We can make that little fellow from the desert, Ahmadinejad, and his threats about closing the Strait of Hormuz, we can make him irrelevant. We don't care what he does. We don't need to continue to send our money to other nations over there that don't like us. So maybe that's something we need to do in the United States.

Lastly, and then I'll yield to the gentleman, because of American technology, because of those folks that know how to drill safely for oil and natural gas, the United States now suddenly is becoming an abundant Nation with natural gas. And we could, if we developed it the way that we can, the United States—primarily Texas, but other States—we could become the Saudi Arabia of natural gas. We could export natural gas, we have so much of it, and bring that money into the United States, rather than constantly sending money throughout the world, all because we don't take care of what we have and use what we have.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Well, T. Boone Pickens said—and everybody knows he's one of the big advocates of natural gas, which is a very clean-burning fuel. He said, if we would convert the tractor-trailer units that bring commerce to all of us, we could lower the cost for all those tractor-trailer units, as far as energy consumption is concerned, by 50 percent—cut it in two—and that would have a dramatic impact on things that are transported by tractor-trailer units.

I would just like to say that the President, when he took office—and I'll conclude with this, because you've done such a good job tonight. You've covered it very well. When the President took office, he said that his energy policies would, of necessity, cause energy costs to skyrocket. Well, as Ronald Reagan would say, "Well, he did, and energy prices have skyrocketed," and we've got to do something about it.

The American people don't want to pay \$4 or \$5 a gallon for gasoline. They can't live that way. It's causing a deterioration in their standard of living.

So if I were talking to the President—and I know I can't, Madam Speaker. But if I were talking to him, I would say, Mr. President, why don't you get with the program. The Amer-

ican people really need your help. And if you don't pay attention to them regarding the energy policies, it's my humble opinion that there may be a big change in administrations next year. So for political survivability alone, you ought to take another look at what you're doing.

And with that, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding to me.

□ 1940

Mr. POE of Texas. I thank the gentleman for his participation.

Madam Speaker, it seems to me that the United States can make some decisions and solve some of our own problems. We can start with finding people in the EPA that do not have their own personal vendetta against the oil and gas industry, replace those individuals like Armendariz and get some fair and balanced bureaucrats to make sure we have a clean environment to work with our energy companies rather than against them, and stop the war against the energy companies in the U.S.

We can work and bring down the price of energy in the United States. One way, not the only way, is to make sure that we have a supply. A greater supply, as we all know, of anything, does help reduce the cost of energy, so that people in southeast Texas who have a hard time getting to work and who are paying more for products that they have to buy, just like Americans throughout our Nation are having tough times because of high gasoline prices, we owe it to them to do that, to take care of ourselves and to work with Canada and to work with Mexico so that the three countries can be a strong ally, not just politically, but that we can be strong allies with our energy economy.

With that, I'll yield back to the Chair.

And that's just the way it is.

#### MADE IN CHINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY) is recognized for 25 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Madam Speaker, as I was shopping for some family items recently, I noted how difficult it is to find items that are made in America. While American manufacturing is, encouragingly enough, on the rebound, products ranging from hairbrushes to iPods still carry that "Made in China" label. All the while, many questions about China and its economic policies, foreign policies, and human rights records are left largely unexamined.

For the good of our economy, it is essential that we thoroughly understand China's record and their intentions as a country. Our nations have a complicated and lopsided economic relationship. Americans buy great quantities of Chinese-made products. China finances a great portion of America's

debt. Currently, nearly one-third of our debt is foreign owned with China easily being the largest debt holder at nearly \$1.2 trillion. Other estimates peg the figure at closer to \$2 trillion. The effect of such indebtedness is the shift of our wealth assets into the hands of a foreign nation, losing the market for American-made products to a country with lax labor and environmental standards, which manipulates its currency and creates unbalanced and unfair trading conditions.

China's involvement on the world stage is also of significant concern. While it aggressively pursues its own mercantilistic agenda, China lends little constructive hand to creating conditions for international stability. China is seen as an enabler of North Korea, who is actively pursuing nuclear weapons capabilities; and they continue on their march toward more aggressive missile testing, as well, despite the protest of the international community.

Over recent months, as the U.S. and the European Union have accelerated important efforts to curb Iran's nuclear ambitions, China has been conspicuously absent from the leadership table in this discussion. China continues to be a top buyer of Iranian oil—one of the key leverage points of economic sanctions against Iran. At a discussion I attended, a Chinese official in so many words said the U.S. is to blame for Iran's pursuit of nuclear weapons capability. And he went on to say, while China does not desire this outcome, we're going to do business as usual.

Africa is becoming a lost continent, diplomatically and economically, in favor of international players who do not have the same regard for human rights as we do. China's influence in resource-rich Africa is growing rapidly—with disturbing consequences. Direct Chinese investment in Africa has grown exponentially over the last 2 years. One million Chinese nationals now do business in Africa, and Chinese energy and mineral resource companies are quickly acquiring oil fields and mines.

In the process, China has forged strategic alliances with war criminals. According to China's Foreign Ministry spokesman, China shares a "deep and profound friendship" with Sudanese war criminal Omar al-Bashir. I should note there was a bright spot this week. When approached by South Sudanese President Salva Kiir for assistance as Sudan and South Sudan march toward war, China's President Hu Jintao echoed the United States in calling for peace and negotiation between the two countries, rather than continuing to back Omar al-Bashir. The international community will look upon China's new role as a diplomatic figure in this conflict with great interest.

Beyond this, an honest discussion is necessary about Chinese industrial virtues. A Chinese official has said that in dealing with "differences in corporate

culture and the degree of openness to the outside world, Chinese companies always take the domestic business practices with them." Chinese companies always take "domestic business practices" with them. Those practices, according to witnesses who have given congressional testimony, include fertility monitors on factory floors, invasively examining female employees for pregnancy and reporting pregnant women to the Chinese family planning police. China has practiced the violence of forced abortions. China also has tragically high suicide rates for workers, who use suicide as their only means of collective bargaining against dire and oppressive labor conditions.

As China continues to advance as a world economic power, it has a choice. It can join the responsible community of nations in respecting the dignity and rights of all persons while conducting affairs with other nations in an ethical fashion, or it can stand by current practices that exploit relationships in order to fuel its own brand of corporate collectivism, undermining international stability in the process.

Madam Speaker, it is my belief that it is important to seek reasonable and good relationships with China, a country with a rich cultural history, a country which is rapidly ascending onto the world stage. We must do so ideally and practically for the sake of our own national security. But we must do so with open eyes, fully understanding the implications when all of us buy products with that "made in China" label.

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

#### FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) is recognized for 18 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I thank you for the time and being down here with me. I will set up my charts tonight because I can't commit it all to memory. I'm glad to be here at the end of the leadership hour. We've talked about China, we've talked about U.S. energy, and we've talked about the big issues that are on the floor of this House and that are here in Washington, D.C.

I want to say to folks, I come from a conservative part of the world. I come from the Deep South. I come from the suburbs of Atlanta, Gwinnett County, Forsyth County, Walton County and Barrow County. But I brought with me tonight quotes from President Barack Obama because, as I have said in town hall meeting after town hall meeting, I disagree with about 80 percent of what the President does, but I believe in about 80 percent of what he says. I think if we can come together on some of those principles that he is enunciating, we might be able to make some real progress.

This is from the President's 2011 inaugural address. He says this:

At stake right now is not who wins the next election. At stake is whether new jobs and industries take root in this country or somewhere else.

That is absolutely true. Folks come down to the floor of this House every day. They say what they're doing, they're doing for job creation. They say what they're doing, they're doing for economic growth. But we have a substantial disagreement about what that means.

□ 1950

I happen to believe that one of the things that encourages job creation and economic growth is fiscal responsibility. We need fiscal responsibility in our families, we need it in our businesses, and we need it in our government.

The President said this, Madam Speaker, his State of the Union address in 2010. He said:

Families across the country are tightening their belts and making tough decisions; the Federal Government should do the same.

State of the Union address, 2010, "the Federal Government should do the same."

It wasn't just in 2010. I'm not cherry-picking comments. Here we are in the President's State of the Union address in 2011, Madam Speaker:

Every day, families sacrifice to live within their means. They deserve a government that does the same.

He said it in 2010. He said it in 2011. In fact, go back to the beginning of his Presidency. Here we are in 2009, the same State of the Union address:

Given these realities, everyone in this Chamber, Democrats and Republicans, will have to sacrifice some worthy priorities for which there are no dollars, and that includes me.

Madam Speaker, he was right there in front of where you sit tonight. He said:

Given these realities, everyone in this Chamber must sacrifice some worthy priorities for which there are no dollars, and that includes me.

The President of the United States.

But what's the reality, Madam Speaker? We can put the words back up. We can put the words up from 2009, from 2010, from 2011, but what's the reality? The reality, sadly, is this chart, Madam Speaker. You can't see it from where you are, but it's a chart from *The Wall Street Journal*, entitled, "The Debt Boom." It charts the public debt of the United States from the year 2000 to the year 2012.

What we see, Madam Speaker, is that as a percent of GDP, the debt was entirely too high during the Bush years. Don't get me wrong. There is not a party in this town that is blameless in this debate. For Pete's sake, we were having economic boom times and our debt was running 35 percent of GDP. Thirty-five percent of all the economy of the United States of America was being borrowed in debt. But look what

happens. Look what happens. President Obama is sworn in in January of 2009. You see a debt boom, where we rise from 35 percent of GDP as our debt level up to 80 percent of GDP as our debt level.

Now, again, I can put the words back up: “Time for sacrifice.” “Families are tightening their belts, we must do the same.” “Everyone must sacrifice priorities, including me,” the President of the United States. I can put the words back up. The reality, Madam Speaker, is that the President has continued to promote spending with reckless abandon.

And it’s not just in the debt.

Madam Speaker, this chart is a chart produced by the Budget Committee on which I have the privilege of serving. What it charts is the debt of the United States. We see it on the white dotted line here. And it charts the proposed plan of President Barack Obama.

The President, to his credit, introduced a budget in January—the law requires him to do it and he did it. In fact, he has every year that he’s been in office. The law requires the Senate to produce a budget every year. They ignore that law and have again this year for the third time in a row. But the President produced his budget.

I can, again, go back to the words where he talks about sacrifice, where he talks about tightening his belt, where he talks about what American families are doing and says America deserves a government that does the same, but look at this chart. The white dotted line represents the current debt path of America. The red line represents the President’s proposal from February of this year. If you look closely, Madam Speaker, what you can see is that under the President’s proposal of February of this year, enacting the President’s proposal raises the deficit in the United States year after year after year after year—2012, ’13, ’14, ’15, ’16, ’17, ’18, ’19, and ’20—more than doing nothing.

Madam Speaker, you ask: How can that be true? The President’s proposal includes \$2 trillion in new taxes on American families. That’s true. That’s true. The President has made no secret of his desire to work our way through our current economic crisis by taxing the American people. I don’t believe that’s the right way to go, but he has introduced that as a plan. And, yes, his budget raises taxes by \$2 trillion, but he spends so much more that even with a \$2 trillion tax increase, Madam Speaker, we don’t see any improvement in our debt in 2013 or ’14 or ’15 or ’16 or ’17 or ’18 or ’19 or ’20 or ’21.

Now, I’ve blown up, Madam Speaker, just so folks can see it, way out there in 2022, you finally begin to see a better debt trajectory from the President’s budget than if we had done something. Nine years from now, America would have a slightly lower deficit under the President’s plan than if we did nothing and just left all of our systems on autopilot. That doesn’t jibe with what we heard.

Can I go back to the beginning, Madam Speaker?

At stake is not who wins the election; at stake is new jobs, new jobs that come through fiscal responsibility.

Go back to his State of the Union address:

Families across the country are tightening their belts and making tough decisions. The Federal Government should do the same.

Madam Speaker, there’s not one tough decision made when you tax the American people by \$2 trillion but you spend even more.

I believed the President. I believed the President when he said:

Given these realities, everyone in this Chamber, Republicans and Democrats, will have to sacrifice some worthy priorities for which there are no dollars.

He was right when he said that. That was an applause line, Madam Speaker. Folks got to their feet here in the House Chamber. He’s right, that sacrifice is necessary. His budget includes none of it.

The good news, though, Madam Speaker, is we’re not limited to the President’s ideas in this town. We have a freshman class here in Washington, D.C., Madam Speaker, of which you are a critical part, that says we can do better; in fact, we must do better; in fact, we cannot take “no” for an answer.

Let me show you what I have here, Madam Speaker. It’s a chart of discretionary appropriations. Now, discretionary appropriations, for folks who are in the freshman class who haven’t followed that back in their offices, that’s the part that we have to affirmatively act on every year.

About two-thirds of the Federal budget is on autopilot. If we closed the doors of Congress tomorrow, that money would continue to flow out the door, but not so with one-third of the Federal budget. We call that discretionary spending. You and I, Madam Speaker, we have responsibility to do oversight on that every year.

Look what we see here. FY 2010—that’s the first year I’ve charted—we spent about \$1.3 trillion in this discretionary spending. That was 2010. You and I were not yet here, Madam Speaker. You and I showed up while we were still working on the FY 2011 budget. You will see we spent less in this Congress—and I don’t just mean we proposed spending less. I don’t just mean we talked about spending less. I don’t mean that we got together as Republicans and said this is our idea, but we’re not going to be able to get the Democrats to go along with it. I mean, as a body in this House, as a Congress on Capitol Hill, with the cooperation of the President’s signature, we actually passed into law a budget for discretionary spending that went down in 2011 from 2010 levels.

And guess what? We didn’t stop there, Madam Speaker. As you know, we passed another set of appropriations bills that took spending down even further. From 2011 levels, we went down further in 2012. And guess what? This

freshman class, we’re not done yet. This House leadership, they’re not done yet. For 2013, we are on track to reduce spending—I don’t mean reduce rates of growth. I don’t mean reduce projected increases. I mean reduce the actual dollars going out the door for a third year in a row. The third year in a row. It’s unprecedented. It hadn’t happened since World War II. It’s happened because the American people said we have to do better. It happened because the American people said we can’t just talk about it; we have to do it.

But I’ve got some bad news, Madam Speaker. We’re going to keep working on this discretionary spending side of the ledger. We’re going to keep trying to drive those numbers down. But that’s not where the real spending is. As I said a few minutes ago, that’s only one-third of the budget. Two-thirds of the budget is on autopilot.

I have it up here, Madam Speaker. In yellow, you see what they call mandatory spending. That’s the autopilot money. Again, you could close the White House tomorrow, you could close the Congress tomorrow, this money still flows out the door. If we’re going to stop it, we have to act affirmatively to stop it.

This little piece of the pie up here is the defense part. You would think that national security is one of the biggest things we spend money on around here. Madam Speaker, it’s down to less than 20 percent of the money that goes out the door in Washington, D.C. goes towards national security. This 17 percent here is everything else, everything else that’s in that discretionary budget. The 63 percent, 64 percent, so says the Congressional Budget Office, this is the mandatory spending that’s on autopilot.

□ 2000

I have it displayed here in a slightly different way. The red bar represents our discretionary spending. And you can see that discretionary spending, as a percentage of the budget, has been in decline each and every year since 1962. Now, those aren’t actual dollars going down, that’s just a share of what we do in Washington, D.C. It’s been this Congress that’s brought the actual dollars down, as I said, for the first time since World War II.

But over time we’ve had a shift in this country. Discretionary spending has declined as a percentage of what we do, and this out-of-control mandatory spending, this autopilot spending is increasing. What are we going to do about that?

There’s not enough time tonight, Madam Speaker, to get into the details. But I encourage all of our colleagues, Madam Speaker, and I hope you will help me to encourage them, to keep an eye out on what’s coming down the road, because what’s coming down the road in this body is a process called reconciliation. And I put to you that we haven’t had a real reconciliation process in this House. In 1997, Republicans in the House and Senate, and a

Democrat in the White House, came together to pass the biggest spending reduction bill that we'd had in our lifetime prior to this point.

We can't balance the budget on the discretionary spending side of the ledger alone. As you know, Madam Speaker, if we zeroed out everything—and I mean everything. I don't mean cut by 5 percent, I don't mean cut by 10 percent, I mean zeroed out everything except Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, interest on the national debt, those mandatory spending programs that I'm talking about, those autopilot programs, if we zeroed out everything else, the budget still wouldn't be balanced. That's how far out of whack we are. And that's how big those categories are.

We're going to do something that hasn't been done since 1997 and that is, go through reconciliation, where we ask the committees of this House, we go back to our communities and ask in town hall meetings, what can we do on that mandatory spending side of the ledger to tighten our belts, to do better to provide more bang for their buck to the American taxpayers.

Those bills are going to start coming to the floor in the month of May, for the first time since 1997, in a serious way. Now, it's going to be a small process at first. We're talking about just the amount of money to cover some of our necessary defense spending needs. But we're going to start to talk about priorities here. And when I say talk about, I mean legislate on.

Madam Speaker, the talking has already been done. "Every day families sacrifice to live within their means. They deserve a government that does the same." President Barack Obama, 2011.

"Families across the country are tightening their belts and making tough decisions. The Federal Government should do the same." President Obama 2010.

At stake right now is not who wins the election. At stake is whether new jobs and industry take root in this country or not. Madam Speaker, we are bankrupting this country. We are bankrupting this country. We have doubled, doubled the annual spending deficits that we've seen in this country. We've seen the public debt of this Nation increase by 50 percent in the last 3½ years. And that was with the efforts of the most conservative U.S. House of Representatives we've seen in our lifetime. That was with the efforts of this U.S. House of Representatives that has cut spending, not 1 year in a row, not 2 years in a row, but 3 years in a row.

Madam Speaker, the good ship United States of America is in troubled waters. The President is saying all the right things. I come to the floor here tonight, Madam Speaker, to ask you to encourage him to do the right things. Join this U.S. House of Representatives, join these 100 new Democrat and freshman Members in this body as we

try to do something that hasn't been done since 1997, and that's take programs off of autopilot and make sure that every dollar leaving this institution is doing the very best that it can for the hardworking American taxpayers that have entrusted us to spend it.

Madam Speaker, I thank you for being here and yielding me this time this evening.

I yield back the balance of my time.

#### OUR FRIEND IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, there's a lot going on in the world these days. I had an interesting trip to Afghanistan this weekend, a country into which we are pouring billions and billions of dollars and have military there that is keeping President Karzai in office.

And he's a very grateful man. That was demonstrated when he told our government, this Obama administration, that DANA ROHRBACHER, my very dear friend, one of the greatest patriots I know, would not be allowed into Afghanistan, as if he had that power, because he had been very critical of President Karzai.

So we're spending billions and billions of dollars so that a cantankerous President of Afghanistan, who is only there because of the lives and treasure that Americans have sacrificed, can turn around and tell Americans, we don't want Members of Congress that actually control the purse strings to money flowing into this country, we don't want them here. It was rather interesting.

And as might be expected, President Karzai had his facts entirely wrong. He was representing that Representative ROHRBACHER had a bill that was attempting to partition, divide up Afghanistan. Entirely wrong. I knew that because I assisted with the bill and co-sponsored it, proudly, because it was a resolution that basically was encouraging Afghanistan to allow elections of their regional governors. It encouraged elections.

Somehow President Karzai found this very offensive, as a threat to him. And I can see it from his standpoint. If one puts one's self in his position, you realize, gee, I'm President Karzai. I get to appoint every regional governor. And gee, that would be a system, like ancient Rome, where you would be appointed to be governor, but you had to kick back to Caesar in order to keep your seat. Interesting.

That is a plan fraught with the potential for corruption. That's one of the reasons that DANA and I, and so many others, think it would be a good idea, help strengthen the country, if the people in the various regions were able to elect their governors.

President Karzai not only appoints the governors, he appoints the mayors. They don't get to elect them. He appoints them. You want to be a mayor of a city, you better go suck up to President Karzai because he's going to make the appointment.

If you would like to be the chief of police, don't worry with some local city council in Afghanistan. Don't worry with the governor. You'll be appointed, that's right, by President Karzai.

We're told by Afghans that actually it goes so much further than that. He even appoints many of the teachers. You want to be a teacher at an upper level? Afghans tell me that he appoints them as well.

President Karzai gets to appoint a slate of potential legislators. He has tremendous control of the purse strings in Afghanistan, not someone to be countered with, you would think, unless perhaps you're from a government that assists the government of Afghanistan in meeting its budget needs.

□ 2010

As I understand it, Afghanistan has a budget of \$12.5 billion. As I understand it, Afghanistan provides \$1.5 billion of that \$12.5 billion budget. That's all the revenue—taxes, fees, all kinds of things. That's the extent of their revenue.

Gee, what would happen to President Karzai if all of a sudden this Congress did what the 1974 Democratic-controlled Congress did when, without any regard for those who had fought with us in Vietnam and in Southeast Asia, every penny was just completely shut off, when every penny being spent in Vietnam back in '74 was cut off? What happened after we left was an absolute horrible bloodbath of those who had assisted the United States in any way.

So I don't think this Congress will be as abrupt as the Democratic Congress was in 1974, but it certainly has the ability to do that. The difference is, I think, there are enough people in this Congress who realize, unless we empower those who fought the Taliban in late 2001, after 9/11, and in early 2002 when they basically routed the Taliban with U.S.-embedded support and air support, unless we empower those allies by allowing them to elect their own regional governors, by allowing them to elect their mayors, taking some of the power away from a central administration where, regardless of whether or not reports may or may not be accurate about corruption at the highest level, then there is certainly corruption in Afghanistan.

It is also interesting that this administration refuses to replace the inspector general, who is supposed to supervise and audit the money that's going into Afghanistan. Surely, that couldn't be because it's an election year. Surely, that couldn't be because, if we had somebody actually monitoring where all of the billions of dollars were pouring into Afghanistan are going, the report would indicate widespread corruption, which would reflect poorly on this

administration, throwing away billions of dollars not only to the Solyndras around the country but to corrupt administrations who are fattening their bank accounts while Americans don't have any.

Many Americans struggle to have any money in their bank accounts, yet we're propping up an administration over there that thinks that, on a whim, they can say, I don't like this Congressman because he has been critical of my administration, so we're going to keep him out.

I realize that Secretary Clinton inherited a very difficult situation that was not of her making, but it is important in dealing with matters of foreign policy and in dealing with matters of State that we not be duped by people who have made careers out of duping Americans and Russians and other nationalities.

So we have a great ally in the nation of Israel. They believe in freedom as we do. They have a truly representative government, one in which the Prime Minister of Israel does not forbid the elections of other officials so that he will be the only one who has the power to appoint. Israel allows elections, and as others have pointed out, they're more likely more free than any of the other neighbors immediately surrounding Israel. Even Muslims in Israel have greater freedom to elect whom ever they wish in fair and free elections. We have an ally in Israel.

Now, I realize there are differences in views, whether the Old Testament, the Torah, the Tanakh have valid legitimacy these days. Some of us believe them and are proud to do so just as the Founders did. Heck, of the 56 signers of the Declaration, over a third of them were ordained Christian ministers who believed every word of the Old Testament.

So I've been looking in the Old Testament for wisdom in application to our current situation because we know, back earlier this year, The Washington Post was told by this administration that the window during which Israel was going to likely attack Iran was between two different dates during a certain period. Well, that's not very helpful to an ally when we tell the world about when an ally may choose to defend itself. That's more a heads-up to an enemy of Israel's and the United States, a sworn enemy of the United States, led by people who have sworn to the destruction of the United States and Israel.

So it's a little bit confusing to see how this administration could be going about betraying our friend Israel. It would seem, when this administration leaked to the media that our dear friend and ally Israel was going to utilize the relationship with Azerbaijan to attack, that such a release was not something you would do for a friend but, rather, a betrayal of a friend and ally.

It appears that those were efforts to keep Israel from doing what it needed

to do to defend itself when this administration is telling Israel, Hey, just trust us. Trust us. We'll take care of your national security, and yes, there is a window beyond which you could no longer do any good in trying to stop the nuclear proliferation in Iran and beyond which we in the United States could. So, if we can just force Israel past that window, then they would have to rely completely on the United States to do all in its power to protect Israel.

If Israel looks at what has been happening already this year with a couple of betrayals of our friendship, that would not bode well that the top in this administration for this country will protect Israel at whatever cost. That has to be considered by Israel.

Then we have this report. This was dated April 19, 2012, from the Middle East Media Research Institute. The introduction reads:

An important element in the renewal of nuclear negotiations with Iran in the talks in Istanbul April 13-14, 2012, was an alleged fatwa attributed to Iranian Supreme Leader Ali Khamenei, according to which the production, stockpiling, and use of nuclear weapons are forbidden under Islam and that the Islamic Republic of Iran shall never acquire these weapons. Indeed, U.S. leaders, among them Secretary of State Hillary Clinton and even U.S. President Barack Obama, along with other representatives to the talks, the International Atomic Energy Agency Board of Governors, and even highly respected research institutes considered the fatwa as an actual fact, and examined its significance and implications for the nuclear negotiations with Iran that were renewed in Istanbul.

However, an investigation by the Middle East Media Research Institute reveals that no such fatwa ever existed or was ever published, and that media reports about it are nothing more than a propaganda ruse on the part of the Iranian regime apparatuses in an attempt to deceive the top U.S. administration officials and the others mentioned above.

Iranian regime officials' presentation of facts on nuclear weapons attributed to Supreme Leader Ali Khamenei as a fatwa, or religious edict, when no such fatwa was issued by him, is a propaganda effort to propose to the West a religiously valid substitute for concrete guarantees of inspectors' access to Iran's nuclear facilities. Since the West does not consider mere statements by Khamenei or other regime officials to be credible, the Iranian regime has put forth a fraudulent fatwa the West would be more inclined to trust.

□ 2020

It goes on to talk about, and I'll just read from this:

U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton clarified that she had discussed the fatwa with "experts and religious scholars," and also with Turkish Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdogan. At the NATO conference in Norfolk, Virginia, in early April, she stated: "The other interesting development which you may have followed was the repetition by the supreme leader, the Ayatollah Khamenei, that he had issued a fatwa against nuclear weapons, against weapons of mass destruction. Prime Minister Erdogan and I discussed this at some length, and I've discussed with a number of experts and religious scholars. And if it is indeed a state-

ment of principles and values, then it is a starting point for being operationalized, which means that it serves as the entryway into a negotiation as to how you demonstrate that it is indeed a sincere, authentic statement of conviction. So we will test that as well."

During his visit to Tehran in late March, in an interview with Iranian state television, Prime Minister Erdogan said, "I have shared the Leader's [Khamenei's] statement with U.S. President Barack Obama and told him that in face of this assertion, I do not have a different position, and the Iranians are using nuclear energy peacefully."

On April 7, 2012, Kayhan International reported, citing Press TV, that Turkish Foreign Minister Ahmet Davutoglu had told the Turkish Kanal D TV that there is no possibility that "Khamenei's fatwa forbidding the possession and use of nuclear weapons might be disobeyed in Iran."

So we can all celebrate. There's has been a fraudulent false report of a fatwa by Khamenei. So, gosh, nobody in Iran would violate this fatwa making it against the Islamic religion to develop nuclear weapons. When the truth is, if Israel is not going to defend itself by itself, as President Obama said it absolutely must on more than one occasion, if it is going to rely on the representations of this administration to, Trust us, we'll take care of you, we got your back, then Israel may want to note how easy it is to deceive this administration into believing what it wants—that Iran would not develop nuclear weapons.

It is important to note that this administration has been praised in messages coming from the Islamic Society of North America and other groups actually named coconspirators in funding terrorism in the world. They've been praised by these named coconspirators in funding terrorism for their cleansing of training materials of our FBI, of our intelligence, of our State Department. We have gone through and eliminated words like "jihad," words like "Islam," words like "radical," replacing them with things like "violent extremism." When the trouble is, it is so easy to deceive national officials in any country where they refuse to study the enemy who has sworn to destroy them. If you will not study the enemy who is sworn to destroy you and your country, then you will continue to be easily duped.

So we have these named coconspirators for funding terrorism out there praising this administration and their meetings inside the hearts of the administration at the State Department, in the White House, in the Justice Department. They've been praised for eliminating all of these references to such inappropriate things as "Islam."

Well, this weekend, despite efforts by some in this administration to prevent it, a few of us met with our allies, members of the national front, one of which could be elected the next President of Afghanistan. These are people who, while we in America were burying Americans, they were burying family members who had fought with us against the Taliban. These are the enemy of our enemy, the Taliban. They

should be our friends, and they are my friends.

Therefore, when I saw my Muslim friends there at the home of my friend Massoud, there were big hugs all around. This administration calls them war criminals because some of them fight as viciously as the Taliban that they fight against, but they were friends. They fought with us. They did much of our fighting for us before we became occupiers in Afghanistan.

Yet, when this administration throws our allies under a bus, it means for them to stay there. Well, some of us believe that if we ever hope to have other allies, then it is critical that we treat our allies with respect. We don't stab them in the back. We don't throw them under the bus. But that's a lesson hard learned.

There are international reports that say President Karzai may be willing to resign a year early. That's been heard different places around the world. Gee, wow, isn't that wonderful if Karzai would resign a year early. But in meeting with my friends who have talked to some of Karzai's circle, they point out: Do you in America not understand that when this President Karzai says he's looking at retiring a year early, it's not because he is some big-hearted, wonderful, democracy-loving person? If he loved democracy, he'd let us elect our governors. He'd let us elect our mayors. But he wants to appoint them, and he's not ready to give up power. But the Afghan constitution apparently says that if you've served two terms, you cannot run for a third term.

So, this President Karzai is looking at a way, when perhaps if he resigned a year early, then he could argue, I didn't serve two terms. I served 1 year short of two terms, therefore I can run for a third term.

□ 2030

Being as how the President of Afghanistan appoints the governors, the mayors, the chiefs of police, so many of the positions of power in Afghanistan, it's quite conceivable that he could ensure that he got elected again next time if he ran a third time. And if he were to be allowed to run a third time and get elected, that puts him beyond 2014, which means the United States will not be around to enforce the promises that President Karzai made.

Oh, it's a hope and prayer that this administration will quit living on the false promises of people who say they're going to help us, but are sworn publicly and privately to destroy our way of life. And there are those we continue to hear say, Look, Israel is just occupiers. They're occupiers in this land. The Palestinians have more claim. But as Newt Gingrich pointed out, the term "Palestinian" is a very recent word that found usage. If you go back, as one reporter did, who ended up being let go, she marveled that these people ought to go back to Poland or wherever they came from, when actually if you look at where they came

from 1,600, 1,700 years before Mohammed existed in the city of Hebron, a King named David ruled for 7 years. He then moved the capital up to Jerusalem, and a beautiful capital it was.

Some have said, "Well, where is the evidence of the Israelis being in Jerusalem?" Well, we know that Mohammed never went to Jerusalem. He had a dream, as I understand it at one point, that he had gone there; but he never physically went. That's for sure. But here is the current city of Jerusalem. This is the city of David here, south of the Temple Mount, Mount Moriah, where Abraham went. It's interesting, because people have said, gee, where is the archeological evidence? And we see people around the country in Hebron where Jesse was buried, where his tomb is, in what I call Shiloh and they were calling Sheloh. The Ark of the Covenant, they've found the location, it certainly appears, where it was kept for over 300 years, long before there was a Mohammed.

People have said, well, where is the evidence? It is beginning to show up in droves. Quite interesting, as the archeologists have begun to look, they've realized, you know what, the city of David may have been south down the hill from where the current Temple Mount is. They began excavating, and they found all kinds of dramatic evidence of Israel's existence. It's dramatic. There is no question from the things that are being found and the way they're being dated and the dates that are coming to light that Israel existed in the land where it has its country now. Not just in part, but throughout the West Bank. That was Israeli territory many, many centuries before a man named Mohammed lived.

I'm not attempting to push my religious beliefs on anybody else. These are simply the facts of history that we have to look at and understand. Until we have an administration that stops blinding those who are supposed to protect us, we're in big trouble. So it is important that we pay tribute to our dear friend Israel, stop the betrayals, and say thank God for the nation of Israel and the dear friend that they are to the United States.

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

---

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today and April 27 on account of personal reasons.

---

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, April 27, 2012, at 9 a.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5797. A letter from the Secretary, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's "Major" final rule — Swap Dealer and Major Swap Participant Recordkeeping, Reporting, and Duties Rules; Futures Commission Merchant and Introducing Broker Conflicts of Interest Rules; and Chief Compliance Officer Rules for Swap Participants, and Futures Commission Merchants (RIN: 3038-AC96) received April 3, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5798. A letter from the Deputy Chief Management Officer, Department of Defense, transmitting the annual report for FY 2012 for the Investment Review Board and Investment Management; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5799. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of 3 officers to wear the authorized insignia of the grade of brigadier general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5800. A letter from the Vice Admiral, U.S. Navy, Principal Military Deputy, Department of Defense, transmitting notice that the Navy intends to donate the destroyer ex-EDSON (DD946) to the Saginaw Valley Naval Ship Museum; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5801. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting Report to Congress: Tobacco Prevention and Control Activities in the United States, 2008-2009; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5802. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Creation of a Low Power Radio Service [MM Docket No.: 99-25] received April 3, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5803. A letter from the Program Manager, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Summary of Benefits and Coverage and Uniform Glossary [TD 9575] (RIN: 1545-BJ94) received April 10, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5804. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's annual report prepared in accordance with section 203 of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Pub. L. No. 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5805. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Management of Chief Financial Officer, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's report for fiscal year 2011 on the Acquisition of Articles, Materials, and Supplies Manufactured Outside the United States, pursuant to Public Law 110-28, section 8306; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5806. A letter from the Director, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's annual report for FY 2011 prepared in accordance with Section 203 of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Public Law 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5807. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's annual report for Fiscal Year 2011

prepared in accordance with Section 203 of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Public Law 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5808. A letter from the Director, International Broadcasting Bureau, transmitting the Bureau's annual report for fiscal year 2011 on the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation (No FEAR) Act of 2002; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5809. A letter from the Chairman, Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting the Board's annual report for FY 2011 prepared in accordance with the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5810. A letter from the Associate Commissioner/EEO Director, National Indian Gaming Commission, transmitting the Commission's annual report for FY 2011 prepared in accordance with the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Pub. L. 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5811. A letter from the Director, Office of EEO and Diversity, Patent and Trademark Office, transmitting the Office's annual report for fiscal year 2011, in accordance with Section 203 of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Public Law 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5812. A letter from the EEO Director, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's annual report for FY 2011 prepared in accordance with the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Pub. L. 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5813. A letter from the Deputy Chief, National Forest System, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's report on the exterior boundary of Allegheny Wild and Scenic River Allegheny National Forest, pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 1274; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5814. A letter from the Acting Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting the 2011 Report to Congress on the Disclosure of Financial Interest and Recusal Requirements for Regional Fishery Management Councils and Scientific and Statistical Committees; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5815. A letter from the Trial Attorney, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Railroad Workplace Safety; Adjustment-Track On-Track Safety for Roadway Workers [Docket No.: FRA-2008-0059, Notice No. 5] (RIN: 2130-AB96), pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5816. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Value Engineering [FHWA Docket No.: FHWA-2011-0046] (RIN: 2125-AF40) received April 2, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5817. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30832; Amdt. No. 3469] received April 11, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5818. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30831; Amdt. No. 3468] received April 9, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5819. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company (GE) Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2006-2573; Directorate Identifier 2006-NE-27-AD; Amendment 39-16961; AD 2012-04-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 2, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5820. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airplanes Originally Manufactured by Lockheed for the Military as P2V Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0107; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-018-AD; Amendment 39-16955; AD 2012-03-51] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 2, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5821. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney Division Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0944; Directorate Identifier 2011-NE-11-AD; Amendment 39-16960; AD 2012-04-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 2, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5822. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2008-0107; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-087-AD; Amendment 39-16965; AD 2012-04-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 2, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5823. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2011-1230; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-141-AD; Amendment 39-16964; AD 2012-04-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 2, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5824. A letter from the Chairman, Department of Transportation, Surface Transportation Board, transmitting the Department's final rule — Waybill Data Released in Three-Benchmark Rail Rate Proceedings [Docket No. EP 646 (Sub-No. 3)] received April 11, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5825. A letter from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of the Wisconsin Ledge Viticultural Area [Docket No.: TTB-2011-0007; T.D. TTB-102; Re: Notice No. 121] (RIN: 1513-AB82) received April 9, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5826. A letter from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Labeling Imported Wines With Multistate Appellations [Docket No.: TTB-2010-0007; T.D. TTB-101; Re: Notice No.: 110] (RIN: 1513-AB58) received April 9, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on 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. ISSA: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 4257. A bill to amend chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, to revise requirements relating to Federal information security, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 112-455). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

## 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. STEARNS (for himself and Ms. MATSU):

H.R. 4817. A bill to require the reallocation and auction for commercial use of the electromagnetic spectrum between the frequencies from 1755 megahertz to 1780 megahertz; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 4818. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to ensure health care coverage value and transparency for dental benefits under group health plans; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 4819. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain sound-isolating earphones with multiple balanced armature speakers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 4820. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain single-driver sound isolating earphones; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 4821. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain self-contained, single-element unidirectional (cardioid) dynamic microphones; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BERMAN:

H.R. 4822. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on certain shopping bags; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BERMAN:

H.R. 4823. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on spun-bonded, non-woven, high-density polyethylene materials; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BERMAN:

H.R. 4824. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on non-woven recycled polyethylene terephthalate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself, Mr. TERRY, Mr. ROSS of Florida, and Mr. FLORES):

H.R. 4825. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to establish a point of order to prohibit the extension of the statutory debt limit unless a concurrent resolution on the budget has been agreed to and is in effect, Federal spending is cut and capped, and a balanced budget amendment to the constitution has been sent to the States for ratification, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, 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. DAVIS of Kentucky:

H.R. 4826. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow additional investment credits for qualifying supercritical advanced coal projects; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NUNNELEE:

H.R. 4827. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain aluminum alloy foil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NUNNELEE:

H.R. 4828. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain aluminum alloy profiles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NUNNELEE:

H.R. 4829. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on used camshafts and crankshafts for diesel engines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:

H.R. 4830. A bill to suspend temporarily the rate of duty on certain glass fibers and articles thereof; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:

H.R. 4831. A bill to suspend temporarily the rate of duty on Ammonium polyphosphate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:

H.R. 4832. A bill to suspend temporarily the rate of duty on 1-Propene, polymer with ethene; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:

H.R. 4833. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on Phosphinic acid, diethyl-, aluminum salt with synergists and encapsulating agents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:

H.R. 4834. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on Phosphinic acid, diethyl-, aluminum salt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:

H.R. 4835. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on 1,4-Benzenedicarboxylic acid, polymer with N,NBis(2-aminoethyl)-1,2-ethanediamine, cyclized, methosulfate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:

H.R. 4836. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on cyanuric chloride; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:

H.R. 4837. A bill to suspend temporarily the rate of duty on Zinc diethylphosphinate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:

H.R. 4838. A bill to suspend temporarily the rate of duty on Fluoroalkyl acrylic copolymerisates dispersed in water; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:

H.R. 4839. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on Sulfur black 1; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:

H.R. 4840. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on certain manufacturing equipment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:

H.R. 4841. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on certain manufacturing equipment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:

H.R. 4842. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on certain manufacturing equipment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUNYAN:

H.R. 4843. A bill to extend the suspension of duty on certain ion-exchange resins; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUNYAN:

H.R. 4844. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on certain ion-exchange

resins; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky:

H.R. 4845. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on TFM; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. BALDWIN:

H.R. 4846. A bill to prevent mail, telemarketing, and Internet fraud targeting seniors in the United States, to promote efforts to increase public awareness of the enormous impact that mail, telemarketing, and Internet fraud have on seniors, to educate the public, seniors, their families, and their caregivers about how to identify and combat fraudulent activity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on 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. FLORES (for himself and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 4847. A bill to prevent certain discriminatory taxation of natural gas pipeline property; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARKE of Michigan (for himself, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. GRJALVA, Ms. WATERS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Mr. ELLISON):

H.R. 4848. A bill to save neighborhoods and keep families in their homes by encouraging mortgage loan modifications and suspending foreclosures and evictions; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, 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. NUNES (for himself, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. DENHAM, and Mr. MCCLINTOCK):

H.R. 4849. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue commercial use authorizations to commercial stock operators for operations in designated wilderness within the Sequoia and Kings Canyon National Parks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. ADERHOLT:

H.R. 4850. A bill to allow for innovations and alternative technologies that meet or exceed desired energy efficiency goals; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 4851. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on 1-Propene, 1,1,2,3,3,3-hexafluoro-, oxidized, polymerized, reduced hydrolyzed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 4852. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on Ethene, tetrafluoro, oxidized, polymerized reduced, methyl esters, reduced; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 4853. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on Methoxycarbonyl-terminated perfluorinated polyoxymethylene-polyoxyethylene; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 4854. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on Propanoic acid, 3-hydroxy-2-(hydroxymethyl)-2-methyl polymers with 5-isocyanato-1-(isocyanatomethyl)-1,3,3-trimethylcyclohexane and reduced methyl esters of reduced polymerized, oxidized tetrafluoroethylene, compounds

with trimethylamine; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 4855. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on Diaminododecane; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 4856. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on 1,1,2,2-Tetrafluoroethene, oxidized, polymerized; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 4857. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on Vinylidene chloride-methyl methacrylate-acrylonitrile copolymer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 4858. A bill to extend the temporary reduction of duty on p-Hydroxybenzoic acid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 4859. A bill to suspend temporarily the rate of duty on 1,1,2,2-Tetrafluoroethylene, oxidized, polymerized, reduced; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 4860. A bill to suspend temporarily the rate of duty on Vinylidene fluoride-trifluoroethylene copolymer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 4861. A bill to suspend temporarily the rate of duty on Chlorotrifluoroethylene; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 4862. A bill to suspend temporarily the rate of duty on Diphosphoric acid, polymers with ethoxylated reduced methyl esters of reduced polymerized oxidized tetrafluoroethylene; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 4863. A bill to suspend temporarily the rate of duty on 4,4'-Dichlorodiphenyl sulfone; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 4864. A bill to suspend temporarily the rate of duty on 1,2-Propanediol, 3-(diethylamino)-, polymers with 5-isocyanato-1-(isocyanatomethyl)-1,3,3-trimethylcyclohexane, propylene glycol and reduced Me esters of reduced polymd. oxidized tetrafluoroethylene, 2-ethyl-1-hexanol-blocked, acetates (salts); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 4865. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on Oxiranemethanol, polymers with reduced methyl esters of reduced polymerized oxidized tetrafluoroethylene; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 4866. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on ethene, tetrafluoro, oxidized, polymerized reduced, methyl esters, reduced, ethoxylated; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 4867. A bill to suspend temporarily the rate of duty on certain licorice extract derivatives; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 4868. A bill to suspend temporarily the rate of duty on extract of licorice; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOSWELL (for himself and Mr. LOEBBACK):

H.R. 4869. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to jointly conduct a study on the incidence of breast cancer among members of the Armed Forces and veterans; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, 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. CAMPBELL:

H.R. 4870. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain non-toric shaped polarized materials of more than 80 mm in diameter; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAMPBELL:

H.R. 4871. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain toric shaped polarized materials; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAMPBELL:

H.R. 4872. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain non-toric shaped polarized materials of 80 mm or less in diameter; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. CAPITO:

H.R. 4873. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on mixtures containing Imidacloprid and Thiodicarb; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. CAPITO:

H.R. 4874. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on mixtures containing Thiencarbazone-methyl, Isoxaflutole, and Cyprosulfamide; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. CAPITO:

H.R. 4875. A bill to modify and extend the temporary reduction of duty on mixtures of imidacloprid with application adjuvants; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. CAPITO:

H.R. 4876. A bill to extend the temporary reduction of duty on Imidacloprid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. CAPITO:

H.R. 4877. A bill to reduce temporarily the duty on mixtures containing Imidacloprid and Cyfluthrin or its  $\beta$ -Cyfluthrin isomer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. CAPITO:

H.R. 4878. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 1-Naphthyl, N-methylcarbamate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. CAPITO:

H.R. 4879. A bill to reduce temporarily the duty on Penflufen; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. CAPITO:

H.R. 4880. A bill to extend the suspension of duty on ion-exchange resin powder, dried to less than 10 percent moisture; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. CAPITO:

H.R. 4881. A bill to extend the suspension of duty on an ion exchange resin comprising a copolymer of styrene crosslinked with divinylbenzene, iminodiacetic acid, sodium form; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. CAPITO:

H.R. 4882. A bill to extend the suspension of duty on an ion exchange resin comprising a copolymer of styrene crosslinked with ethenylbenzene, aminophosphonic acid, sodium form; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. CAPITO:

H.R. 4883. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on IMIDACLOPRID; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. CAPITO:

H.R. 4884. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on 2-Phenylphenol sodium salt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. CAPITO:

H.R. 4885. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on 2-Hydroxypropylmethyl cellulose; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. CAPITO:

H.R. 4886. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on 2-Phenylphenol; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. CAPITO:

H.R. 4887. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 2-amino-5-cyano-N,3-

dimethylbenzamide; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. CAPITO:

H.R. 4888. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Picoxystrobin; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. CAPITO:

H.R. 4889. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on A5546 sulfonamide; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. CAPITO:

H.R. 4890. A bill to reduce temporarily the duty on ethylene/tetrafluoroethylene copolymer (ETFE); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARNAHAN:

H.R. 4891. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain work footwear for men; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARNAHAN:

H.R. 4892. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain work footwear for women; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARNAHAN:

H.R. 4893. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain work footwear for women covering the ankle; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARNAHAN:

H.R. 4894. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain work footwear for men covering the ankle; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARNAHAN:

H.R. 4895. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain work boots for men; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARNAHAN:

H.R. 4896. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain work boots for women; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARNAHAN:

H.R. 4897. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain women's footwear with outer soles and uppers of rubber or plastics and valued over \$6.50 but not over \$12 per pair; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARNAHAN:

H.R. 4898. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain women's footwear with outer soles and uppers of rubber or plastics and valued over \$12 but not over \$20 per pair; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARNAHAN:

H.R. 4899. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain women's platform footwear; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARNAHAN:

H.R. 4900. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain women's footwear with outer soles of rubber or plastics and uppers of textile materials and leather; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARNAHAN:

H.R. 4901. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on certain women's sports footwear; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.R. 4902. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on photomask blanks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLARKE of Michigan:

H.R. 4903. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on power electronic boxes and static converter composite units; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLARKE of Michigan:

H.R. 4904. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on stator/rotor parts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLARKE of Michigan:

H.R. 4905. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Tinopal OB CO; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLARKE of Michigan:

H.R. 4906. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Uvinul 3039; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLARKE of Michigan:

H.R. 4907. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Lucirin TPO; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLARKE of Michigan:

H.R. 4908. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain high pressure fuel pumps; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLARKE of Michigan:

H.R. 4909. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain hybrid electric vehicle inverters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLARKE of Michigan:

H.R. 4910. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain direct injection fuel injectors; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLARKE of Michigan:

H.R. 4911. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on lithium ion electrical storage battery; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLARKE of Michigan:

H.R. 4912. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on motor generator units; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado (for himself and Mr. COOPER):

H.R. 4913. A bill to require designated military command responsibility and accountability for the care, handling, and transportation of the remains of a deceased member of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps who died overseas, from the place of death, through the defense mortuary system, until the remains are accepted by the member's next of kin, in order to ensure that the deceased member is treated with dignity, honor, and respect; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COSTA:

H.R. 4914. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on mixtures containing Fluopyram and Tebuconazole; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H.R. 4915. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Agilon 400; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H.R. 4916. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Brine Electrolysis Ion Exchange Apparatus; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ELLMERS:

H.R. 4917. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on ceiling fans for permanent installation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. FUDGE:

H.R. 4918. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on sodium thiocyanate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 4919. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Para-methoxyphenol; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 4920. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on mixtures or coprecipitates of yttrium phosphate and cerium phosphate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 4921. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Tertio-butyl catechol flakes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 4922. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on phosphoric acid, lanthanum salt, cerium terbium-doped; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 4923. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on germanium unwrought; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 4924. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on germanium oxides; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 4925. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on gallium unwrought; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRIS (for himself and Mr. CARNEY):

H.R. 4926. A bill to extend and modify the temporary suspension of duty on certain women's footwear; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRIS (for himself and Mr. CARNEY):

H.R. 4927. A bill to extend and modify the temporary suspension of duty on certain men's footwear; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRIS (for himself and Mr. CARNEY):

H.R. 4928. A bill to extend and modify the temporary suspension of duty on certain men's footwear; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRIS (for himself and Mr. CARNEY):

H.R. 4929. A bill to extend and modify the temporary suspension of duty on certain women's footwear; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan:

H.R. 4930. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on 4-Chloro-2-nitro-aniline; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan:

H.R. 4931. A bill to extend and modify the temporary reduction of duty on 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine dihydrochloride ([1,1'-biphenyl]-4,4'-diamino, 3,3'-dichloro-); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan:

H.R. 4932. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Polyalkene Yellow (4A100); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KIND (for himself, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Ms. MOORE, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. RIBBLE):

H.R. 4933. A bill to authorize the award of the Medal of Honor to First Lieutenant Alonzo H. Cushing for acts of valor during the Civil War; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LATOURETTE:

H.R. 4934. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on 4,8-Dicyclohexyl -6-2,10-dimethyl -12H-dibenzo[d,g][1,3,2]-dioxaphosphocin; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LATOURETTE:

H.R. 4935. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on mixtures of zinc dicyanato diamine with an elastomer binder of ethylene-propylene-diene monomer and ethyl vinyl acetate, and dispersing agents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LATOURETTE:

H.R. 4936. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on mixtures of benzenesulfonic acid, dodecyl-, with 2-aminoethanol and Poly (oxy-1,2-ethanediy),  $\alpha$ -[1-oxo-9-octadecenyl]-w-hydroxy-, (9Z); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LATOURETTE:

H.R. 4937. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on mixtures of NN-(3,4-dichloro-phenyl)-N,N-dimethylurea with acrylate rubber; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LATOURETTE:

H.R. 4938. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on mixtures of caprolactam disulfide with an elastomer binder of ethylene-propylene-diene monomer and ethyl vinyl acetate, and dispersing agents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LATOURETTE:

H.R. 4939. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Aflux 37; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LATOURETTE:

H.R. 4940. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on 1-Octadecanaminium, N,N-dimethyl-N-octadecyl-, (Sp-4-2)-[29H,31H-phthalocyanine-2-sulfonato(3-)-kN29,kN30, kN31, kN32]cuprate(1-); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LATOURETTE:

H.R. 4941. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on 2-Oxepanone, polymer with aziridine and tetrahydro-2H-pyran-2-one, dodecanoate ester; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LATOURETTE:

H.R. 4942. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Ethylene-Propylene polymer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LATOURETTE:

H.R. 4943. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on mixtures of alkali metal phenate, mineral oil, and p-Dodecylphenol; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LATOURETTE:

H.R. 4944. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Sensomer CT-400; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LATOURETTE:

H.R. 4945. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on D-Galacto-D-mannan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LATOURETTE:

H.R. 4946. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Benzene, polypropene derivatives; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MICHAUD:

H.R. 4947. A bill to extend and modify the temporary reduction of duty on certain rayon staple fibers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. NOEM:

H.R. 4948. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act to extend certain supplemental agricultural disaster assistance programs through fiscal year 2017, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 4949. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain bulk container bags; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 4950. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain drive-axles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 4951. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on non-driving axles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 4952. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on gear boxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself and Mr. BILBRAY):

H.R. 4953. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit for the production of renewable chemicals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PETRI:

H.R. 4954. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain compression-ignition internal combustion piston engines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PETRI:

H.R. 4955. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain programmable controllers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUPPERSBERGER:

H.R. 4956. A bill to suspend temporarily the rate of duty on Oleo Turmeric; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUPPERSBERGER:

H.R. 4957. A bill to suspend temporarily the rate of duty on Oleo Black Pepper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUPPERSBERGER:

H.R. 4958. A bill to suspend temporarily the rate of duty on Oleo White Pepper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUPPERSBERGER:

H.R. 4959. A bill to suspend temporarily the rate of duty on Oleo Cassia; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUPPERSBERGER:

H.R. 4960. A bill to suspend temporarily the rate of duty on Oleo Capsicum; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUPPERSBERGER:

H.R. 4961. A bill to suspend temporarily the rate of duty on Oleo Ginger; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUPPERSBERGER:

H.R. 4962. A bill to suspend temporarily the rate of duty on Oleo Celery; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHERMAN (for himself and Mr. HINCHEY):

H.R. 4963. A bill to address the concept of "Too Big To Fail" with respect to certain financial entities; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. WATT:

H.R. 4964. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on benzenesulfonyl chloride; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOREN:

H. Res. 634. A resolution honoring RSU Public Television on the occasion of its 25th anniversary; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

#### 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. STEARNS:

H.R. 4817.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, §8, clause 3, the Commerce Clause: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 4818.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This legislation is being introduced in order to amend ERISA—which was passed based on a combination of Article 1 Section 8 Clause 3 (commerce clause) and Article 1 Section 8 Clause 18 (the necessary and proper clause).

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 4819.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to lay and collect duties and to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 4820.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to lay and collect duties and to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 4821.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to lay and collect duties and to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. BERMAN:  
H.R. 4822.  
The United States Constitution, Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. BERMAN:  
H.R. 4823.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
The United States Constitution, Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. BERMAN:  
H.R. 4824.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
The United States Constitution, Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. SULLIVAN:  
H.R. 4825.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

“The Congress shall have 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; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.”

Article V  
“The Congress shall have power . . . when-ever two thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose Amendments to this Constitution, or, on the Application of the Legislatures of two thirds of the several States, shall call a Convention for proposing Amendments, which in either Case, shall be valid to all Intents and Purposes, as Part of this Constitution, when ratified by the Leg-islatures of three fourths of the several States or by Conventions in three fourths thereof, as the one or the other Mode of Ratification may be proposed by the Con-gress; Provided that no Amendment which may be made prior to the Year One thousand eight hundred and eight shall in any Manner affect the first and fourth Clauses in the Ninth Section of the first Article; and that no State, without its Consent, shall be de-prived of its equal Suffrage in the Senate.”

By Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky:  
H.R. 4826.  
Congress has the power to enact this legis-lation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. NUNNELEE:  
H.R. 4827.  
Congress has the power to enact this legis-lation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, the Taxing and Spend-ing Clause: “The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. NUNNELEE:  
H.R. 4828.  
Congress has the power to enact this legis-lation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, the Taxing and Spend-ing Clause: “The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. NUNNELEE:  
H.R. 4829.  
Congress has the power to enact this legis-lation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, the Taxing and Spend-

ing Clause: “The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:  
H.R. 4830.  
Congress has the power to enact this legis-lation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1. “The Con-gress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.”

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:  
H.R. 4831.  
Congress has the power to enact this legis-lation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1. “The Con-gress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.”

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:  
H.R. 4832.  
Congress has the power to enact this legis-lation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1. “The Con-gress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.”

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:  
H.R. 4833.  
Congress has the power to enact this legis-lation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1. “The Con-gress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.”

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:  
H.R. 4834.  
Congress has the power to enact this legis-lation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1. “The Con-gress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.”

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:  
H.R. 4835.  
Congress has the power to enact this legis-lation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1. “The Con-gress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.”

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:  
H.R. 4836.  
Congress has the power to enact this legis-lation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1. “The Con-gress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United

States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.”

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:  
H.R. 4837.  
Congress has the power to enact this legis-lation pursuant to the following: Article I, Section 8, Clause 1. “The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Im-posts and Excises, to pay the Debts and pro-vide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.”

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:  
H.R. 4838.  
Congress has the power to enact this legis-lation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1. “The Con-gress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.”

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:  
H.R. 4839.  
Congress has the power to enact this legis-lation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1. “The Con-gress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.”

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:  
H.R. 4840.  
Congress has the power to enact this legis-lation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1. “The Con-gress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.”

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:  
H.R. 4841.  
Congress has the power to enact this legis-lation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1. “The Con-gress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.”

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:  
H.R. 4842.  
Congress has the power to enact this legis-lation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1. “The Con-gress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.”

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:  
H.R. 4843.  
Congress has the power to enact this legis-lation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1. “The Con-gress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.”

By Mr. RUNYAN:  
H.R. 4844.  
Congress has the power to enact this legis-lation pursuant to the following:

The Commerce clause Article 1, Section 8, clause 3 of the Constitution  
By Mr. RUNYAN:  
H.R. 4844.  
Congress has the power to enact this legis-lation pursuant to the following:  
The Commerce clause Article 1, Section 8, clause 3 of the Constitution





Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;”

By Mr. DOYLE:

H.R. 4915.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to lay and collect duties and to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H.R. 4916.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to lay and collect duties and to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8.

By Mrs. ELLMERS:

H.R. 4917.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause I, the Congress shall have Power To lay and collect. Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

By extension of this Clause, Congress may also set the level of said duties including lowering them to zero where warranted.

By Ms. FUDGE:

H.R. 4918.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to lay and collect duties and to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 4919.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution—“The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.”

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 4920.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution—“The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.”

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 4921.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution—“The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.”

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 4922.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution—“The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and pro-

vide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.”

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 4923.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 4924.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 4925.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 4926.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 4927.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 4928.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution of the United States.

6 By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 4929.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan:

H.R. 4930.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution, which states the Congress shall have the power “To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations.”

By Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan:

H.R. 4931.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution, which states the Congress shall have the power “To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations.”

By Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan:

H.R. 4932.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution, which states the Congress shall have the power “To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations.”

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 4933.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress “to provide for the common Defence”, “to raise and support Armies”, “to provide and maintain a Navy” and “to make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces” as enumerated in Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LATOURETTE:

H.R. 4934.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 Clause 1 of the US Constitution.

By Mr. LATOURETTE:

H.R. 4935.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 Clause 1 of the US Constitution.

By Mr. LATOURETTE:

H.R. 4936.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 Clause 1 of the US Constitution.

By Mr. LATOURETTE:

H.R. 4937.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 Clause 1 of the US Constitution.

By Mr. LATOURETTE:

H.R. 4938.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 Clause 1 of the US Constitution.

By Mr. LATOURETTE:

H.R. 4939.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 Clause 1 of the US Constitution.

By Mr. LATOURETTE:

H.R. 4940.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 Clause 1 of the US Constitution.

By Mr. LATOURETTE:

H.R. 4941.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 Clause 1 of the US Constitution.

By Mr. LATOURETTE:

H.R. 4942.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 Clause 1 of the US Constitution.

By Mr. LATOURETTE:

H.R. 4943.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 Clause 1 of the US Constitution.

By Mr. LATOURETTE:

H.R. 4944.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 Clause 1 of the US Constitution.

By Mr. LATOURETTE:

H.R. 4945.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 Clause 1 of the US Constitution.

By Mr. LATOURETTE:

H.R. 4946.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 Clause 1 of the US Constitution.

By Mr. MICHAUD:

H.R. 4947.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. NOEM:

H.R. 4948.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, the Commerce Clause.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 4949.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3, which gives Congress the power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes."

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 4950.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3, which gives Congress the power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes."

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 4951.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3, which gives Congress the power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes."

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 4952.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3, which gives Congress the power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes."

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 4953.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PETRI:

H.R. 4954.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution which states: "The Congress shall have 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; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;"

AND

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution which grants Congress the power "To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;"

By Mr. PETRI:

H.R. 4955.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution which states: "The Congress shall have 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; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;"

AND

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution which grants Congress the power "To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;"

By Mr. RUPPERSBERGER:

H.R. 4956.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. RUPPERSBERGER:

H.R. 4957.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. RUPPERSBERGER:

H.R. 4958.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. RUPPERSBERGER:

H.R. 4959.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. RUPPERSBERGER:

H.R. 4960.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. RUPPERSBERGER:

H.R. 4961.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. RUPPERSBERGER:

H.R. 4962.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. SHERMAN:

H.R. 4963.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (the Commerce Clause).

By Mr. WATT:

H.R. 4964.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, the Taxing and Spending Clause: "The Congress shall have the Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . ."

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

- H.R. 23: Mr. ROSS of Arkansas.
- H.R. 85: Ms. WATERS and Mr. OLVER.
- H.R. 157: Mr. GOSAR.
- H.R. 218: Ms. WATERS.
- H.R. 327: Mr. PASCRELL.
- H.R. 329: Mr. STEARNS, Mr. PETRI, and Mr. PETERSON.
- H.R. 361: Mr. LOBIONDO.
- H.R. 365: Mr. GALLEGLY.
- H.R. 374: Mr. GRIMM.
- H.R. 409: Mr. PETRI.
- H.R. 451: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan and Mr. ANDREWS.
- H.R. 459: Mr. PETERSON.
- H.R. 721: Mr. PRICE of Georgia.
- H.R. 743: Mr. MCGOVERN.
- H.R. 807: Mr. COOPER.
- H.R. 860: Ms. WATERS.
- H.R. 885: Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. OWENS, Mr. LUJAN, Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.
- H.R. 1006: Mr. RANGEL.
- H.R. 1190: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. SCHOCK, and Mr. DOGGETT.
- H.R. 1375: Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. SHERMAN.
- H.R. 1386: Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. CHU, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. NEAL, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. CLARKE of Michigan.
- H.R. 1543: Ms. NORTON.
- H.R. 1592: Mr. LOBIONDO.
- H.R. 1639: Ms. BUEKLE.
- H.R. 1684: Mr. HIGGINS.
- H.R. 1697: Mr. MEEHAN.
- H.R. 1845: Mr. HECK, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PETRI, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. TSONGAS, and Mr. HARPER.
- H.R. 1955: Mr. MEEHAN.
- H.R. 1957: Mrs. MALONEY.
- H.R. 1960: Ms. BALDWIN.
- H.R. 1968: Mr. FORTENBERRY.
- H.R. 2051: Mr. YODER.
- H.R. 2069: Mr. PALLONE and Mr. ANDREWS.
- H.R. 2108: Mr. GOSAR and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
- H.R. 2134: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
- H.R. 2161: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
- H.R. 2185: Mr. FILNER.
- H.R. 2206: Mrs. ROBY.
- H.R. 2230: Mr. SABLAN.
- H.R. 2245: Ms. BONAMICI.
- H.R. 2269: Mr. HANNA.
- H.R. 2299: Mr. WESTMORELAND and Mr. LOBIONDO.
- H.R. 2429: Mr. YODER.
- H.R. 2569: Mr. HULTGREN.
- H.R. 2697: Mr. TIBERI.
- H.R. 2810: Mr. CONAWAY and Mr. NUNNELEE.
- H.R. 2888: Mr. YODER.
- H.R. 2962: Mr. HANNA.
- H.R. 3032: Mr. BOSWELL.
- H.R. 3125: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
- H.R. 3126: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
- H.R. 3173: Mr. WITTMAN and Mr. DEFazio.
- H.R. 3187: Mr. ROSKAM and Mr. GALLEGLY.
- H.R. 3238: Mr. BERG and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.
- H.R. 3368: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
- H.R. 3395: Mr. DENT.
- H.R. 3433: Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina.
- H.R. 3461: Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. CONAWAY, and Mr. SCHRADER.
- H.R. 3596: Mr. GUTIERREZ and Ms. TSONGAS.
- H.R. 3609: Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina.
- H.R. 3665: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
- H.R. 3679: Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. FALCOMA, and Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California.

- H.R. 3704: Ms. MOORE, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. BERMAN.
- H.R. 3728: Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mr. YODER.
- H.R. 3737: Mr. MEEHAN.
- H.R. 3803: Ms. BUERKLE, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. MICA, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mr. TURNER of Ohio.
- H.R. 3826: Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. MARKEY, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
- H.R. 3828: Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina.
- H.R. 3838: Mr. STARK.
- H.R. 3848: Mr. FINCHER, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. WEST, and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.
- H.R. 3863: Mr. MCGOVERN.
- H.R. 3985: Mrs. ELLMERS.
- H.R. 3989: Mr. BARLETTA.
- H.R. 3990: Mr. BARLETTA.
- H.R. 4017: Mr. LATHAM.
- H.R. 4066: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
- H.R. 4070: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York and Mr. TOWNS.
- H.R. 4077: Ms. RICHARDSON and Mr. SIREs.
- H.R. 4083: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
- H.R. 4120: Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. HIGGINS, and Mr. FORTENBERRY.
- H.R. 4122: Mr. MARKEY.
- H.R. 4132: Mr. PETERSON, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. POLIS, Mr. POSEY, and Mr. GUTHRIE.
- H.R. 4137: Mr. DINGELL.
- H.R. 4144: Ms. LEE of California.
- H.R. 4157: Mr. PEARCE, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. SCHILLING, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. FLORES, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.
- H.R. 4169: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
- H.R. 4192: Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. POLIS, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. COOPER, and Ms. CHU.
- H.R. 4201: Mr. JONES and Mr. KLINE.
- H.R. 4202: Mr. CLARKE of Michigan and Ms. FUDGE.
- H.R. 4222: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.
- H.R. 4229: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. PAULSEN, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
- H.R. 4243: Mr. SHUSTER, Ms. BUERKLE, and Mr. CLAY.
- H.R. 4257: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
- H.R. 4269: Mr. COBLE.
- H.R. 4271: Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.
- H.R. 4275: Mr. ELLISON and Ms. CHU.
- H.R. 4286: Ms. CLARKE of New York and Mr. CLARKE of Michigan.
- H.R. 4290: Mr. TOWNS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, and Ms. BALDWIN.
- H.R. 4330: Mr. OWENS, Mr. JONES, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. CRAWFORD, and Mr. FINCHER.
- H.R. 4335: Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. STARK, and Mr. ENGEL.
- H.R. 4336: Mr. TURNER of Ohio.
- H.R. 4367: Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. FINCHER, Ms. HAYWORTH, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. STIVERS.
- H.R. 4371: Mr. RANGEL.
- H.R. 4379: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
- H.R. 4502: Mr. HARRIS.
- H.R. 4503: Mr. HARRIS.
- H.R. 4504: Mr. HARRIS.
- H.R. 4505: Mr. HARRIS.
- H.R. 4643: Ms. JENKINS, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. HERGER, Mr. SCHOCK, and Mr. RANGEL.
- H.R. 4770: Mr. GERLACH.
- H.R. 4816: Mrs. CAPPs, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. COSTELLO, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. SIREs, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. MARKEY, and Ms. SPEIER.
- H.J. Res. 106: Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California.
- H.J. Res. 107: Mr. CANSECO.
- H. Con. Res. 115: Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. TURNER of Ohio, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. SCHILLING, and Mrs. NOEM.
- H. Con. Res. 120: Mr. CICILLINE and Mr. MCGOVERN.
- H. Res. 220: Mr. GALLEGLY.
- H. Res. 351: Ms. NORTON, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. SIREs, Mr. CARNAHAN, and Mr. FILNER.
- H. Res. 568: Mr. HALL, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, and Mr. LEVIN.
- H. Res. 592: Mr. HIGGINS.
- H. Res. 608: Mr. MORAN.
- H. Res. 609: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. RANGEL.
- H. Res. 611: Mr. SHUSTER.

---

#### 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 LANGEVIN, or a designee, to H.R. 3523, the Cyber Intelligence Sharing and Protection Act, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.