



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, APRIL 16, 2013

No. 51

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
April 16, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DANIEL WEBSTER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

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

THE McLELLAND-HASSE LINE OF DUTY ACT

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on January 31, Kaufman County, Texas, Assistant District Attorney Mark Hasse had just pulled into work at the courthouse. He got out of his car and he started walking through the parking lot like he did every day, but Mark never made it to the courthouse to prosecute any other cases. He was ambushed, sprayed with bullets, and murdered in the parking lot. Officials are still uncertain of who murdered him.

Then on March 19, just after supper-time in Colorado, the top prison chief, Tom Clements, heard a knock at his door. When he opened the door, he was shot point blank; and he died in the doorway of his own home in his own blood. Clements' suspected killer, Evan Able, resurfaced in Texas weeks later and died in a shootout with law enforcement officers in north Texas because he promised that he would not ever return to prison.

Just 11 days later back in Kaufman County, Texas, District Attorney Mike McLelland and his wife, Cynthia, were sitting at home when their home was invaded by intruders. Mike was shot 20 times, and his wife, Cynthia, was also murdered. They were assassinated and murdered in their own home. District Attorney Mike McLelland had vowed to bring the scum to justice that had killed his assistant district attorney, Mark Hasse, but the assassins got all of them first: three fallen law enforcement officers and one family member.

And just yesterday, a woman in jail in Texas is accused of trying to hire a hit man to kill Assistant District Attorney Rob Freyer, a friend of mine, and to also injure the district attorney in Montgomery County, Texas, to mimic the Kaufman County shootings.

These attacks, Mr. Speaker, are really attacks on the symbol of the rule of law in the United States. These attacks also hit home for me and others of us who have worked at the courthouse. I spent part of my life as a prosecutor and a judge in Texas.

Bad guys come through the courthouse charged with everything from stealing to killing. And I, like many others, had threats on several occasions; but fortunate for me, law enforcement officers in Houston, Texas, made sure those threats were never carried out. But as we've seen this year, sometimes the bad guys are successful in attacking and killing folks that work at the courthouse.

Law enforcement officials, prosecutors, and judges do the work that many people just don't want to do, or will do. They deliver justice to criminals knowing that they face the threat of retaliation when they administer justice. These public officials enforce the rule of law for those who live outside the law.

That's why I'm introducing the McLelland-Hasse Line of Duty Act. Senator CORNYN has introduced a similar bill in the Senate. This bill would beef up protections for prosecutors and judges who are in danger of retaliation and who are threatened with intimidation. It boosts the punishment for killing these officials or their family members or conspiring to commit these crimes against these individuals. The legislation also allows them to carry firearms in Federal facilities and Federal courts and other jurisdictions for their own self-protection.

Courthouse prosecutors and judges risk their lives every day to administer justice and create order in our communities. This legislation promotes security for those that secure justice for the rest of us.

Because justice is what we do in America.

And that's just the way it is.

PREVENTABLE PATIENT DEATHS

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

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I want to come to the House floor today to address what I think is a serious issue facing all Americans without regard to race, color, party, region of the country, or anything like that. The issue that I want to talk about is trying to prevent patient deaths.

Back in 1999, the statistics show that about 98,000 people a year died from preventable medical deaths, preventable deaths in hospitals and things like

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.

H2029

that. That number has grown. We're now at about 200,000 people a year who die in hospitals because of preventable death. That's about 3,800 people every week, which is basically the equivalent of two jumbo jet passenger airplanes crashing and killing all of the passengers.

The fact of the matter is that this is something that we as a Nation need to step forward and do something about. It's something that is in our power to do something about. The thing that we need to do to prevent these preventable deaths is to coordinate. It is possible to eliminate these deaths. It is possible through a series of measures to even eliminate them completely.

What we need to do is first of all look at this problem in a holistic way. There's not one magic thing that is going to stop all of them, but a series of small things that are going to prevent and eradicate these preventable deaths.

The first thing I think we need to do is to come together to figure out how to connect our technology, the people and ideas and figure out how to cooperate and, most importantly, make a commitment to prevent these deaths from happening.

Ten years ago, there was a young woman named Lenore Alexander, who had a healthy 11-year-old girl, Leah. Leah underwent elective surgery to correct pectus carinatum at a prestigious southern California hospital. Though the surgery went well, Lenore awoke at around 2 a.m. on the second postoperative night to find Leah dead, the victim of undetected respiratory arrest caused by a drug that was intended to ease her pain. If Leah had been monitored continuously after the surgery, hospital staff and Lenore may have been alerted, and Leah would probably have been rescued.

There are also other sorts of preventable deaths that have to do with the transfer of infections when hands aren't washed properly. Monitoring was already pointed out by Lenore's tragic situation. The fact is that Lenore's situation is not unique, unfortunately. The Patient Safety, Science & Technology Summit is a gathering of people who came together to figure out what we can do to solve the problem—going back to that coordination and cooperation that I spoke about earlier.

The fact is that at this Patient Safety, Science & Technology Summit trained professionals came together to figure out what we can do about it. They came together to talk about, yes, technology, but also just more safe procedures to protect, eliminate, and save people from preventable deaths.

These preventable deaths are tragedies for the families that suffer them. Imagine going into a hospital for a routine procedure that you don't think is going to be serious only to get the tragic news that your loved one has passed away in the course of it.

So today I want to bring attention, Mr. Speaker, to this situation that is

within our power to eliminate and stop. I want to salute the people who attended the Patient Safety, Science & Technology Summit, who came together to try to bring real attention to this problem.

A good friend named Joe Kiani brought this issue to my attention. He's a person who has given a lot of time and attention to try to figure out how we can save families from tragic incidents such as what happened to Lenore's family. And, of course, everyone has something that they can do to prevent these serious problems.

□ 1010

At the end of the day, our goal should be to make zero the number of deaths in hospitals, to make preventable deaths something of the past, and to bring Americans to attention so that we can focus our technology, our procedures, our energy, and our love and attention on trying to make sure that no family suffers these tragic incidents anymore. 200,000 deaths is too many. One is too many. Zero should be our goal. Let's stop preventable hospital deaths.

KEEP CRUSHABLE PAIN PILLS OFF THE MARKET

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, today marks a critical turning point in our country's battle against prescription drug abuse—what CDC has called a national epidemic. It takes more American lives than car crashes.

Unless the Food and Drug Administration takes action today, generic drug-makers will be free to dump cheap painkillers, lacking abuse deterrence, back into U.S. markets—pills that can be easily crushed and which are to be blamed for tens of thousands of emergency room visits and accidental overdose deaths in the last decade.

Two weeks ago, at the National Rx Drug Abuse Summit, FDA Commissioner Peggy Hamburg acknowledged the many "individuals and their families whose lives have been shattered by prescription opioid abuse, misuse, and addiction." She also affirmed that FDA has the authority to keep these crushable pills off the market when abuse-deterrent technologies are available.

It is time to execute that authority, FDA. On behalf of the thousands of families in my region and all over this country, keep crushable pills off our streets and out of our children's hands.

SPECIAL IMMIGRANT VISAS

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. In the aftermath of the 10th anniversary of the war in Iraq this spring, those of us who op-

pose the war, as those who thought it justified, are all sorting through what happened. More important, we are united in our support for our men and women in uniform who fought that heroic effort regardless of our feelings about the war's justification or history's verdict.

We have an obligation to all those who served to smooth their reentry and to minimize the price they paid for that war.

But there is another group who put themselves at risk for the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. I am speaking of the Iraqi and Afghan nationals who worked with the American soldiers—thousands who were shoulder to shoulder with our troops, often in the most difficult of circumstances. They provided services as guides and interpreters that literally made the difference as to whether our soldiers lived or died.

I've talked to returning servicepeople who made clear how important it was that they had that help and how grateful they were to the Iraqis and Afghans who played those vital roles. I've worked with some of those soldiers to try and bring to America—to safety—some of those people who worked with them.

There is another group who knows about their contributions—the hostile elements still on the ground in Iraq and Afghanistan. These are people with long memories, who have vowed to take retribution for what they felt was an act of betrayal. Countless foreign nationals who worked with us have paid the price. They, along with members of their families, have been attacked, kidnapped, and killed.

We have an obligation to get them out of harm's way.

That is why I worked with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and on both sides of the Capitol in 2007 to create a special immigration visa program to enable them to come safely to the United States. It's a program not just for Iraqis; but starting in 2008, it was extended to Afghans as well—anyone who faced an ongoing and serious threat as a result of their employment for and on behalf of the United States Government. These two programs have enabled us to save the lives of these brave Iraqis and Afghans who often were in the heaviest fighting and whose contributions were most critical.

But we're facing two serious problems:

One, the programs are set to expire—for Iraq, September 30; for Afghanistan, 1 year later. Even more critically, we need to make sure that the special immigration visas, the SIVs, that have already been authorized are utilized. The processing has been incredibly slow.

Recently, joined by 18 of my colleagues of both parties, including six of our colleagues who were veterans of Iraq and Afghanistan, we urged the administration to work with us to extend and reform the visa program. Let's cut through the extensive paperwork, the numerous agencies and timelines involved with all the background checks,

provide the transparency to applicants so they know where they're at, and address the adverse decisions by a chief of missions so people have a chance to correct the record.

Make no mistake—this is urgent.

Just yesterday, on the front page of *The New York Times*, there was the story about an Afghan interpreter named Sulaiman, who has been working with us in Afghanistan for over a decade in over 300 missions in highly dangerous Special Operations assignment. Over the course of the last few years, the Taliban has attempted to kill Sulaiman three times; but despite his exemplary service and the extreme threat to his life, that visa we created is not functioning for him. After 2 years, he remains in limbo, with no visa and the program set to expire. Only 22 percent of the Iraqi visas and 12 percent of the Afghan visas have been issued. These are ready to go.

Last fall, *The Post* reported that over 5,000 documentarily-complete Afghan applications remained in a backlog. No doubt, the past performance is abysmal, but we have an obligation to extend and reform the programs and to make sure we give the resources necessary to deal with the understandable paperwork involved.

This bipartisan issue offers Members of Congress and the administration the chance to work together to save lives and ensure the safety of our troops currently serving in harm's way and future missions abroad. Otherwise, no one in their right mind is ever going to cooperate with U.S. forces under these circumstances.

THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY'S FY14 BUDGET PROPOSAL ON NUCLEAR WASTE

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the Department of Energy's budget proposal on nuclear waste. It's a joke—but as a representative of nuclear electricity consumers and taxpayers, I don't find it funny.

DOE Assistant Secretary Peter Lyons says we should "cut our losses and move on" from Yucca Mountain. We've spent \$15 billion on Yucca Mountain, but this administration says we should just give up and go try somewhere else, hoping some other State will be a willing host. The DOE budget proposes spending \$5.6 billion over the next 10 years to start over and maybe, just maybe, have a permanent repository by 2048.

The details provided for this new plan are scant to say the least—14 pages. DOE proposes to abandon \$15 billion and 30 years of work, start over, create a new government entity to be responsible, and find willing States to host two interim storage facilities and a repository—all within 14 pages. I consider it brainstorming, not a plan. It's certainly not something that justifies

\$5.6 billion. In addition, DOE has repeatedly stated the need for Congress to pass legislation, but has yet to propose any. That shows the administration is not trying to solve this problem, just avoid it by pointing the finger at Congress.

Nuclear electricity consumers pay for a permanent repository for spent nuclear fuel. What would they get after spending another 10 years and \$5.6 billion? A pilot interim storage facility with limited capacity.

□ 1020

A pilot facility? Dry cask storage, the same technology that will be used at the interim storage facility, is currently used at 65 locations. As for transportation, the U.S. nuclear industry has completed 3,000 shipments of used nuclear fuel over 1.7 million miles of roads and railroads. What's the purpose of having a pilot facility?

The only other pilot facility is the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in New Mexico. I've been there, and it's an impressive facility. But that pilot project became a permanent facility with a 10,000-year environmental standard. Given that backdrop, does DOE really think some unsuspecting State will actually fall for the idea that a pilot interim storage facility will truly be temporary?

But \$5.6 billion doesn't begin to address the real costs hidden in this proposal. Instead of merely paying for a repository, nuclear electricity consumers will now have to write off the cost of abandoning the Yucca Mountain site where we've spent \$15 billion. DOE's previous estimates for transportation were \$19 billion; so if DOE is now going to have to transport it twice, once to an interim storage and then later to a repository, ratepayers will be on the hook for an extra \$19 billion. All this, plus the \$5.6 billion in the budget, equals \$39.6 billion.

And that's just the bill for nuclear electricity consumers. Taxpayers will continue to pay for the liability costs of DOE's failure to provide disposal. That cost is \$2.6 billion so far and projected to be \$20 billion by 2020. The Government Accountability Office tells us that it's faster to finish Yucca Mountain than to start over with interim storage. Yet this administration prefers to start over, disregarding the cost to the taxpayer.

Electricity consumers and taxpayers shouldn't have to pay for President Obama's campaign promise to HARRY REID, certainly not \$39.6 billion worth. Mr. Speaker, DOE's proposal is a boondoggle at a time when our citizens can least afford it. I, for one, am not laughing.

Mr. Speaker, as we remember the tragic events of yesterday, we are reminded that there is sin and evil in the world. We pray for Boston, our country, and the world, but the business of the Republic must go on.

PROTECTING AMERICA

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to reflect again on yesterday's tragic and obviously painful events. I think it's important for our colleagues, and certainly for those we represent across America, to recognize that our attention on those issues are equal to the pain and the devastation that they represent. It is important to again offer sympathy to those who lost their loved ones, to those who still are under the care of the medical team in Boston, to the city of Boston, the State of Massachusetts, the mayor and Governor, my colleagues from the State of Massachusetts, and certainly the people there. You have our prayers and, again, our commitment to never cease until the perpetrator or perpetrators are brought to justice.

In saying that, I believe it is important that we proceed in a discussion that will also move this country forward, and that is to finally get to a point of passing a budget that eliminates, takes away, never to be seen again, this horrific sequester that the American people do not deserve.

Let me congratulate the President on having a humane budget, a budget that considers the needs of Americans. It is outstanding that he has offered a universal pre-K, having seen the tears of grown men when the sequester came through and their child was eliminated from Head Start, grown men, parents crying at the Head Start center. And everywhere I go in my district, people who are in charge of Head Start literally in pain about those that they have to eliminate from those positions because those families don't have the resources for private child care.

So I congratulate the President on his astuteness in recognizing the importance of that and recognizing to not stray away from the necessities of job creation and putting in place major transportation jobs and infrastructure jobs: passenger rail, which I am so passionate about; surface transportation; and a most important one, rebuilding your neighborhoods and communities and cities where jobs are in short demand and where the infrastructure and the city is crumbling.

I want to congratulate the President for his saving of Medicaid and ensuring that seniors who are in nursing homes will be protected. But, more importantly, that those without health insurance will have the ability under the Affordable Care Act to ensure that they will have that.

But I serve as well on the Homeland Security Committee, and I think it is important to say and be honest that the sequester is devastating to America's homeland security. It is good to have a budget that respects those needs, but it is important to tell the truth. We are desperate when it comes to recognizing the needs of our Border Patrol agents and the numbers, even at

16 APRIL, 1963.

21,000, that we may need to increase, that there are Border Patrol agents being removed from the front lines in order to process those individuals who have come across the border. When they do that, they remove the coverage from the front lines on the border dealing with those who are in those detention centers.

We have to recognize that transportation security, as much as one might say how many officers they have, in the sequester, we will be standing in long lines, and it is about to come. That is the front lines of securing this Nation, along with the Coast Guard and many, many other facets of the Department of Homeland Security.

We are asked a question about the securing of the homeland. We are feeling the pain along with our colleagues of the tragedies that have occurred, the attempted Times Square bombing, the successful bombing in Boston. We cannot take this anymore, and I believe it is time, with the President's budget, the Senate's budget, the House budget, that the Speaker of the House needs to immediately appoint budget conferees to move us forward to conference and to get rid of the sequester, which is not the fault of the American people.

Our deficit is going down. We need to determine what revenue we can increase in order to pay our bills and provide for the basic necessities of this Nation. Not only is the tragedy in Boston one of human life, but it is a disaster that requires Federal Emergency Management aid, just as our continued friends in the Southeast and Northeast are still suffering from Hurricane Sandy and the atrocity of this House not providing them with resources for 65 days.

So I believe it is time for the American people to know that we do care. In order to care, you need to have budget conferees go through the budget process and begin to pass elements of the President's budget that speaks to the heart and mind of the needs of the American people.

I conclude by offering my deepest sympathy and my promise to those who suffer that America and its Congress must stand up to respond to your needs. I'm ready to do so, as my colleagues are, and we should do it now.

NATIONAL OSTEOPATHIC MEDICINE WEEK

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

Mr. HECK of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today to announce that this week, April 14 through April 20, is National Osteopathic Medicine Week. This week celebrates the contributions of more than 100,000 osteopathic physicians and medical students in the United States to the health of our communities.

There are many doctors in the House of Representatives, but as the lone osteopathic physician in Congress, I feel

it incumbent upon me to mark this week by raising awareness of the importance of osteopathic medicine.

The practice of osteopathic medicine was founded by Dr. Andrew Taylor Still in 1874, and over the past 139 years, osteopathic physicians have made significant contributions to the United States health care system. Osteopathic doctors have treated Presidents and Olympic athletes, contributed to the fight against AIDS, and continue to be involved on the front lines of our health care systems today. In fact, Dr. Martin Levine, immediate past president of the American Osteopathic Association, was part of the medical team at the Boston Marathon and was pressed into service, providing immediate care in the wake of yesterday's tragedy.

As osteopathic physicians, we take a holistic approach to medicine that focuses on the health of the whole person, and we are committed to improving the health of the communities we serve through education and awareness, as well as delivering quality health care services.

In light of the contributions made by osteopathic physicians to the health of our Nation, and this being their national week of recognition, I have introduced House Resolution 159, which calls on the House to support the designation of National Osteopathic Medicine Week.

I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing the field of osteopathic medicine and supporting the designation of National Osteopathic Medicine Week.

□ 1030

CELEBRATING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING'S "LETTER FROM A BIRMINGHAM JAIL"

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

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to join so many Americans across this Nation and this world in celebrating the 50th anniversary of Dr. Martin Luther King's "Letter from a Birmingham Jail."

After being arrested on April 12, 1963, Dr. King came across an article in The Birmingham News entitled "White Clergymen Urge Local Negroes to Withdraw From Demonstrations."

The eight White clergymen who authored that article were very critical of Dr. King and the others who demonstrated. They called the demonstrations "untimely and unwise."

These criticisms inspired Dr. King to pen a letter that was published upon his release on April 16, 1963. The letter became one of the most preeminent documents of the civil rights era. So today I join the voices around the world as I read in part from this beautifully written, masterful document, "Letter from a Birmingham Jail" by Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.:

My Dear Fellow Clergymen:

While confined here in the Birmingham city jail, I came across your recent statement calling my present activities "unwise and untimely." Seldom do I pause to answer criticisms of my work and ideas. If I sought to answer all the criticisms that cross my desk, my secretaries would have little time for anything else . . . But since I feel that you are men of genuine goodwill, and that your criticisms are sincere and heartfelt, I want to try to answer your statement in what I hope will be a patient and reasonable term.

I think I should indicate why I am here in Birmingham, since you have been influenced by the view that I am somehow an outsider coming in. I am in Birmingham because injustice is here.

Moreover, I am cognizant of the interdependency of all communities and states. I cannot sit idly by in Atlanta and not be concerned about what's happening in Birmingham. Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere. We are caught in an inescapable network of mutuality, tied in a single garment of destiny. Whatever affects one directly, affects all indirectly. Never again can we afford to live with the narrow, provincial "outside agitator" idea. Anyone who lives in the United States of America can never be considered an outsider anywhere within its bounds.

We know through painful experience that freedom is never voluntarily given by the oppressor; it must be demanded by the oppressed. Frankly, I have yet to engage in a direct-action campaign that was not "well timed" in the view of those who have not suffered unduly from the disease of segregation. For years now, I have heard the word "Wait!" It rings in the ear of every Negro with piercing familiarity. This "Wait" has almost always meant "Never." We must come to see with one another what one jurist said, that "justice too long delayed is justice denied."

Oppressed people cannot remain oppressed forever. The yearning for freedom eventually manifests itself, and that is what has happened to the American Negro.

The Negro has had many pent up frustrations and resentments and must release them. So let him march; let him make a prayerful pilgrimage to the city hall; let him go on freedom rides and try to understand why he must do so; let him release his frustration in a nonviolent way . . .

But though I was initially disappointed at being criticized as an extremist by you, as I continued to think about the matter I gradually gained a measure of satisfaction from the label. Was not Jesus an extremist for love?

Was not Amos an extremist for justice? "Let justice roll down like waters and righteousness like an ever-flowing stream."

Was not Paul an extremist for the Christian gospel? "I bear in my body the marks of the Lord Jesus."

So the question is not whether we will be extremists, but what kind of extremists we will be. Will we be extremists for hate or for love? Will we be extremists for the preservation of injustice or for the extension of justice?

Perhaps the South, the Nation, and the world are in dire need of creative extremists.

I hope this letter finds you in strong faith. Let us all hope that the dark cloud of racial prejudice will soon pass away and the deep fog of misunderstanding will lift from our fear-drenched communities, and in some time not so distant, that the radiant stars of love and brotherhood will shine over our great Nation in all of their succulent beauty.

Yours for the cause of peace and brotherhood.

Martin Luther King, Jr.

So Mr. Speaker, on this 50th anniversary of this beautifully written letter, I hope my colleagues will join me in reflecting on its powerful words. "Letter from a Birmingham Jail" stands as a reminder of how far we've come in our Nation and living up to the ideals of justice and equality for all.

CLIMATE CHANGE

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

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, Ranking Member WAXMAN and I have sent 24 letters to Chairman UPTON of the Energy and Commerce Committee and Chairman WHITFIELD of the Energy and Power Committee since May 2011 requesting hearings on the science of climate change.

Mr. Speaker, since Mr. WAXMAN and I are not able to get the majority on the Energy and Commerce Committee to act, I take it upon myself to come to the House floor to speak directly to the American people on why this issue is so important to them. Power to the people.

Mr. Speaker, last year, 2012, marked the hottest year ever recorded in U.S. history. Fully two-thirds of our Nation experienced drought. Half of the Nation's grazing pastures and up to 30 percent of the Nation's corn crop was in poor condition, or in very poor condition, which impacted the price that the American people pay for their food, for ethanol, and for consumer goods for all of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, just because some of my colleagues might not like what the science is telling us, it does not mean that they can continue to put their collective heads in the sand and simply ignore these facts or wish these facts away.

Last year's record temperatures, serious droughts, pervasive wildfires, and widespread flooding prove that there is climate change occurring all around us on a regular basis continually.

And Mr. Speaker, the majority ignores climate change, not at some of our peril, not at a portion of our peril, not at a minority of our peril, but all of our perils are being impacted because of the majority's refusal to simply have the scientists come before the committee of jurisdiction and tell this Congress, in no uncertain terms, what is really happening to the world's climate.

□ 1040

Mr. Speaker, these very same scientists, these experts, these people who have spent and dedicated their lives to understanding climate and climate control and what is happening, these climatologists are waiting, they're willing, and they're eager to come before this Congress to share their information and their expertise with the Members of this Congress. The scientists are sounding the alarm and in-

forming us that we are reaching a critical tipping point as it relates to this very important issue of climate control.

Mr. Speaker, my prayers are for the people of Boston, my prayers are for the people in Boston, and my prayers are for the American people. All power to the people.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 41 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

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

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

As the people's House gathers today, our Nation's heart is heavy as once again our domestic tranquility has been shattered by the selfish and violent actions witnessed yesterday near the finish line of the Boston Marathon.

We ask Your blessing, Lord, on those who died and those who mourn them, on those who were physically injured, and on those who have been emotionally traumatized. We give You thanks for those many who responded to the injured and to those who kept the order and keep it still.

And send Your Spirit upon whomever perpetrated this bombing and others who might contemplate emulating it. Calm their troubled souls, stay their violent hands. May those tasked with investigating this tragedy find success in their work, so that justice might be served and peace returned to our Nation's communities.

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

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. O'ROURKE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. O'ROURKE 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.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEES ON THE JUDICIARY AND HOMELAND SECURITY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignations as a member of the Committees on the Judiciary and Homeland Security:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 16, 2013.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
The Capitol, Washington DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: In light of my recent appointment to the House Committee on Financial Services, I hereby resign my position on both the House Committee on the Judiciary and the House Committee on Homeland Security.

Sincerely,

KEITH ROTHFUS,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignations are accepted. There was no objection.

ELECTING A MEMBER TO A STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the House Republican Conference, I send to the desk a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 162

Resolved, That the following named Member be, and is hereby, elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES: Mr. Rothfus.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

HONORING SAIGE HALSETH

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

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to honor Saige Halseth, a fifth-grade student at Shawnee Heights Elementary School in Topeka, Kansas, who has brought together her community by helping her classmate, Alex White.

Alex suffers from a progressive neurological condition that affects his balance and mobility, and relied on a special companion, a service dog named

Hope, until March, when Hope was tragically killed by a motorist. For Alex, Hope was a blessing, a best friend and, to quote Alex directly, quite the “chick magnet.”

Saige knows how much Alex depended on Hope, and she started a fund-raising campaign to help him afford a new service dog. She wrote letters sharing his story and sold wristbands that read, “Always Have Hope.”

I want to thank Saige, a caring young leader and inspiration to her community, for her selfless commitment to helping her friend, Alex.

It's because of young people like Alex and Saige that even after yesterday's tragedy in Boston, we can always have hope.

THERE IS STILL MUCH MORE TO LEARN ABOUT ALZHEIMER'S

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, I will participate in a symposium on dementia being sponsored by the western New York chapter of the Alzheimer's Association. This event is a reminder that, while progress has been made in understanding Alzheimer's, there is still a great deal that we must learn about how to treat this terrible illness.

Alzheimer's is a disease whose origins are unknown, but whose end is absolutely certain. It's a disease that's touched the families of many in this Chamber, including my own.

According to the Alzheimer's Association, as many as 5 million Americans have Alzheimer's disease, with its prevalence expected to increase over the next several decades.

With so many in Washington mindlessly devoted to the agenda of austerity, we must remember that our budget is not only an accounting statement, but also a statement of our values. I urge the rejection of austerity and an increase in the funding we need for medical research to find a cure for diseases like Alzheimer's that devastate so many American families.

DOUBLE DIP: SOCIAL SECURITY DISABILITY INSURANCE AND UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as part of my ongoing effort to protect precious, hard-earned taxpayer dollars by going after waste, fraud, and abuse, I have introduced a commonsense bill, H.R. 1502—listen up—the Social Security Disability Insurance and Unemployment Benefits Double Dip Elimination Act of 2013.

This bill would stop people from receiving disability at the same time they are receiving unemployment. Under current law, a person can receive

both disability and unemployment at the same time. This isn't right. It just doesn't make sense. I don't know how someone can be able and available to work and also be unable to work because of a disability.

I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense bill in order to help make sure the disability program is there for those who truly cannot work.

President Obama also included a similar proposal in his budget, and I look forward to working with the administration to get this bill signed into law.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

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

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of immigration reform. I wanted to take a moment to read an excerpt from a letter I received from Father Sean Carroll, a Jesuit priest who's with the Kino Border Initiative in Arizona.

He writes:

I have been working with deported migrant men, women, and children along the U.S. border with Mexico. These past 4 years I have witnessed their brokenness in body and spirit.

I have held the hand of a mother separated from her children in Chicago and listened to a father deported away from his children in North Dakota. I have been present with the son seeking to be reunited with his mother in Central California.

I know God calls us not to oppress the widow, the orphan, and the stranger—Exodus 22 and Deuteronomy 27—and yet I have witnessed how we make widows out of women migrants when we deport them away from their husbands. And I'm aware of how we turn U.S. children into orphans by repatriating their parents to Mexico and placing them in foster care.

I see the ways we reject the stranger, the person seeking a better life for their families, the one who, in the Gospel of Matthew, reflects the presence of Jesus Himself.

What would happen if we accepted God's invitation to remember the moments that we were in exile, in Exodus, the times when we felt like strangers, and to recall how God had led us through those experiences to new life?

□ 1210

TRAGEDY IN BOSTON

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, we saw yet another sickening act of terror yesterday in Boston. It was a grim reminder that there is evil in the world. There are those with dark hearts and twisted ideologies bent on killing Americans because of who we are and the values we hold dear.

Early reports indicate the bombs were packed with metal ball bearings to inflict maximum carnage on the innocent. One of the innocent was an 8-year-old boy found dead among the

smoke, confusion, and blood. Eight years old.

As we track down the killer or killers, let us pray for the victims and their families, and let us resolve to never take the freedoms we enjoy as Americans for granted, never take the service of those who protect our freedoms for granted, never forget those who've made the ultimate sacrifice, and never underestimate the lengths to which America's enemies will go to do us harm.

But, Mr. Speaker, our enemies should never, ever underestimate America's resolve to hold accountable those responsible for this deadly attack.

REMEMBERING NAVAL FLIGHT OFFICER WILLIAM BROWN McILVAINE, III

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

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember William Brown McIlvaine, III, a naval flight officer from El Paso, Texas, who led an exemplary life. Lieutenant Junior Grade McIlvaine died last month during a training flight when his Prowler airplane crashed.

In his 24 years, William accomplished remarkable things and touched many lives with his friendship and his kindness. He was commissioned from the U.S. Naval Academy with Merit in May 2010 with a degree in chemistry. His lifelong dream was to fly, and he earned his wings in May 2012 at the Pensacola Naval Air Station. William was also a gifted musician. He sang in a cappella groups and played the bagpipes. During his time at Annapolis, he led the Pipes and Drums, which toured the U.S. and played in parades, including the St. Patrick's Day parade in Boston.

We remember William as someone who lived his dreams and died serving his Nation. On behalf of the El Paso community, I am proud to honor William's extraordinary life and his service.

HONORING THE DOOLITTLE RAIDERS

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to salute the Doolittle Raiders. Seventy-one years ago this Thursday, 16 Army bombers took off from the flight deck of an aircraft carrier, the USS Hornet. The Hornet was spotted by the Japanese hundreds of miles before their intended launch point. Led by Colonel Doolittle, all 16 bombers were launched, knowing that they would not have the fuel for safe shelter and they would crash land in enemy territory. A short 4 months after Pearl Harbor, these heroes bombed Tokyo and sent a message to the world that America

would win World War II. Eighty pilots took off that day. Four of them are still alive. They had their last reunion this week.

I ask my colleagues to support H.R. 1209, which will give a Congressional Gold Medal to the Doolittle Raiders and give them one final honor before their final flight home.

TRAGEDY IN BOSTON

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

Mr. HORSFORD. Yesterday was a tragic day. In our thoughts and prayers are those who lost their lives or were injured during the Boston Marathon, as well as the families and friends of those affected. The character of our country was reflected in the Boston police and firefighters, the first responders, the nurses and the medical providers, the people donating blood, the residents offering shelter and care, the thousands praying for healing, and everyone opening their doors in Boston to care for those in need.

Today, we are all Bostonians. There are no words to console those who have lost loved ones, but Congress will assist those in Boston and Massachusetts in any way possible. As we await answers, we will continue to make emergency preparedness, responsiveness, and caring for those in need a priority.

TRAGEDY IN BOSTON

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

Mr. MESSER. I rise on behalf of Indiana's Sixth Congressional District to express our condolences to the victims of yesterday's bombing in Boston. The thoughts and prayers of every American are with those who were killed and maimed by this unspeakable horror. We don't yet know who turned what should have been a day of triumph into a day of tragedy. But those whose lives have been forever changed by this terror should know that their government will not rest until the responsible are brought to justice.

May God bless the victims, comfort their families, and continue to watch over the United States of America.

CHARLES YOUNG BUFFALO SOLDIERS NATIONAL MONUMENT

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

Mrs. BEATTY. I would like to join with my fellow Ohioans to thank President Obama and Secretary Salazar for the designation of the Charles Young Buffalo Soldiers National Monument in Wilberforce, the great State of Ohio. This monument recognizes the legacy of Charles Young and the proud traditions of African Americans in our military over the last nearly 150 years.

I join my good friend Marsha Bayless, mayor of Xenia, Ohio, who is in D.C. today, because we believe that it is a great honor for our community that the home of this outstanding American, the first African American to reach the rank of colonel, be recognized and honored. I urge the House to wholeheartedly support the President's efforts to preserve the American heritage through the Antiquities Act.

KING-THOMPSON PROPOSAL THREATENS SECOND AMENDMENT RIGHTS

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

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my concern and opposition to legislation introduced today in the House of Representatives by Representatives PETER KING and MIKE THOMPSON. This bill, which mirrors a recent Senate proposal to expand background checks, holds threats to our Second Amendment rights while doing little to address the underlying problems behind violent crimes. As thousands of Montanans have shared with me, expanding Washington bureaucracy and restricting the rights of law-abiding citizens is the wrong approach. This is the number one issue I hear about from my great State.

As a fifth-generation Montanan and lifelong sportsman, I am deeply committed to protecting the rights that thousands of Montanans lawfully exercise every day. We recognize that the Second Amendment is not about hunting. It is about freedom. That's why I joined my colleague, Representative STEVE STOCKMAN, in the calling of the House to block any proposal to undermine the Second Amendment; and I will continue to fight against any proposals, whether in the House or the Senate, that threaten Montanans' Second Amendment rights.

STANDING WITH BOSTON

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

Ms. KUSTER. In the wake of yesterday's tragedy in Boston, I come to the floor with a very heavy heart. In the days and weeks to come, we'll remember those we lost and those who were injured. We'll remember where we were when we first heard the news, and we'll remember how a cowardly act of violence shattered a beautiful Boston day.

But we'll also remember the extraordinary heroism that we saw in Boston yesterday. In the immediate aftermath of the explosion, when every human instinct tells you to seek safety and to run away, our fearless first responders ran toward danger, selflessly putting themselves in harm's way to save others.

In the worst of that moment, we saw the best of America. In times of crisis, we stick together. We take care of one

another. We put the needs of others before our own. And no one exemplifies this more than those brave Americans who rushed to aid the victims of this horrific crime.

As law enforcement works to identify those responsible for these cowardly acts, I join all Granite Staters in sending my thoughts and prayers to the victims, their families, and the entire city of Boston.

□ 1220

TERRORISM IN BOSTON

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

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the people of Oregon's Second District to offer my deepest sympathies to the families and the victims of this senseless act of terrorism in Boston.

Scripture tells us: blessed are those who mourn, for they will be comforted. Our prayers go to those who lost loved ones and to the injured as they recover so that they may be comforted.

Our thanks go to the first responders and Good Samaritans who selflessly assisted the victims yesterday. That's what Americans do; they help their fellow men and women in time of need. That's a common bond that unites us.

Boston is the birthplace of the American Revolution, the cradle of liberty for our Nation. That spirit of freedom and brotherhood lives on in us as Americans and brings us closer together in our grief. As Americans, we will care for the victims and their families; we will ensure that justice is done for those behind these cowardly attacks; and we will emerge as a Nation, stronger than ever before.

FAMILY REUNIFICATION

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

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, as we begin the much-anticipated discussion on immigration reform, we have tended to overlook a critical aspect of it, and that is called family reunification.

What's the problem? Family reunification has arbitrary caps and major backlogs. The caps are about 114,000 per country, and most countries have an average of 10 years of backlog. They're working on 2003 applications. But there is one country that has had a greater rate, and that is the Philippines. This is the saddest example.

The Filipino World War II veterans were promised full rights for fighting with us against the Japanese in World War II. After the war, there was the Rescission Act of 1946 which took away that promise. In 1990, we finally made good on that promise, but we're processing 1989 applications to reunify these families. Many can't travel anymore. Many can't wait. Families are critical to the success of this country.

Small businesses are built with families, values of unity, caring for elders. We must keep our promise.

BOSTON MARATHON ATTACK

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

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, on a day meant to celebrate patriots' freedom and personal strength, we witnessed terror and tragedy. My prayers remain with the victims and everyone in Boston. I'm grateful for the first responders, the medical professionals, and fellow citizens who responded so heroically.

We don't know yet who is responsible for this terrorist attack. The United States Government must—and will—use all tools at its disposal to track down the perpetrators and hold them accountable.

This vicious act of terror cannot stand, and we must remain committed to the task of combating the scourge of terrorism no matter where it raises its ugly head.

The Boston Marathon is a symbol of so much of what is great about America. It honors personal fortitude and perseverance. Let it continue to be a symbol of fortitude and perseverance for Boston and for our entire Nation.

GUN VIOLENCE PREVENTION LEGISLATION

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I have been on this floor yesterday and today, earlier this morning, to offer my sympathy to those who lost their lives and suffer in Boston and say that we are united with them. But this Congress now is proceeding on some important business, and I offer to my colleagues that we cannot wait to pass legislation on gun safety and gun violence prevention.

Homicide is the second leading cause of death for young people ages 15 to 24. Homicide is the leading cause of death for many minorities in this country. 82.8 percent of young people who are killed are killed with a firearm. Every 30 minutes, a child or teenager in America is injured by a gun. Every 3 hours and 15 minutes, a child or a teenager loses their life to a firearm. And in 2010, 82 children under 5 years of age lost their lives due to guns.

We must respond.

I have introduced H.R. 65, which indicates prevention, or a system to prevent children from having access to guns. Children have accidentally shot themselves, shot their parents because guns have been accessible because we as adults have not been responsible.

As we work across the Houses, it is important to pass gun violence prevention legislation and do it now. It does not violate the Second Amendment.

SENATE IMMIGRATION BILL STRIKES OUT

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is three strikes and you're out for the Senate's immigration proposal.

First, it legalizes almost everyone in the country illegally before the border is secured. This of course will encourage even more illegal immigration.

Second, it puts the interests of foreign workers ahead of the interests of American workers. The immigration plan allows millions of illegal immigrants to compete with American workers, driving down their wages.

And third, it treats illegal immigrants better than those who have played by the rules and waited their turn in line to come into the United States. Illegal immigrants get legal status immediately. The law abiding, well, they just have to continue waiting.

I don't think the American people are going to give the Senate another turn at bat.

WHAT HAPPENED IN CYPRUS CAN HAPPEN IN U.S.

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

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, the indebtedness of the United States is reaching \$17 trillion. Just a few weeks ago, Europe, the entire world, and Americans shuddered when they saw, in Cyprus, what took place.

Imagine going to the bank and having the door closed. Imagine putting your ATM card in and not being able to get funds. Imagine being restricted to taking \$300 a day.

What happened in Cyprus can happen in the United States.

Remember, also, accounts for people who worked hard, had invested and put their accounts and money away. They came in; and if you had \$100,000, the government skimmed off the top.

Look at President Obama's proposal in his budget. Look at his restrictions, and also taxing and taking from those who have retired.

The same thing can happen in America that's happened in other countries.

POW/MIA ACCOUNTING AND RECOVERY SUPPORT ACT

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1520, the POW/MIA Accounting and Recovery Support Act of 2013.

The Joint POW/MIA Accounting Command, or JPAC, is a task force

within the Department of Defense with a mission to account for prisoners of war or those missing in action from all past conflicts. It's part of a commitment we have made to these American heroes, along with their families and loved ones seeking closure.

As most are aware, the Pentagon recently announced plans to furlough as many as 800,000 Federal civilian workers in order to achieve spending reductions under the Budget Control Act. These workers will be required to take 14 unpaid days off between now and October. As a result, JPAC employees will have to take at least 1 furlough day a week, with no exceptions. This will significantly impact JPAC's accounting and recovery teams, which are actually deployed on operations that last between 35 and 45 days.

The POW/MIA Accounting and Recovery Support Act will allow JPAC civilian employees to continue these critical missions without unnecessary disruption or delay. I encourage my colleagues to join me and Representative STEPHEN LYNCH in cosponsoring H.R. 1520.

HEROES AMONG US

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

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, over 100 Kansans traveled across the country to take part in the world's most recognized marathon yesterday in Boston.

We've all seen the images of the destruction caused by the cowardly acts of violence. But, Mr. Speaker, what was not cowardly was the instinct and immediate reaction of so many first responders and countless spectators who were watching their loved ones partake in the Patriots' Day tradition.

Cowardly doesn't describe runners who passed the finish line after running 26 miles and immediately, without hesitation, turning around, running back to help.

Those heroes include Dr. Chris Rupe from Salina, Kansas. Chris finished the race and was only 10 yards away from the first explosion. Dr. Rupe turned and ran to help the injured, the way Kansans do, the way so many Americans did.

Mr. Speaker, there is still much to determine in regards to the details from yesterday, and we will get those answers I'm sure of it. What is known for certain is the bravery and courage of the American people and Kansans like Dr. Rupe in emergencies and times of tragedy like yesterday in Boston.

□ 1230

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FORTENBERRY). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to

suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

FEDERAL INFORMATION SECURITY AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2013

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1163) to amend chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, to revise requirements relating to Federal information security, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1163

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 2013”.

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 unauthorized access, use, disclosure, disruption, modification, or destruction of such information or information system;

“(B) determining the levels of information security appropriate to protect such infor-

mation 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 agency-wide 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 “sec-

tion 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)—

(i) in paragraph (2), by striking “section 3532(1)” and inserting “section 3552(b)”;

(ii) in paragraph (5), by striking “section 3532(b)(2)” 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. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Cybersecurity threats represent one of the most serious national security and economic challenges we face in our Nation. Whether it's criminal hackers, organized crime, terrorist networks, or nation-states, our Nation is under siege from dangerous cybersecurity threats that grow daily in frequency and sophistication.

It is critical that the Federal Government address cybersecurity threats in a manner that keeps pace with our Nation's growing dependence on technology, but current Federal 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 cyber threats. And yet the Government Accountability Office recently found that security incidents among 24 key agencies increased by 650 percent, or more than six-fold, in the last 5 years.

To address the rising challenge posed by cyber threats, Ranking Member CUMMINGS and I introduced last Congress a bill to reauthorize FISMA. That

bill was adopted by the House unanimously.

Recently, Mr. CUMMINGS and I reintroduced that legislation as H.R. 1163, the Federal Information Security Amendments Act of 2013. The bill was voted out of our committee by unanimous vote on March 20. This bill aims to harness the last decade of technological innovation in securing Federal information systems.

To enhance the current framework of securing Federal information technology systems, our bill calls for automated and continuous monitoring of government information systems—and I'm going to repeat—automated and continuous monitoring of government information systems. And it ensures that continuous monitoring finally incorporates regular threat assessments, not just “check the box.”

The bill also reaffirms the role of the Office of Management and Budget 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 IT systems. Mr. Speaker, that's particularly significant because IT is the backbone of every single large and small agency of the government; and only with the power of the President through the Office of Management and Budget can you, in fact, ensure that the President has transparency and his authority is respected throughout all these agencies.

We can no longer afford the “check the box” that came out of the first piece of legislation. It wasn't its intent, and the six-fold increase in the last 5 years says it has failed us.

While our bill does not include new requirements, restrictions, or mandates on private, non-Federal computer systems, H.R. 1163 does highlight the need for stronger public-private partnership. Again, as we interface over the public Internet, it is critical that the weakest link be prevented. To that extent, this bill has received strong support from cybersecurity experts and industry, including TechAmerica, the Information Technology Industry Council, and the Business Software Alliance.

I'd like to personally thank Ranking Member CUMMINGS for partnering, both personally and through his staff, to create a bill that is necessary, timely, and accurate to meet the growing threat of cybersecurity.

I encourage all Members to support this timely legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I want to begin by thanking Chairman ISSA for sponsoring this legislation and for making this a truly bipartisan effort. I am pleased to join the chairman in sponsoring this bill again this Congress.

Also, I thank the other cosponsors of the bill, including the chairman and the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Government Operations,

Representatives JOHN MICA and GERRY CONNOLLY, and the chairman and the ranking member of the Subcommittee on National Security, Representatives JASON CHAFFETZ and JOHN TIERNEY.

Last month, the Director of National Intelligence, James Clapper, placed cyber attacks at the top of his list of national security threats. This bill is an important step in Congress' response to the cyber threat. This legislation would ensure that Federal agencies use a risk-based approach to defend against cyber attacks and protect government information from being compromised by our adversaries.

It is important that the Federal Government set the example by ensuring that its own information is protected. The Department of Energy was hacked in January, and personal data for hundreds of employees was compromised. We are better than that, Mr. Speaker, and we can do better.

Personal data for more than 100,000 accounts in the Thrift Savings Plan was compromised last year when a contractor's computer was hacked. This bill would shift the Federal Government to a system of continuous monitoring of information systems. And just this morning, the chairman said in a hearing that we have to do more with less and we have to figure out ways to use technology so that we can efficiently and effectively do the things that we need to do.

This bill goes right in that direction, which is so important. It would also streamline reporting requirements and ensure that agencies take a smart, risk-based approach to securing networks.

This bill would 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 the agencies accountable for developing appropriate standards and living up to those very standards. OMB is the appropriate entity to be responsible for ensuring that that happens.

However, nothing in this bill will prevent the Department of Homeland Security from continuing the great work it is doing to protect our Nation against potential cyber attacks. The Department has expanded its cybersecurity workforce and is working with agencies to establish continuous monitoring. This bill supports that work by making clear that agencies must take action to protect their networks, rather than just doing routine “check the box” reports, as Chairman ISSA just talked about.

□ 1240

Today, we have a bipartisan effort. It is truly a bipartisan effort to address a problem that affects every single American and business, every entity of our Nation. That's why it's so good that we had all of our subcommittee rankings and chairmen working together and Mr. ISSA making sure that this legislation got out. As it is so very

important, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this legislation.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1½ minutes.

I want to associate myself with the ranking member's statements.

Mr. CUMMINGS does make the great point that Homeland Security is, in fact, doing a great deal. And if there is an active activity through NSA and other agencies, we applaud that.

A great deal of what this bill reauthorization is intended to do, in working with the subcommittee ranking member Mr. CONNOLLY, is to recognize that there needs to be a public-private partnership. We need our private entities to be as strong as they can be so they don't become conduits for espionage and for attacks. But also that, in fact, it's the smallest entity of government, the one that you don't think much of, the one that may not be high priority that, in fact, also has to be protected: commerce at our public parks; commerce occurring throughout the Federal Government; and, in fact, just the records that are so often collected and maintained in places like the Veterans Administration and so on.

Although they may not represent an immediate threat to national security, as a veteran, I must tell you the fact that those records sit there tells all of us, millions of veterans, that we want to have a robust maintenance of cybersecurity, something that under the current statute we believe the box is being checked, but not all that needs to be done is being done.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. It gives me great pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to yield 3 minutes to a gentleman who has worked very hard on this issue night and day, and it's been at the forefront of his efforts, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished ranking member, my friend from Maryland, and I also thank the distinguished chairman of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee.

I proudly join them in cosponsoring this legislation and rising in strong support of H.R. 1136, the Federal Information Security Amendments Act of 2013. The chairman and ranking member of the full committee have worked in a bipartisan fashion to advance this bill to the floor today, and they deserve great credit.

H.R. 1163 is desperately needed to address a looming and critical threat to our Nation's economic and national security. As the Government Accountability Office testified before our committee in its 2013 High Risk Report, the number of cyber incidents has grown exponentially among Federal agencies and, for that matter, in the private sector.

Specifically, in the year 2006, they reported 5,503 cyber incidents to the U.S. Computer Emergency Readiness Team.

Six years later, that same number was 48,562, which is an astounding 782 percent increase in just 6 years.

According to the Government Accountability Office, cyber attacks involving Federal systems and critical infrastructure, Mr. Speaker, could be devastating to the country. Yet, its audits have consistently revealed information security deficiencies in public and private, financial and nonfinancial systems.

More troubling, despite producing hundreds of recommendations over the past 2 fiscal years that would address security-control deficiencies, the majority of GAO's recommendations have, in fact, not been fully implemented. Unfortunately, vital Federal assets and missions will remain at high risk for fraud, misuse, and disruption unless agencies fully implement the literally hundreds of recommendations made by the GAO and various offices of the inspectors general aimed at strengthening the security of critical information systems.

The sophisticated and rapidly involving cybersecurity threat has outpaced the security framework established by the former Federal Information Security Management Act of 2002. FISMA's static, compliance-based framework, as noted by both the ranking member and the distinguished chairman of the committee, must be enhanced. It can't be used as a substitute for developing strategies to counter this threat.

I believe this bipartisan legislation will accomplish that goal by enhancing FISMA to promote a more dynamic, risk-based approach that leverages current technology to implement continuous monitoring of networks and systems.

Specifically, the Federal Information Security Amendments Act will direct agencies to test and evaluate information security controls and techniques and conduct threat assessments by monitoring information systems and identifying potential system vulnerabilities.

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. I yield the gentleman an additional 1½ minutes.

Mr. CONNOLLY. It will conduct vulnerability assessments and penetration tests commensurate with the risk posed to agency information systems and collaborate with OMB and appropriate public- and private-sector security operations centers on security incidents that extend beyond the control of the agency to require that security incidents be reported through an automated and continuous monitoring capability to the Federal Information Security Incident Center, appropriate security operations centers, and respective agency Offices of Inspector General.

Mr. Speaker, I join the distinguished chairman and ranking member of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee in urging all Members to support this critical bipartisan cyber-

security legislation that is urgently needed to provide Federal agencies with the necessary tools to effectively secure our Federal information systems.

With that, I thank them both for their leadership on this critical matter.

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

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

As we have no other speakers, Mr. Speaker, I just want to make it clear that I think yesterday's incident in Boston should remind us of how fragile our society is and that there are so many people who want to do us harm.

A lot of times we concentrate on those kinds of attacks and don't spend the kind of time we really need to on the cyber attacks, which can be just as harmful, just as damaging. These cyber attacks can literally bring our country and our economy to a halt. That's why we are urging all Members to vote in favor of this.

And it is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that as we are addressing this issue today, that it will send the word out to the Nation that once again our committee and this Congress is putting a microscope on this issue and doing everything in our power to make sure that our efforts are effective and efficient because the threats are there, and they are real.

It is up to us. It is our watch. It is our watch, just like a watchman watching over a fort or watching over a city. We are the watchmen right now, and it's our watch, and we have to make sure we do everything in our power to make sure that we protect against this very clear threat.

With that, I urge all Members to vote in favor of this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time and.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1163 has many authors: Mr. CUMMINGS and myself, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. TIERNEY. It also has every committee chairman and every ranking member here in the House. And I would like to take a moment to thank all the committee chairmen of Homeland Security, Foreign Affairs, and House Administration, because staffs from all of those committees, particularly with the acquiescence of the chairmen and ranking members, have contributed to our fact-finding to try to produce a good bill here today.

I think often our committee is viewed as, what is your authority and so on. This is an odd situation in which, in order for us to bring the bill here today, we really needed all the agencies and all the personnel here to be brought to bear so that we could try to fashion a piece of legislation that would allow the Federal Government to work better, that would allow the executive branch to execute better on behalf of the American people.

□ 1250

Lastly, I would like to thank the outside groups, many of which I men-

tioned in my opening statement, but even more who responded when this bill was posted for comment. They responded with constructive suggestions.

I know there is a lot of trepidation any time the government is, in fact, looking at data passing through the system, but this and other legislation is a balancing act. We cannot have the economy that we enjoy today if these systems are shut down by attacks. At the same time, I know I join with the ranking member and all of the authors of this legislation in that we are committed to making sure we maintain the personal freedom and the privacy that goes with what we are entrusted to here in the government.

So, in closing, Mr. Speaker, this is an update. It is not the last time we will have to update cybersecurity. It is not the last time we will be here concerned about America's economy so dependent on the Internet, but it is a good bill. It is ready.

I urge its approval, and I yield back the balance of my time.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 11, 2013.

Hon. DARRELL E. ISSA,
Chairman, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ISSA: On March 20, 2013, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform ordered H.R. 1163, the "Federal Information Security Amendments Act of 2013", reported favorably to the House with certain provisions in the legislation that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Homeland Security. Specifically, this legislation would require the Department of Homeland Security to share cyber threat information with an information security center, delegate the authority and primary responsibility of information security to a Chief Information Security Officer responsible for overseeing a Department-wide information security program, and recognize the existence of a Federal information security incident center, which in practice, is currently the National Cybersecurity and Communications Integration Center at the Department of Homeland Security.

The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) issued Memorandum M-10-28 on July 6, 2010, transferring many of OMB's Federal information security and responsibilities to the Department of Homeland Security. Since Memorandum M-10-28 was issued, the Department of Homeland Security has conducted the operational aspects of Federal information security through the functions of the National Cybersecurity and Communications Integration Center and the United States Computer Emergency Readiness Team. This legislation, through its accompanied report, preserves the operational capabilities of DHS pertaining to Federal information security while reaffirming OMB's supervisory role with respect to FISMA.

I understand the importance of advancing this legislation to the House floor in an expeditious manner. Therefore, the Committee on Homeland Security will not seek a sequential referral over provisions within our jurisdiction. This action is conditional on our mutual understanding and agreement that doing so will in no way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee on Homeland Security over the subject matter included in this or similar legislation. In addition, I would like to thank you for working

with me on modifying the report that accompanies H.R. 1163 to ensure the operational role the Department of Homeland Security plays in the protection of the Nation's Federal information systems is in no way diminished. I request that you urge the Speaker to appoint Members of this Committee to any conference committee for consideration of any provisions that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Homeland Security in the House-Senate conference on this or similar legislation.

I also request that this letter and your response be included in the committee report on H.R. 1163 and into the Congressional Record during consideration of this measure on the House floor. Thank you for your consideration of this matter.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL T. MCCAUL,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, April 12, 2013.

Hon. MICHAEL MCCAUL,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding the Committee on Homeland Security's jurisdictional interest in H.R. 1163, the "Federal Information Security Amendments."

I agree that the Committee on Homeland Security has a valid jurisdictional interest in federal cybersecurity, and that the Committee's jurisdiction will not be adversely affected by your decision to forego consideration of H.R. 1163. As you have requested, I will support your request for an appropriate appointment of outside conferees from your Committee in the event of a House-Senate conference on this or similar legislation, should such a conference be convened.

Finally, I will include a copy of your letter and this response in the Committee Report and in the Congressional Record during the floor consideration of this bill. Thank you again for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

DARRELL ISSA,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, April 12, 2013.

Hon. DARRELL ISSA,
Chairman, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ISSA: I am writing to you concerning the jurisdictional interest of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology in H.R. 1163, the Federal Information Security Amendments Act of 2013.

I recognize and appreciate the desire to bring this legislation before the House of Representatives in an expeditious manner, and accordingly, I will waive further consideration of this bill in Committee, notwithstanding any provisions that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. This waiver, of course, is conditional on our mutual understanding that agreeing to waive consideration of this bill should not be construed as waiving, reducing, or affecting the jurisdiction of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

Additionally, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology expressly reserves its authority to seek conferees on any provision within its jurisdiction during any House-Senate conference that may be convened on this, or any similar legislation. I ask for your commitment to support any request by

the Committee for conferees on H.R. 1163, as well as any similar or related legislation.

I ask that a copy of this letter be placed in the Committee Report on H.R. 1163 and in the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill on the House floor.

I look forward to continuing to work with you on the legislation as you work towards enactment of H.R. 1163.

Sincerely,

LAMAR SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on Science,
Space, and Technology.

COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, April 16, 2013.

Hon. LAMAR SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on Science, Space, and
Technology, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology's jurisdictional interest in H.R. 1163, the "Federal Information Security Amendments Act of 2013," and your willingness to forego consideration of H.R. 1163 by your committee.

I agree that the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology has a valid jurisdictional interest in certain provisions of H.R. 1163 and that the Committee's jurisdiction will not be adversely affected by your decision to forego consideration of H.R. 1163. As you have requested, I will support your request for an appropriate appointment of outside conferees from your Committee in the event of a House-Senate conference on this or similar legislation should such a conference be convened.

Finally, I will include a copy of your letter and this response in the Committee Report and in the Congressional Record during the floor consideration of this bill. Thank you again for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

DARRELL ISSA,
Chairman.

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. 1163.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

CYBERSECURITY ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2013

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 756) to advance cybersecurity research, development, and technical standards, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 756

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 "Cybersecurity Enhancement Act of 2013".

TITLE I—RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

SEC. 101. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) NATIONAL COORDINATION OFFICE.—The term National Coordination Office means the National Coordination Office for the Networking and Information Technology Research and Development program.

(2) PROGRAM.—The term Program means the Networking and Information Technology Research and Development program which has been established under section 101 of the High-Performance Computing Act of 1991 (15 U.S.C. 5511).

SEC. 102. FINDINGS.

Section 2 of the Cyber Security Research and Development Act (15 U.S.C. 7401) is amended—

(1) by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

"(1) Advancements in information and communications technology have resulted in a globally interconnected network of government, commercial, scientific, and education infrastructures, including critical infrastructures for electric power, natural gas and petroleum production and distribution, telecommunications, transportation, water supply, banking and finance, and emergency and government services.;"

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking "Exponential increases in interconnectivity have facilitated enhanced communications, economic growth," and inserting "These advancements have significantly contributed to the growth of the United States economy.;"

(3) by amending paragraph (3) to read as follows:

"(3) The Cyberspace Policy Review published by the President in May, 2009, concluded that our information technology and communications infrastructure is vulnerable and has 'suffered intrusions that have allowed criminals to steal hundreds of millions of dollars and nation-states and other entities to steal intellectual property and sensitive military information.';"

(4) by amending paragraph (6) to read as follows:

"(6) While African-Americans, Hispanics, and Native Americans constitute 33 percent of the college-age population, members of these minorities comprise less than 20 percent of bachelor degree recipients in the field of computer sciences.;"

SEC. 103. CYBERSECURITY STRATEGIC RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PLAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 12 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the agencies identified in subsection 101(a)(3)(B)(i) through (x) of the High-Performance Computing Act of 1991 (15 U.S.C. 5511(a)(3)(B)(i) through (x)) or designated under section 101(a)(3)(B)(xi) of such Act, working through the National Science and Technology Council and with the assistance of the National Coordination Office, shall transmit to Congress a strategic plan based on an assessment of cybersecurity risk to guide the overall direction of Federal cybersecurity and information assurance research and development for information technology and networking systems. Once every 3 years after the initial strategic plan is transmitted to Congress under this section, such agencies shall prepare and transmit to Congress an update of such plan.

(b) CONTENTS OF PLAN.—The strategic plan required under subsection (a) shall—

(1) specify and prioritize near-term, mid-term and long-term research objectives, including objectives associated with the research areas identified in section 4(a)(1) of the Cyber Security Research and Development Act (15 U.S.C. 7403(a)(1)) and how the near-term objectives complement research and development areas in which the private sector is actively engaged;

(2) describe how the Program will focus on innovative, transformational technologies with

the potential to enhance the security, reliability, resilience, and trustworthiness of the digital infrastructure, and to protect consumer privacy;

(3) describe how the Program will foster the rapid transfer of research and development results into new cybersecurity technologies and applications for the timely benefit of society and the national interest, including through the dissemination of best practices and other outreach activities;

(4) describe how the Program will establish and maintain a national research infrastructure for creating, testing, and evaluating the next generation of secure networking and information technology systems;

(5) describe how the Program will facilitate access by academic researchers to the infrastructure described in paragraph (4), as well as to relevant data, including event data;

(6) describe how the Program will engage females and individuals identified in section 33 or 34 of the Science and Engineering Equal Opportunities Act (42 U.S.C. 1885a or 1885b) to foster a more diverse workforce in this area; and

(7) describe how the Program will help to recruit and prepare veterans for the Federal cybersecurity workforce.

(c) DEVELOPMENT OF ROADMAP.—The agencies described in subsection (a) shall develop and annually update an implementation roadmap for the strategic plan required in this section. Such roadmap shall—

(1) specify the role of each Federal agency in carrying out or sponsoring research and development to meet the research objectives of the strategic plan, including a description of how progress toward the research objectives will be evaluated;

(2) specify the funding allocated to each major research objective of the strategic plan and the source of funding by agency for the current fiscal year; and

(3) estimate the funding required for each major research objective of the strategic plan for the following 3 fiscal years.

(d) RECOMMENDATIONS.—In developing and updating the strategic plan under subsection (a), the agencies involved shall solicit recommendations and advice from—

(1) the advisory committee established under section 101(b)(1) of the High-Performance Computing Act of 1991 (15 U.S.C. 5511(b)(1)); and

(2) a wide range of stakeholders, including industry, academia, including representatives of minority serving institutions and community colleges, National Laboratories, and other relevant organizations and institutions.

(e) APPENDING TO REPORT.—The implementation roadmap required under subsection (c), and its annual updates, shall be appended to the report required under section 101(a)(2)(D) of the High-Performance Computing Act of 1991 (15 U.S.C. 5511(a)(2)(D)).

(f) CYBERSECURITY RESEARCH DATABASE.—The agencies involved in developing and updating the strategic plan under subsection (a) shall establish, in coordination with the Office of Management and Budget, a mechanism to track ongoing and completed Federal cybersecurity research and development projects and associated funding, and shall make such information publicly available.

SEC. 104. SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL RESEARCH IN CYBERSECURITY.

Section 4(a)(1) of the Cyber Security Research and Development Act (15 U.S.C. 7403(a)(1)) is amended—

(1) by inserting “and usability” after “to the structure”;

(2) in subparagraph (H), by striking “and” after the semicolon;

(3) in subparagraph (I), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”;

(4) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(J) social and behavioral factors, including human-computer interactions, usability, and user motivations.”.

SEC. 105. NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION CYBERSECURITY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS.

(a) COMPUTER AND NETWORK SECURITY RESEARCH AREAS.—Section 4(a)(1) of the Cyber Security Research and Development Act (15 U.S.C. 7403(a)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A) by inserting “identity management,” after “cryptography,”; and

(2) in subparagraph (I), by inserting “; crimes against children, and organized crime” after “intellectual property”.

(b) COMPUTER AND NETWORK SECURITY RESEARCH GRANTS.—Section 4(a)(3) of such Act (15 U.S.C. 7403(a)(3)) is amended by striking subparagraphs (A) through (E) and inserting the following new subparagraphs:

“(A) \$119,000,000 for fiscal year 2014;

“(B) \$119,000,000 for fiscal year 2015; and

“(C) \$119,000,000 for fiscal year 2016.”.

(c) COMPUTER AND NETWORK SECURITY RESEARCH CENTERS.—Section 4(b) of such Act (15 U.S.C. 7403(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4)—

(A) in subparagraph (C), by striking “and” after the semicolon;

(B) in subparagraph (D), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(E) how the center will partner with government laboratories, for-profit entities, other institutions of higher education, or nonprofit research institutions.”; and

(2) in paragraph (7) by striking subparagraphs (A) through (E) and inserting the following new subparagraphs:

“(A) \$5,000,000 for fiscal year 2014;

“(B) \$5,000,000 for fiscal year 2015; and

“(C) \$5,000,000 for fiscal year 2016.”.

(d) COMPUTER AND NETWORK SECURITY CAPACITY BUILDING GRANTS.—Section 5(a)(6) of such Act (15 U.S.C. 7404(a)(6)) is amended by striking subparagraphs (A) through (E) and inserting the following new subparagraphs:

“(A) \$25,000,000 for fiscal year 2014;

“(B) \$25,000,000 for fiscal year 2015; and

“(C) \$25,000,000 for fiscal year 2016.”.

(e) SCIENTIFIC AND ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY ACT GRANTS.—Section 5(b)(2) of such Act (15 U.S.C. 7404(b)(2)) is amended by striking subparagraphs (A) through (E) and inserting the following new subparagraphs:

“(A) \$4,000,000 for fiscal year 2014;

“(B) \$4,000,000 for fiscal year 2015; and

“(C) \$4,000,000 for fiscal year 2016.”.

(f) GRADUATE TRAINEESHIPS IN COMPUTER AND NETWORK SECURITY.—Section 5(c)(7) of such Act (15 U.S.C. 7404(c)(7)) is amended by striking subparagraphs (A) through (E) and inserting the following new subparagraphs:

“(A) \$32,000,000 for fiscal year 2014;

“(B) \$32,000,000 for fiscal year 2015; and

“(C) \$32,000,000 for fiscal year 2016.”.

(g) CYBER SECURITY FACULTY DEVELOPMENT TRAINEESHIP PROGRAM.—Section 5(e) of such Act (15 U.S.C. 7404(e)) is repealed.

SEC. 106. FEDERAL CYBER SCHOLARSHIP FOR SERVICE PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the National Science Foundation shall continue a Scholarship for Service program under section 5(a) of the Cyber Security Research and Development Act (15 U.S.C. 7404(a)) to recruit and train the next generation of Federal cybersecurity professionals and to increase the capacity of the higher education system to produce an information technology workforce with the skills necessary to enhance the security of the Nation’s communications and information infrastructure.

(b) CHARACTERISTICS OF PROGRAM.—The program under this section shall—

(1) provide, through qualified institutions of higher education, including community colleges, scholarships that provide tuition, fees, and a competitive stipend for up to 2 years to students pursuing a bachelor’s or master’s degree and up to 3 years to students pursuing a doctoral degree in a cybersecurity field;

(2) provide the scholarship recipients with summer internship opportunities or other meaningful temporary appointments in the Federal information technology workforce; and

(3) increase the capacity of institutions of higher education throughout all regions of the United States to produce highly qualified cybersecurity professionals, through the award of competitive, merit-reviewed grants that support such activities as—

(A) faculty professional development, including technical, hands-on experiences in the private sector or government, workshops, seminars, conferences, and other professional development opportunities that will result in improved instructional capabilities;

(B) institutional partnerships, including minority serving institutions and community colleges;

(C) development and evaluation of cybersecurity-related courses and curricula; and

(D) public-private partnerships that will integrate research experiences and hands-on learning into cybersecurity degree programs.

(c) SCHOLARSHIP REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) ELIGIBILITY.—Scholarships under this section shall be available only to students who—

(A) are citizens or permanent residents of the United States;

(B) are full-time students in an eligible degree program, as determined by the Director, that is focused on computer security or information assurance at an awardee institution; and

(C) accept the terms of a scholarship pursuant to this section.

(2) SELECTION.—Individuals shall be selected to receive scholarships primarily on the basis of academic merit, with consideration given to financial need, to the goal of promoting the participation of females and individuals identified in section 33 or 34 of the Science and Engineering Equal Opportunities Act (42 U.S.C. 1885a or 1885b), and to veterans. For purposes of this paragraph, the term “veteran” means a person who—

(A) served on active duty (other than active duty for training) in the Armed Forces of the United States for a period of more than 180 consecutive days, and who was discharged or released therefrom under conditions other than dishonorable; or

(B) served on active duty (other than active duty for training) in the Armed Forces of the United States and was discharged or released from such service for a service-connected disability before serving 180 consecutive days.

For purposes of subparagraph (B), the term “service-connected” has the meaning given such term under section 101 of title 38, United States Code.

(3) SERVICE OBLIGATION.—If an individual receives a scholarship under this section, as a condition of receiving such scholarship, the individual upon completion of their degree must serve as a cybersecurity professional within the Federal workforce for a period of time as provided in paragraph (5). If a scholarship recipient is not offered employment by a Federal agency or a federally funded research and development center, the service requirement can be satisfied at the Director’s discretion by—

(A) serving as a cybersecurity professional in a State, local, or tribal government agency; or

(B) teaching cybersecurity courses at an institution of higher education.

(4) CONDITIONS OF SUPPORT.—As a condition of acceptance of a scholarship under this section, a recipient shall agree to provide the awardee institution with annual verifiable documentation of employment and up-to-date contact information.

(5) LENGTH OF SERVICE.—The length of service required in exchange for a scholarship under this subsection shall be 1 year more than the number of years for which the scholarship was received.

(d) FAILURE TO COMPLETE SERVICE OBLIGATION.—

(1) **GENERAL RULE.**—If an individual who has received a scholarship under this section—

(A) fails to maintain an acceptable level of academic standing in the educational institution in which the individual is enrolled, as determined by the Director;

(B) is dismissed from such educational institution for disciplinary reasons;

(C) withdraws from the program for which the award was made before the completion of such program;

(D) declares that the individual does not intend to fulfill the service obligation under this section; or

(E) fails to fulfill the service obligation of the individual under this section,

such individual shall be liable to the United States as provided in paragraph (3).

(2) **MONITORING COMPLIANCE.**—As a condition of participating in the program, a qualified institution of higher education receiving a grant under this section shall—

(A) enter into an agreement with the Director of the National Science Foundation to monitor the compliance of scholarship recipients with respect to their service obligation; and

(B) provide to the Director, on an annual basis, post-award employment information required under subsection (c)(4) for scholarship recipients through the completion of their service obligation.

(3) **AMOUNT OF REPAYMENT.**—

(A) **LESS THAN ONE YEAR OF SERVICE.**—If a circumstance described in paragraph (1) occurs before the completion of 1 year of a service obligation under this section, the total amount of awards received by the individual under this section shall be repaid or such amount shall be treated as a loan to be repaid in accordance with subparagraph (C).

(B) **MORE THAN ONE YEAR OF SERVICE.**—If a circumstance described in subparagraph (D) or (E) of paragraph (1) occurs after the completion of 1 year of a service obligation under this section, the total amount of scholarship awards received by the individual under this section, reduced by the ratio of the number of years of service completed divided by the number of years of service required, shall be repaid or such amount shall be treated as a loan to be repaid in accordance with subparagraph (C).

(C) **REPAYMENTS.**—A loan described in subparagraph (A) or (B) shall be treated as a Federal Direct Unsubsidized Stafford Loan under part D of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087a and following), and shall be subject to repayment, together with interest thereon accruing from the date of the scholarship award, in accordance with terms and conditions specified by the Director (in consultation with the Secretary of Education) in regulations promulgated to carry out this paragraph.

(4) **COLLECTION OF REPAYMENT.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—In the event that a scholarship recipient is required to repay the scholarship under this subsection, the institution providing the scholarship shall—

(i) be responsible for determining the repayment amounts and for notifying the recipient and the Director of the amount owed; and

(ii) collect such repayment amount within a period of time as determined under the agreement described in paragraph (2), or the repayment amount shall be treated as a loan in accordance with paragraph (3)(C).

(B) **RETURNED TO TREASURY.**—Except as provided in subparagraph (C) of this paragraph, any such repayment shall be returned to the Treasury of the United States.

(C) **RETAIN PERCENTAGE.**—An institution of higher education may retain a percentage of any repayment the institution collects under this paragraph to defray administrative costs associated with the collection. The Director shall establish a single, fixed percentage that will apply to all eligible entities.

(5) **EXCEPTIONS.**—The Director may provide for the partial or total waiver or suspension of any service or payment obligation by an individual under this section whenever compliance by the individual with the obligation is impossible or would involve extreme hardship to the individual, or if enforcement of such obligation with respect to the individual would be unconscionable.

(e) **HIRING AUTHORITY.**—

(1) **APPOINTMENT IN EXCEPTED SERVICE.**—Notwithstanding any provision of chapter 33 of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, an agency shall appoint in the excepted service an individual who has completed the academic program for which a scholarship was awarded.

(2) **NONCOMPETITIVE CONVERSION.**—Except as provided in paragraph (4), upon fulfillment of the service term, an employee appointed under paragraph (1) may be converted noncompetitively to term, career-conditional or career appointment.

(3) **TIMING OF CONVERSION.**—An agency may noncompetitively convert a term employee appointed under paragraph (2) to a career-conditional or career appointment before the term appointment expires.

(4) **AUTHORITY TO DECLINE CONVERSION.**—An agency may decline to make the noncompetitive conversion or appointment under paragraph (2) for cause.

SEC. 107. CYBERSECURITY WORKFORCE ASSESSMENT.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act the President shall transmit to the Congress a report addressing the cybersecurity workforce needs of the Federal Government. The report shall include—

(1) an examination of the current state of and the projected needs of the Federal cybersecurity workforce, including a comparison of the different agencies and departments, and an analysis of the capacity of such agencies and departments to meet those needs;

(2) an analysis of the sources and availability of cybersecurity talent, a comparison of the skills and expertise sought by the Federal Government and the private sector, an examination of the current and future capacity of United States institutions of higher education, including community colleges, to provide current and future cybersecurity professionals, through education and training activities, with those skills sought by the Federal Government, State and local entities, and the private sector, and a description of how successful programs are engaging the talents of females and individuals identified in section 33 or 34 of the Science and Engineering Equal Opportunities Act (42 U.S.C. 1885a or 1885b);

(3) an examination of the effectiveness of the National Centers of Academic Excellence in Information Assurance Education, the Centers of Academic Excellence in Research, and the Federal Cyber Scholarship for Service programs in promoting higher education and research in cybersecurity and information assurance and in producing a growing number of professionals with the necessary cybersecurity and information assurance expertise, including individuals from States or regions in which the unemployment rate exceeds the national average;

(4) an analysis of any barriers to the Federal Government recruiting and hiring cybersecurity talent, including barriers relating to compensation, the hiring process, job classification, and hiring flexibilities; and

(5) recommendations for Federal policies to ensure an adequate, well-trained Federal cybersecurity workforce.

SEC. 108. CYBERSECURITY UNIVERSITY-INDUSTRY TASK FORCE.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT OF UNIVERSITY-INDUSTRY TASK FORCE.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy

shall convene a task force to explore mechanisms for carrying out collaborative research, development, education, and training activities for cybersecurity through a consortium or other appropriate entity with participants from institutions of higher education and industry.

(b) **FUNCTIONS.**—The task force shall—

(1) develop options for a collaborative model and an organizational structure for such entity under which the joint research and development activities could be planned, managed, and conducted effectively, including mechanisms for the allocation of resources among the participants in such entity for support of such activities;

(2) identify and prioritize at least three cybersecurity grand challenges, focused on nationally significant problems requiring collaborative and interdisciplinary solutions;

(3) propose a process for developing a research and development agenda for such entity to address the grand challenges identified under paragraph (2);

(4) define the roles and responsibilities for the participants from institutions of higher education and industry in such entity;

(5) propose guidelines for assigning intellectual property rights and for the transfer of research and development results to the private sector; and

(6) make recommendations for how such entity could be funded from Federal, State, and non-governmental sources.

(c) **COMPOSITION.**—In establishing the task force under subsection (a), the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall appoint an equal number of individuals from institutions of higher education, including minority-serving institutions and community colleges, and from industry with knowledge and expertise in cybersecurity.

(d) **REPORT.**—Not later than 12 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall transmit to the Congress a report describing the findings and recommendations of the task force.

(e) **TERMINATION.**—The task force shall terminate upon transmittal of the report required under subsection (d).

(f) **COMPENSATION AND EXPENSES.**—Members of the task force shall serve without compensation.

SEC. 109. CYBERSECURITY AUTOMATION AND CHECKLISTS FOR GOVERNMENT SYSTEMS.

Section 8(c) of the Cyber Security Research and Development Act (15 U.S.C. 7406(c)) is amended to read as follows:

“(c) **SECURITY AUTOMATION AND CHECKLISTS FOR GOVERNMENT SYSTEMS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology shall develop, and revise as necessary, security automation standards, associated reference materials (including protocols), and checklists providing settings and option selections that minimize the security risks associated with each information technology hardware or software system and security tool that is, or is likely to become, widely used within the Federal Government in order to enable standardized and interoperable technologies, architectures, and frameworks for continuous monitoring of information security within the Federal Government.

“(2) **PRIORITIES FOR DEVELOPMENT.**—The Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology shall establish priorities for the development of standards, reference materials, and checklists under this subsection on the basis of—

“(A) the security risks associated with the use of the system;

“(B) the number of agencies that use a particular system or security tool;

“(C) the usefulness of the standards, reference materials, or checklists to Federal agencies that are users or potential users of the system;

“(D) the effectiveness of the associated standard, reference material, or checklist in creating

or enabling continuous monitoring of information security; or

“(E) such other factors as the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology determines to be appropriate.

“(3) EXCLUDED SYSTEMS.—The Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology may exclude from the application of paragraph (1) any information technology hardware or software system or security tool for which such Director determines that the development of a standard, reference material, or checklist is inappropriate because of the infrequency of use of the system, the obsolescence of the system, or the inutility or impracticability of developing a standard, reference material, or checklist for the system.

“(4) DISSEMINATION OF STANDARDS AND RELATED MATERIALS.—The Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology shall ensure that Federal agencies are informed of the availability of any standard, reference material, checklist, or other item developed under this subsection.

“(5) AGENCY USE REQUIREMENTS.—The development of standards, reference materials, and checklists under paragraph (1) for an information technology hardware or software system or tool does not—

“(A) require any Federal agency to select the specific settings or options recommended by the standard, reference material, or checklist for the system;

“(B) establish conditions or prerequisites for Federal agency procurement or deployment of any such system;

“(C) imply an endorsement of any such system by the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology; or

“(D) preclude any Federal agency from procuring or deploying other information technology hardware or software systems for which no such standard, reference material, or checklist has been developed or identified under paragraph (1).”

SEC. 110. NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF STANDARDS AND TECHNOLOGY CYBERSECURITY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.

Section 20 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278g-3) is amended by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (f), and by inserting after subsection (d) the following:

“(e) INTRAMURAL SECURITY RESEARCH.—As part of the research activities conducted in accordance with subsection (d)(3), the Institute shall—

“(1) conduct a research program to develop a unifying and standardized identity, privilege, and access control management framework for the execution of a wide variety of resource protection policies and that is amenable to implementation within a wide variety of existing and emerging computing environments;

“(2) carry out research associated with improving the security of information systems and networks;

“(3) carry out research associated with improving the testing, measurement, usability, and assurance of information systems and networks;

“(4) carry out research associated with improving security of industrial control systems; and

“(5) carry out research associated with improving the security and integrity of the information technology supply chain.”

SEC. 111. RESEARCH ON THE SCIENCE OF CYBERSECURITY.

The Director of the National Science Foundation and the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology shall, through existing programs and activities, support research that will lead to the development of a scientific foundation for the field of cybersecurity, including research that increases understanding of the underlying principles of securing complex networked systems, enables repeatable experimentation, and creates quantifiable security metrics.

TITLE II—ADVANCEMENT OF CYBERSECURITY TECHNICAL STANDARDS

SEC. 201. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) DIRECTOR.—The term “Director” means the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology.

(2) INSTITUTE.—The term “Institute” means the National Institute of Standards and Technology.

SEC. 202. INTERNATIONAL CYBERSECURITY TECHNICAL STANDARDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director, in coordination with appropriate Federal authorities, shall—

(1) as appropriate, ensure coordination of Federal agencies engaged in the development of international technical standards related to information system security; and

(2) not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, develop and transmit to the Congress a plan for ensuring such Federal agency coordination.

(b) CONSULTATION WITH THE PRIVATE SECTOR.—In carrying out the activities specified in subsection (a)(1), the Director shall ensure consultation with appropriate private sector stakeholders.

SEC. 203. CLOUD COMPUTING STRATEGY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director, in collaboration with the Federal CIO Council, and in consultation with other relevant Federal agencies and stakeholders from the private sector, shall continue to develop and encourage the implementation of a comprehensive strategy for the use and adoption of cloud computing services by the Federal Government.

(b) ACTIVITIES.—In carrying out the strategy developed under subsection (a), the Director shall give consideration to activities that—

(1) accelerate the development, in collaboration with the private sector, of standards that address interoperability and portability of cloud computing services;

(2) advance the development of conformance testing performed by the private sector in support of cloud computing standardization; and

(3) support, in consultation with the private sector, the development of appropriate security frameworks and reference materials, and the identification of best practices, for use by Federal agencies to address security and privacy requirements to enable the use and adoption of cloud computing services, including activities—

(A) to ensure the physical security of cloud computing data centers and the data stored in such centers;

(B) to ensure secure access to the data stored in cloud computing data centers;

(C) to develop security standards as required under section 20 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278g-3); and

(D) to support the development of the automation of continuous monitoring systems.

SEC. 204. PROMOTING CYBERSECURITY AWARENESS AND EDUCATION.

(a) PROGRAM.—The Director, in collaboration with relevant Federal agencies, industry, educational institutions, National Laboratories, the National Coordination Office of the Networking and Information Technology Research and Development program, and other organizations, shall continue to coordinate a cybersecurity awareness and education program to increase knowledge, skills, and awareness of cybersecurity risks, consequences, and best practices through—

(1) the widespread dissemination of cybersecurity technical standards and best practices identified by the Institute;

(2) efforts to make cybersecurity best practices usable by individuals, small to medium-sized businesses, State, local, and tribal governments, and educational institutions;

(3) improving the state of cybersecurity education at all educational levels;

(4) efforts to attract, recruit, and retain qualified professionals to the Federal cybersecurity workforce; and

(5) improving the skills, training, and professional development of the Federal cybersecurity workforce.

(b) STRATEGIC PLAN.—The Director shall, in cooperation with relevant Federal agencies and other stakeholders, develop and implement a strategic plan to guide Federal programs and activities in support of a comprehensive cybersecurity awareness and education program as described under subsection (a).

(c) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act and every 5 years thereafter, the Director shall transmit the strategic plan required under subsection (b) to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate.

SEC. 205. IDENTITY MANAGEMENT RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.

The Director shall continue a program to support the development of technical standards, metrology, testbeds, and conformance criteria, taking into account appropriate user concerns, to—

(1) improve interoperability among identity management technologies;

(2) strengthen authentication methods of identity management systems;

(3) improve privacy protection in identity management systems, including health information technology systems, through authentication and security protocols; and

(4) improve the usability of identity management systems.

SEC. 206. AUTHORIZATIONS.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 756, the bill now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank Representative MCCAUL and Representative LIPINSKI for introducing this commonsense, bipartisan legislation. I am pleased to be an original cosponsor of H.R. 756, the Cybersecurity Enhancement Act of 2013.

As our reliance on information technology expands, so do our vulnerabilities. Cyber attacks against U.S. Government and private sector networks are on the rise. Protecting America's cyber systems is critical to our economic and national security. Keeping our cyber infrastructure secure is a responsibility shared by different Federal agencies, including the National Science Foundation and the National Institute of Standards and Technology.

The Cybersecurity Enhancement Act coordinates research and development activities to better address evolving cyber threats. The legislation promotes much-needed research and development to help create new technologies and standards that better protect America's information technology systems. To improve America's cybersecurity abilities, this bill strengthens activities in four areas:

One, strategic planning for cybersecurity research and development needs across the Federal Government;

Two, basic research at the National Science Foundation, which we know is important to increasing security over the long term;

Three, National Science Foundation scholarships to improve the quality of the cybersecurity workforce;

Four, improved research, development, and public outreach organized by NIST related to cybersecurity.

These are modest but important changes that will help us better protect our cyber networks.

Cyber attacks threaten our national and economic security. To solve this problem, America needs a solution that involves the cooperation of many public and private sector entities. We must develop a rigorous scientific foundation for cybersecurity. This legislation helps foster such an effort, which will make our computer systems more secure.

The bill was recently approved by the Science, Space, and Technology Committee with strong bipartisan support. I again thank my Science Committee colleagues, Representatives MCCAUL and LIPINSKI, for their initiative on this issue, and look forward to this bill becoming law.

Mr. Speaker, the following groups have written letters of support for H.R. 756, the Cybersecurity Enhancement Act: TechAmerica, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, USTelecom, the Information Technology Industry Council, the National Association of Manufacturers, the Financial Services Roundtable, the Computing Research Association, the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, the Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, and the U.S. Public Policy Council of the Association for Computing Machinery.

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

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 756, the Cybersecurity Enhancement Act of 2013.

This is a good, bipartisan bill, and it is nearly identical to the legislation that passed the House by an overwhelming majority last Congress. I would like to thank my colleagues, Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. MCCAUL, for their leadership and dedication to improving our Nation's cybersecurity.

Almost every one of us uses a computer, a cell phone, and the Internet every single day. These technologies have greatly increased our produc-

tivity and connectivity, and they have become a key component of our economy. Unfortunately, if you pick up the newspaper, you're likely to see another story about a hacker bringing down a Web site, stealing credit card numbers, or gaining access to a company's intellectual property. We need to do what we can to help ensure that these sorts of cyber intrusions are minimized, and I am pleased that H.R. 756 addresses a number of critical issues:

It strengthens public-private partnerships, guarantees a proactive and comprehensive research and development portfolio, ensures the development of robust cybersecurity standards, and trains the next generation of cybersecurity professionals.

Both of the agencies covered in H.R. 756, the National Science Foundation and the National Institute of Standards and Technology, play important and unique roles in the Federal Government's effort to secure cyberspace. I strongly believe that these agencies and the activities they support are vital to our Nation's future prosperity. We not only need to protect the security of our current information systems, but we need to build the next generation of systems—systems that are more secure from the first time they're turned on.

President Obama previously stated that cyber threats are "one of the most serious economic and national security challenges we face as a Nation" and that cutting-edge research and development and a commitment to science and math education are central to securing America's information and communication networks. I couldn't agree more.

Cybersecurity is a critical issue, and it becomes more important day by day. Addressing this issue will not be easy, but it is absolutely necessary. H.R. 756 will help build up our cybersecurity capabilities through research and education. This is a good, bipartisan bill that should be included in any comprehensive effort to keep our Nation, our businesses, and our citizens safe from malicious cybersecurity attacks.

Before I conclude, I would like to thank my staff and the majority's staff for their hard work on this bill. In particular, I would like to thank Marcy Gallo for her efforts on this bill in this Congress and in past Congresses as well. I look forward to working with my colleagues to make sure this bill makes it to the President's desk.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 756, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1300

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL), a member of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, the chairman of the Homeland Security Committee, and the sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to thank my fellow Texan and friend,

Chairman SMITH, for his support, Ranking Member JOHNSON, and DAN LIPINSKI, my cohort on this bill. We passed this in two prior Congresses, and this is our third attempt. Let's hope the third time will be a charm.

For most of us around the country, it is hard to think of anything else other than the terrorist attack in Boston yesterday. It is a solemn reminder of the threats that we face. While the attention of the American people is focused on the physical attack that occurred during the Boston Marathon, I think it is important that we as leader in this Chamber be frank with the American people about the virtual threat of a cyber attack against our national and economic security interests. We must be vigilant against both.

The United States faces several daunting challenges at this moment in history, including emerging threats that we must as a Nation be prepared to face head on. Congress is often blamed for not rising to the occasion by being too reactive to events or failing to act at all. I'm determined, as my colleagues are, that this Congress tackle head on the problem of our vulnerable cyber defenses and bolster our security in cyberspace.

Last month our country's top intelligence officials told Congress that the U.S. is vulnerable to cyber espionage, cyber crime, and outright destruction of computer networks, both from sophisticated government-sponsored assaults from countries like China and Iran, as well as criminal hacker groups and cyber terrorists. We know that foreign nations are conducting reconnaissance on our critical infrastructures and utilities, including our gas lines and water systems and energy grids. If the ability to send a silent attack through our digital networks falls into our enemies' hands, this country could be the victim of a devastating attack. Last December, Iran attacked the state-owned Saudi Aramco with the goal of stopping Saudi Arabia's oil production. Additionally, this year Iran conducted multiple denial of service attacks on major U.S. banks. And just last year, an al Qaeda operative issued a call for electronic jihad against the United States, comparing our technological vulnerabilities to that of our security before 9/11.

Yet while these threats are imminent, no major cybersecurity legislation that would help protect us has been enacted since 2002. Quite simply, we are not prepared to meet the threats of the 21st century.

This act improves coordination in government, providing for a strategic plan to assess the cybersecurity risk and guide the overall direction of Federal cyber R&D. It updates the National Institutes of Standards and Technology's responsibilities to develop security standards for Federal computer systems to ensure computer hygiene and processes for agencies to follow.

Our bill also establishes a Federal-university-private-sector task force to

coordinate research and development, improves training of cyber professionals, and continues the much-needed cybersecurity research and development programs at the National Science Foundation and NIST.

This bill has been endorsed, as the chairman stated, by leading industry groups, including the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and Tech America. Most importantly, this bill is fiscally responsible. It is not being paid for with any new money since it is intended to work within the boundaries of funds authorized and appropriated to NSF and NIST. I'm confident that this legislation will advance the work these agencies are doing to bolster our domestic cybersecurity, as much as I'm confident that this Congress will finally address in a meaningful way the urgent need to pass this bipartisan cybersecurity legislation at that time. So I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI).

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I want to start by thanking the gentlelady for yielding and for her support on this bill, and thank Chairman SMITH for his support and for moving the bill early in this Congress. I also want to thank Mr. MCCAUL for working with me on this bill for the third straight Congress and for his broader leadership in Congress on cybersecurity issues.

Two Congresses ago when Democrats were in the majority, I was the lead sponsor of this bill. Last Congress, Mr. MCCAUL became the lead sponsor. Both times the bill passed with overwhelming bipartisan support, which is a testament to the importance of this bill and to the quality of the work that has gone into it. Hopefully in this Congress, as Mr. MCCAUL said, the House and the Senate will finally pass this vital piece of the puzzle in protecting America's cybersecurity.

When I began working on this bill in 2010, it was clear that our use of the Internet and other communication networks would continue to grow and evolve, and that threats from individual hackers, criminal syndicates, and even other governments would grow and evolve, too. This has turned out to be all too true.

Just last month, the Director of National Intelligence testified before the Senate Intelligence Committee that the danger of cyber attacks and cyber espionage on crucial infrastructure tops the list of global threats to our Nation. I believe that we face the possibility of a cyber "Pearl Harbor" that could destroy America's military or economic security. We have already seen the loss of countless jobs through cyber espionage, and we face—and thankfully, so far, we have repelled—much worse attacks every day. It is now more important than ever that we get this legislation onto the President's desk.

H.R. 756 will increase the security of our networks and information systems by building strong public-private partnerships, improving the transfer of cybersecurity technologies to the marketplace, training a cybersecurity workforce for both the public and private sectors, and coordinating and prioritizing Federal cybersecurity R&D efforts.

In addition to requiring a strategic plan for Federal cybersecurity R&D among all of the relevant Federal agencies, this bill explicitly authorizes programs and activities at the National Science Foundation and the National Institute of Standards and Technology. Both of these agencies play an important and unique role in the Federal Government's efforts to secure cyberspace.

This bill also builds on recommendations of the administration's cyberspace policy review. The first step is education, including educating individuals, companies, and especially the next generation of IT professionals. This legislation works towards these goals by building on existing partnerships, such as the NSF-sponsored Center for System Security and Information Assurance at Moraine Valley Community College in Palos Hills, Illinois. This college has trained hundreds of teachers and college faculty in cybersecurity-related areas since 2003, individuals who are now teaching at colleges and technical training programs nationwide.

H.R. 756 utilizes these existing programs across the country by providing scholarships to students pursuing cybersecurity degrees in exchange for their service in the Federal IT workforce. This approach not only provides for the immediate workforce needs of the Federal Government but also builds a pipeline for private industry.

Of course, research, standards, and education are only part of the cybersecurity solution, but they are critical pieces of the puzzle that Congress must complete to secure our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank again Mr. MCCAUL for his work on this legislation. I urge Members to support it.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) who is the vice chairman of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to thank LAMAR SMITH and Congressmen MCCAUL and LIPINSKI for the leadership that they've provided on this very significant issue.

First of all, I would like to say that I am completely supportive of this bill. This legislation will continue America's path toward greater capabilities on cybersecurity. This is critical to our national security and our future.

And while we are increasing the authorization levels in this legislation for these critical activities, we are aware that every new dollar that we spend is a dollar that we borrowed, probably from China.

□ 1310

The Communist Chinese regime, of course, is the greatest human rights abuser in the world and potential adversary of the United States.

Furthermore, there has been unequivocal evidence that the Chinese Government is a source of significant cyber attacks on targets within the United States, which leads me to the main point, being, we must take note that there are many students from China and students from other known cyber attack countries attending our universities, participating in our programs, and learning exactly how we are setting up our system and defenses.

We need to apply a little common sense here, which is so often missing from our government, of course; and we need to make certain that we are not funding, enabling, and training our potential enemies.

Section 106 of this legislation clearly limits the Scholarships for Service program to citizens or permanent residents of the United States. But that limitation is not extended to the Graduate Traineeships Program, which is also authorized; nor does it extend that limitation to the National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship program, which has previously been expanded to include computer and network security specializations.

Other cybersecurity programs give funding to and rely upon universities that are now training both sides in a future cyber war.

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. So here we might end up, if we're not careful on how we approach this battle that we're having for the security of our country, we could end up financing both sides of a potential cyber conflict. We don't need to do that.

The Chinese graduate students that head home, after being trained by the American taxpayers, and they're supposed to head home, by the way, after they go through education here, if they go home, they could end up becoming soldiers in China's cyber war against us.

We need to consider the fundamental questions of how we got ourselves into this predicament, and that was through our policies of technology transfer, trade, and investment that benefited and actually were structured in a way to transfer wealth to China.

We need solutions to get ourselves out of this problem and not be in jeopardy from this Communist Chinese dictatorship that still exists in Beijing. Well, turning off the funding spigot to those who threaten us and potentially could do us harm is the first step.

So I would hope that as this legislation works its way through the Senate and elsewhere, that we make sure that there are limitations placed on it so that no students from countries that

are possible enemies of the United States, but are currently engaged in cyber attacks, should be able to be funded by this program.

But with that said, the purpose of the program is terrific. We need to do it, and we need to do it right. And I congratulate my friends and my colleagues for the good job they've done.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Before I begin, let me just say that my heart goes out to all those who lost their lives and were injured in the terrorist attack at the Boston Marathon yesterday. My thoughts and prayers are with them and their families, and we pray for a quick recovery for all of those who were hurt. And our thoughts and prayers are with everyone in Boston at this difficult time.

I also would like to take a minute just to comment on and to lend my support to the previous bill that was just debated, H.R. 1163, the FISMA reform bill that was before the House, vitally important for updating our reporting of cybersecurity incidents and other issues relating to enhancing our cybersecurity. And I commend Chairman ISSA for his leadership on that, as well as others on the committee who are supporting that bill.

But, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to rise as a supporter and cosponsor of the Cybersecurity Enhancement Act, offered by my good friend and colleague, the chairman of the Homeland Security Committee, as well as the co-chair, along with me, on the Cybersecurity Caucus, Chairman MCCAUL.

Mr. Speaker, it seems that every week we read about a new cyber attack taking place. Last month, the Mandiant Report detailed a campaign of espionage against hundreds of corporations around the world. The New York Times and other media companies have also been victims of recent attacks; and we saw in South Korea last month the financial and communications sectors can clearly be vulnerable to these pernicious attacks as well.

Mr. Speaker, the cyber threat is real. Protecting our networks is a complex task that we, in Congress, need to focus more on and address. Chairman MCCAUL and I served together on the CSIS Commission on Cybersecurity for the 44th Presidency, and I am happy to report that the Cybersecurity Enhancement Act builds on the important work that we did there.

As we are constantly reminded, today's threat may not be tomorrow's, due to the prodigious rate of technological innovation. This bill before us today encourages coordination between Federal agencies tasked with cyber research and development and requires

them to develop a strategic plan for R&D activities.

Success in this area demands a skilled cyber workforce, something that we currently lack. This bill takes an important first step in correcting our course by reauthorizing NSF graduate fellowships in cybersecurity and requiring the President to issue a report addressing our critical cyber workforce shortage.

So, Mr. Speaker, with that, let me again thank the gentleman from Texas for his outstanding leadership on this issue. He's been a visionary on working to protect our Nation's cybersecurity, and I greatly appreciate his efforts and that of many others. I look forward to continuing to work with him, and I'm pleased to support this bipartisan piece of legislation.

I also recognize Mr. LIPINSKI and his leadership on this issue as well.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we have no more requests for time on this side, so we'll be prepared to yield back at the right time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Let me thank the chairman and the ranking member for their leadership on the Science Committee, and thank the proponents of this legislation, my chairman on the Homeland Security Committee, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. LIPINSKI, for their bipartisan leadership on something that is enormously crucial; and it is certainly crucial for those of us who serve on both Judiciary and Homeland Security and probably a number of others.

What I want to applaud most of all is the R&D and expanded training. We will need to have a cadre, an army of civilians, who understand the protection of America's cyber landscape, if you will. And it is a domestic issue, as well as a security issue, because America's energy and utilities and medical care all are tied into the cybersphere.

Whether or not it is a youngster who wants to hack, or whether or not it is an aggressive foreign country, it is valuable and important for us to be trained. I'd like to offer the importance of Historically Black Colleges and Hispanic-serving Colleges as well, being part of this very important effort and, as well, to educate the private sector, which has 85 to 80 to 90 percent, in essence, of the private sector dealing with cybersecurity.

Let me complete, Mr. Speaker, by saying as we move forward, I think it is important for Homeland Security to be a lead on some of these issues, particularly the bill coming forward. But I applaud this legislation. I congratulate the proponents and sponsors and ask my colleagues to support this legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to please heed the gavel.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have no further

requests for time. I'd like to just urge that we support the bill, and I thank the chairman.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1320

Mr. SMITH of Texas. I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 756, the Cybersecurity Enhancement Act of 2013—legislation that I'm proud to cosponsor, which will both enhance our national security and help boost our economy.

Cybersecurity is increasingly essential to our national defense and to our economic security in the 21st century.

As the Internet and other communication networks have grown and become more sophisticated, so have the threats from individual hackers, criminal syndicates, and even other governments.

It's critical that we take steps today to encourage and better coordinate the research and development of cybersecurity technology on a national scale.

The Cybersecurity Enhancement Act will help ensure that our country is prepared to face the security threats of the 21st century, that our businesses have the IT protections they need to compete on a global scale. I am proud that we're making critical investments in science and IT education for our young people and our educational institutions.

By authorizing grants and prioritizing research areas with the National Science Foundation and the National Institute of Standards and Technology, this legislation will help boost workforce development. In Connecticut, home to high-tech manufacturing and top-quality universities and technical schools, these workforce investments are essential to our economic future.

Mr. Speaker, for the sake of our nation's security, for the sake of our businesses, for the sake of our economy, I urge a yes vote on this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 756, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

ADVANCING AMERICA'S NETWORKING AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2013

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 967) to amend the High-Performance Computing Act of 1991 to authorize activities for support of networking and information technology research, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 967

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 “Advancing America’s Networking and Information Technology Research and Development Act of 2013”.

SEC. 2. PROGRAM PLANNING AND COORDINATION.

(a) **PERIODIC REVIEWS.**—Section 101 of the High-Performance Computing Act of 1991 (15 U.S.C. 5511) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(d) **PERIODIC REVIEWS.**—The agencies identified in subsection (a)(3)(B) shall—

“(1) periodically assess the contents and funding levels of the Program Component Areas and restructure the Program when warranted, taking into consideration any relevant recommendations of the advisory committee established under subsection (b); and

“(2) ensure that the Program includes large-scale, long-term, interdisciplinary research and development activities, including activities described in section 104.”

(b) **DEVELOPMENT OF STRATEGIC PLAN.**—Section 101 of such Act (15 U.S.C. 5511) is amended further by adding after subsection (d), as added by subsection (a) of this Act, the following new subsection:

“(e) **STRATEGIC PLAN.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The agencies identified in subsection (a)(3)(B), working through the National Science and Technology Council and with the assistance of the National Coordination Office described under section 102, shall develop, within 12 months after the date of enactment of the Advancing America’s Networking and Information Technology Research and Development Act of 2013, and update every 3 years thereafter, a 5-year strategic plan to guide the activities described under subsection (a)(1).

“(2) **CONTENTS.**—The strategic plan shall specify near-term and long-term objectives for the Program, the anticipated time frame for achieving the near-term objectives, the metrics to be used for assessing progress toward the objectives, and how the Program will—

“(A) foster the transfer of research and development results into new technologies and applications for the benefit of society, including through cooperation and collaborations with networking and information technology research, development, and technology transition initiatives supported by the States;

“(B) encourage and support mechanisms for interdisciplinary research and development in networking and information technology, including through collaborations across agencies, across Program Component Areas, with industry, with Federal laboratories (as defined in section 4 of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3703)), and with international organizations;

“(C) address long-term challenges of national importance for which solutions require large-scale, long-term, interdisciplinary research and development;

“(D) place emphasis on innovative and high-risk projects having the potential for substantial societal returns on the research investment;

“(E) strengthen all levels of networking and information technology education and training programs to ensure an adequate, well-trained workforce; and

“(F) attract more women and underrepresented minorities to pursue postsecondary degrees in networking and information technology.

(3) **NATIONAL RESEARCH INFRASTRUCTURE.**—The strategic plan developed in accordance with paragraph (1) shall be accompanied by milestones and roadmaps for establishing and maintaining the national research infrastructure required to support the Program, including the roadmap required by subsection (a)(2)(E).

“(4) **RECOMMENDATIONS.**—The entities involved in developing the strategic plan under paragraph (1) shall take into consideration the recommendations—

“(A) of the advisory committee established under subsection (b); and

“(B) of the stakeholders whose input was solicited by the National Coordination Office, as required under section 102(b)(3).

“(5) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—The Director of the National Coordination Office shall transmit the strategic plan required under paragraph (1) to the advisory committee, the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives.”

(c) **ADDITIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES OF DIRECTOR.**—Section 101(a)(2) of such Act (15 U.S.C. 5511(a)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A) by inserting “education,” before “and other activities”; and

(2) by redesignating subparagraphs (E) and (F) as subparagraphs (F) and (G), respectively; and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (D) the following new subparagraph:

“(E) encourage and monitor the efforts of the agencies participating in the Program to allocate the level of resources and management attention necessary to ensure that the strategic plan under subsection (e) is developed and executed effectively and that the objectives of the Program are met;”

(d) **ADVISORY COMMITTEE.**—Section 101(b)(1) of such Act (15 U.S.C. 5511(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) after the first sentence, by inserting the following: “The co-chairs of the advisory committee shall meet the qualifications of committee membership and may be members of the President’s Council of Advisors on Science and Technology.”; and

(2) in subparagraph (D), by striking “high-performance” and inserting “high-end”.

(e) **REPORT.**—Section 101(a)(3) of such Act (15 U.S.C. 5511(a)(3)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B)—

(A) by redesignating clauses (vii) through (xi) as clauses (viii) through (xii), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after clause (vi) the following: “(vii) the Department of Homeland Security;”

(2) in subparagraph (C)—

(A) by striking “is submitted,” and inserting “is submitted, the levels for the previous fiscal year,”; and

(B) by striking “each Program Component Area,” and inserting “each Program Component Area and research area supported in accordance with section 104;”

(3) in subparagraph (D)—

(A) by striking “each Program Component Area,” and inserting “each Program Component Area and research area supported in accordance with section 104;”

(B) by striking “is submitted,” and inserting “is submitted, the levels for the previous fiscal year,”; and

(C) by striking “and” after the semicolon;

(4) by redesignating subparagraph (E) as subparagraph (G); and

(5) by inserting after subparagraph (D) the following new subparagraphs:

“(E) include a description of how the objectives for each Program Component Area, and the objectives for activities that involve multiple Program Component Areas, relate to the objectives of the Program identified in the strategic plan required under subsection (e);

“(F) include—

“(i) a description of the funding required by the National Coordination Office to perform the functions specified under section 102(b) for the next fiscal year by category of activity;

“(ii) a description of the funding required by such Office to perform the functions specified under section 102(b) for the current fiscal year by category of activity; and

“(iii) the amount of funding provided for such Office for the current fiscal year by each agency participating in the Program; and”.

(f) **DEFINITION.**—Section 4 of such Act (15 U.S.C. 5503) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (7) as paragraphs (2) through (8), respectively;

(2) by inserting before paragraph (2), as so redesignated, the following new paragraph:

“(1) ‘cyber-physical systems’ means physical or engineered systems whose networking and information technology functions and physical elements are deeply integrated and are actively connected to the physical world through sensors, actuators, or other means to perform monitoring and control functions;”;

(3) in paragraph (3), as so redesignated, by striking “high-performance computing” and inserting “networking and information technology”;

(4) in paragraph (4), as so redesignated—

(A) by striking “high-performance computing” and inserting “networking and information technology”; and

(B) by striking “supercomputer” and inserting “high-end computing”;

(5) in paragraph (6), as so redesignated, by striking “network referred to as” and all that follows through the semicolon and inserting “network, including advanced computer networks of Federal agencies and departments;”;

(6) in paragraph (7), as so redesignated, by striking “National High-Performance Computing Program” and inserting “networking and information technology research and development program”.

SEC. 3. LARGE-SCALE RESEARCH IN AREAS OF NATIONAL IMPORTANCE.

Title I of such Act (15 U.S.C. 5511) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 104. LARGE-SCALE RESEARCH IN AREAS OF NATIONAL IMPORTANCE.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Program shall encourage agencies identified in section 101(a)(3)(B) to support large-scale, long-term, interdisciplinary research and development activities in networking and information technology directed toward application areas that have the potential for significant contributions to national economic competitiveness and for other significant societal benefits. Such activities, ranging from basic research to the demonstration of technical solutions, shall be designed to advance the development of research discoveries. The advisory committee established under section 101(b) shall make recommendations to the Program for candidate research and development areas for support under this section.

“(b) **CHARACTERISTICS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Research and development activities under this section shall—

“(A) include projects selected on the basis of applications for support through a competitive, merit-based process;

“(B) involve collaborations among researchers in institutions of higher education and industry, and may involve nonprofit research institutions and Federal laboratories, as appropriate;

“(C) when possible, leverage Federal investments through collaboration with related State initiatives; and

“(D) include a plan for fostering the transfer of research discoveries and the results of technology demonstration activities, including from institutions of higher education and Federal laboratories, to industry for commercial development.

“(2) **COST-SHARING.**—In selecting applications for support, the agencies shall give special consideration to projects that include cost sharing from non-Federal sources.

“(3) **AGENCY COLLABORATION.**—If 2 or more agencies identified in section 101(a)(3)(B), or other appropriate agencies, are working on large-scale research and development activities in the same area of national importance, then

such agencies shall strive to collaborate through joint solicitation and selection of applications for support and subsequent funding of projects.

“(4) **INTERDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH CENTERS.**—Research and development activities under this section may be supported through interdisciplinary research centers that are organized to investigate basic research questions and carry out technology demonstration activities in areas described in subsection (a). Research may be carried out through existing interdisciplinary centers, including those authorized under section 7024(b)(2) of the America COMPETES Act (Public Law 110-69; 42 U.S.C. 1862o-10).”

SEC. 4. CYBER-PHYSICAL SYSTEMS.

(a) **ADDITIONAL PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS.**—Section 101(a)(1) of such Act (15 U.S.C. 5511(a)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (H), by striking “and” after the semicolon;

(2) in subparagraph (I)—

(A) by striking “improving the security” and inserting “improving the security, reliability, and resilience”; and

(B) by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs:

“(J) provide for increased understanding of the scientific principles of cyber-physical systems and improve the methods available for the design, development, and operation of cyber-physical systems that are characterized by high reliability, safety, and security; and

“(K) provide for research and development on human-computer interactions, visualization, and big data.”

(b) **WORKSHOP.**—Title I of such Act (15 U.S.C. 5511) is amended further by adding after section 104, as added by section 3 of this Act, the following new section:

“SEC. 105. UNIVERSITY/INDUSTRY WORKSHOP.

“(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Advancing America’s Networking and Information Technology Research and Development Act of 2013, the Director of the National Coordination Office shall convene a workshop, with participants from institutions of higher education, Federal laboratories, and industry, to explore mechanisms for carrying out collaborative research and development activities for cyber-physical systems, including the related technologies required to enable these systems, and to develop grand challenges in cyber-physical systems research and development.

“(b) **FUNCTIONS.**—The workshop participants shall—

“(1) develop options for models for research and development partnerships among institutions of higher education, Federal laboratories, and industry, including mechanisms for the support of research and development carried out under these partnerships;

“(2) develop options for grand challenges in cyber-physical systems research and development that would be addressed through such partnerships;

“(3) propose guidelines for assigning intellectual property rights and for the transfer of research results to the private sector; and

“(4) make recommendations for how Federal agencies participating in the Program can help support research and development partnerships in cyber-physical systems, including through existing or new grant programs.

“(c) **PARTICIPANTS.**—The Director of the National Coordination Office shall ensure that participants in the workshop are individuals with knowledge and expertise in cyber-physical systems and that participants represent a broad mix of relevant stakeholders, including academic and industry researchers, cyber-physical systems and technologies manufacturers, cyber-physical systems and technologies users, and, as appropriate, Federal government regulators.

“(d) **REPORT.**—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of the Advancing Amer-

ica’s Networking and Information Technology Research and Development Act of 2013, the Director of the National Coordination Office shall transmit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives a report describing the findings and recommendations resulting from the workshop required under this section.”

SEC. 5. CLOUD COMPUTING SERVICES FOR RESEARCH.

Title I of such Act (15 U.S.C. 5511) is amended further by adding after section 105, as added by section 4(b) of this Act, the following new section:

“SEC. 106. CLOUD COMPUTING SERVICES FOR RESEARCH.

“(a) **INTERAGENCY WORKING GROUP.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Advancing America’s Networking and Information Technology Research and Development Act of 2013, the Director of the National Coordination Office, working through the National Science and Technology Council, shall convene an interagency working group to examine—

“(1) the research and development needed—

“(A) to enhance the effectiveness and efficiency of cloud computing environments;

“(B) to increase the trustworthiness of cloud applications and infrastructure; and

“(C) to enhance the foundations of cloud architectures, programming models, and interoperability; and

“(2) how Federal science agencies can facilitate the use of cloud computing for federally funded science and engineering research, including—

“(A) making recommendations on changes in funding mechanisms, budget models, and policies needed to remove barriers to the adoption of cloud computing services for research and for data preservation and sharing; and

“(B) providing guidance to organizations and researchers on opportunities and guidelines for using cloud computing services for federally supported research and related activities.

“(b) **CONSULTATION.**—In carrying out the tasks in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a), the working group shall consult with academia, industry, Federal laboratories, and other relevant organizations and institutions, as appropriate.

“(c) **REPORT.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Advancing America’s Networking and Information Technology Research and Development Act of 2013, the Director of the National Coordination Office shall transmit to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report describing the findings and any recommendations of the working group.

“(d) **TERMINATION.**—The interagency working group shall terminate upon transmittal of the report required under subsection (c).”

SEC. 6. NATIONAL COORDINATION OFFICE.

Section 102 of such Act (15 U.S.C. 5512) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 102. NATIONAL COORDINATION OFFICE.

“(a) **OFFICE.**—The Director shall continue a National Coordination Office with a Director and full-time staff.

“(b) **FUNCTIONS.**—The National Coordination Office shall—

“(1) provide technical and administrative support to—

“(A) the agencies participating in planning and implementing the Program, including such support as needed in the development of the strategic plan under section 101(e); and

“(B) the advisory committee established under section 101(b);

“(2) serve as the primary point of contact on Federal networking and information technology

activities for government organizations, academia, industry, professional societies, State computing and networking technology programs, interested citizen groups, and others to exchange technical and programmatic information;

“(3) solicit input and recommendations from a wide range of stakeholders during the development of each strategic plan required under section 101(e) through the convening of at least 1 workshop with invitees from academia, industry, Federal laboratories, and other relevant organizations and institutions;

“(4) conduct public outreach, including the dissemination of findings and recommendations of the advisory committee, as appropriate; and

“(5) promote access to and early application of the technologies, innovations, and expertise derived from Program activities to agency missions and systems across the Federal Government and to United States industry.

“(c) **SOURCE OF FUNDING.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The operation of the National Coordination Office shall be supported by funds from each agency participating in the Program.

“(2) **SPECIFICATIONS.**—The portion of the total budget of such Office that is provided by each agency for each fiscal year shall be in the same proportion as each such agency’s share of the total budget for the Program for the previous fiscal year, as specified in the report required under section 101(a)(3).”

SEC. 7. IMPROVING NETWORKING AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY EDUCATION.

Section 201(a) of such Act (15 U.S.C. 5521(a)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (4) as paragraphs (3) through (5), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraph:

“(2) the National Science Foundation shall use its existing programs, in collaboration with other agencies, as appropriate, to improve the teaching and learning of networking and information technology at all levels of education and to increase participation in networking and information technology fields, including by women and underrepresented minorities;”

SEC. 8. CONFORMING AND TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.

(a) **SECTION 3.**—Section 3 of such Act (15 U.S.C. 5502) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “HIGH-PERFORMANCE COMPUTING” and inserting “NETWORKING AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY”;

(2) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “high-performance computing” and inserting “networking and information technology”;

(B) in subparagraphs (A), (F), and (G), by striking “high-performance computing” each place it appears and inserting “networking and information technology”; and

(C) in subparagraph (H), by striking “high-performance” and inserting “high-end”; and

(3) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking “high-performance computing and” and inserting “networking and information technology and”; and

(B) by striking “high-performance computing network” and inserting “networking and information technology”.

(b) **TITLE I.**—The heading of title I of such Act (15 U.S.C. 5511) is amended by striking “HIGH-PERFORMANCE COMPUTING” and inserting “NETWORKING AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY”.

(c) **SECTION 101.**—Section 101 of such Act (15 U.S.C. 5511) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by striking “HIGH-PERFORMANCE COMPUTING” and inserting “NETWORKING AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT”;

(2) in subsection (a)—
 (A) in the subsection heading, by striking “NATIONAL HIGH-PERFORMANCE COMPUTING” and inserting “NETWORKING AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT”;

(B) in paragraph (1) of such subsection—
 (i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “National High-Performance Computing Program” and inserting “networking and information technology research and development program”;

(ii) in subparagraph (A), by striking “high-performance computing, including networking” and inserting “networking and information technology”;

(iii) in subparagraphs (B) and (G), by striking “high-performance” each place it appears and inserting “high-end”;

(iv) in subparagraph (C), by striking “high-performance computing and networking” and inserting “high-end computing, distributed, and networking”;

(C) in paragraph (2) of such subsection—

(i) in subparagraphs (A) and (C)—
 (I) by striking “high-performance computing” each place it appears and inserting “networking and information technology”;

(II) by striking “development, networking,” each place it appears and inserting “development,”;

(ii) in subparagraphs (F) and (G), as redesignated by section 2(c)(1) of this Act, by striking “high-performance” each place it appears and inserting “high-end”;

(3) in subsection (b)—
 (A) in paragraph (1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “high-performance computing” both places it appears and inserting “networking and information technology”;

(B) in paragraph (2), in the second sentence, by striking “2” and inserting “3”;

(4) in subsection (c)(1)(A), by striking “high-performance computing” and inserting “networking and information technology”.

(d) SECTION 201.—Section 201(a)(1) of such Act (15 U.S.C. 5521(a)(1)) is amended by striking “high-performance computing” and all that follows through “networking;” and inserting “networking and information research and development;”.

(e) SECTION 202.—Section 202(a) of such Act (15 U.S.C. 5522(a)) is amended by striking “high-performance computing” and inserting “networking and information technology”.

(f) SECTION 203.—Section 203(a) of such Act (15 U.S.C. 5523(a)(1)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “high-performance computing and networking” and inserting “networking and information technology”;

(2) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking “high-performance” and inserting “high-end”.

(g) SECTION 204.—Section 204 of such Act (15 U.S.C. 5524) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1)—
 (A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “high-performance computing systems and networks” and inserting “networking and information technology systems and capabilities”;

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking “interoperability of high-performance computing systems in networks and for common user interfaces to systems” and inserting “interoperability and usability of networking and information technology systems”;

(C) in subparagraph (C), by striking “high-performance computing” and inserting “networking and information technology”;

(2) in subsection (b)—
 (A) in the heading, by striking “HIGH-PERFORMANCE COMPUTING AND NETWORK” and inserting “NETWORKING AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY”;

(B) by striking “sensitive”.

(h) SECTION 205.—Section 205(a) of such Act (15 U.S.C. 5525(a)) is amended by striking “computational” and inserting “networking and information technology”.

(i) SECTION 206.—Section 206(a) of such Act (15 U.S.C. 5526(a)) is amended by striking “computational research” and inserting “networking and information technology research”.

(j) SECTION 207.—Section 207(b) of such Act (15 U.S.C. 5527(b)) is amended by striking “high-performance computing” and inserting “networking and information technology”.

(k) SECTION 208.—Section 208 of such Act (15 U.S.C. 5528) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by striking “HIGH-PERFORMANCE COMPUTING” and inserting “NETWORKING AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY”;

(2) in subsection (a)—
 (A) in paragraph (1), by striking “High-performance computing and associated” and inserting “Networking and information”;

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “high-performance computing” and inserting “networking and information technologies”;

(C) in paragraph (3), by striking “high-performance” and inserting “high-end”;

(D) in paragraph (4), by striking “high-performance computers and associated” and inserting “networking and information”;

(E) in paragraph (5), by striking “high-performance computing and associated” and inserting “networking and information”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 967, the bill now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.
 Mr. SMITH of Texas. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS) for her work on this bill. And I'm pleased to join the Science Committee's ranking member, Ms. JOHNSON, as a cosponsor of H.R. 967, the Advancing America's Networking and Information Technology Research and Development Act of 2013. This bill had broad bipartisan support in the last Congress, and I hope it will receive that same level of support today.

In the digital age, protecting our Nation's computer networking systems is more important than ever. This bill provides the coordinated research and development efforts necessary to improve cyber and data security nationwide. And better network security promotes U.S. competitiveness, enhances national security, and creates high-tech jobs.

The NITRD program is an extension of the High-Performance Computing Act of 1991. It represents the Federal Government's main R&D investment portfolio for unclassified networking, computing, software, cybersecurity, and related information technologies. Currently, 15 Federal agencies are contributing members of NITRD, with an

additional 20 or so participating in the program.

This bill serves as the mechanism for interagency coordination of R&D to ensure no duplication of research efforts among Federal agencies or the private sector. It rebalances R&D portfolios to focus less on short-term goals and more on large-scale, long-term interdisciplinary research.

While this bill does not authorize specific funding amounts, NITRD spending totals over \$3.7 billion annually. Over \$1.1 billion of this is from the National Science Foundation and over \$550 million is from the Department of Energy. The bill updates the underlying High-Performance Computing statute and codifies work undertaken by the National Coordination Office, housed within NSF, to oversee the 15 different agencies.

The NITRD program has eight strategic priorities for its research: cybersecurity; autonomous, robotic systems; high-end computing and applications; exascale computing; human-computer interaction; large-scale networking, workforce development; and software design and productivity.

Technologies that come from these research priorities are applied by the commercial sector and the government to protect and enhance emergency communications, the power grid, air traffic control networks, and national defense systems. Networking and information technology support and boost American competitiveness, enhance national security, and help strengthen the economy.

American job creators also recognize the importance of networking and information technology research and development. Many industry partners and stakeholders have written letters in support of this bill. They include the National Association of Manufacturers, TechAmerica, Computing Research Association, Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineers-USA, Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, and the U.S. Public Policy Council of the Association for Computing Machinery.

Cybersecurity provisions in the bill include research necessary to detect, prevent, and recover from actions that can compromise or threaten computer-based systems.

I again thank my Science Committee colleague, Representative LUMMIS, the chairwoman of the Energy Subcommittee, for her initiative on this issue. I urge my colleagues to support the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 967, the Advancing America's Networking and Information Technology Research and Development Act of 2013. H.R. 967 is a good, bipartisan bill which I was pleased to join Mrs. LUMMIS from Wyoming and Mr. HALL from Texas in introducing.

H.R. 967 is largely based on a 2009 House-passed bill that was introduced by then-Chairman Gordon and Ranking Member HALL. But the current bill also includes some updates from the 2009 bill that reflect changes to the network and information technology landscape as well as policy and management recommendations made by an outside panel of experts charged with evaluating the NITRD program.

The NITRD program, as it is known, involves a collaboration of 15 Federal research and development agencies, each contributing its own unique expertise and effort to ensure that we make most effective use of our Federal R&D resources and remain a leader in these fields. H.R. 967 requires that all 15 agencies come together to develop and periodically update a strategic plan for Federal investments in NIT R&D.

H.R. 967 calls for increased support for large-scale, long-term interdisciplinary research in NIT that will help us tackle national challenges such as improving the effectiveness and efficiency of our health care and energy delivery service systems. The bill also promotes partnerships between the Federal Government, academia, and industry to foster technology transfer.

In particular, I'd like to highlight H.R. 967's role in ensuring that the education of the future NIT workforce remains an important component of the NITRD program. I am hearing every day from small and large companies alike that the demand for skilled IT professionals is much higher than the supply. We hear this same message from university faculty, who tell us their computer science graduates are snatched up the moment they graduate, regardless of the health of the overall job market. This gap between supply and demand exists despite the fact that these jobs are among the highest-paying and the most stable jobs in our economy today.

It is imperative that we encourage more young Americans to pursue studies in the NIT fields. In particular, because of the stark gender and racial gaps we see in computer science programs, it is imperative that we encourage more young women and students of color to enter these fields. We simply won't be able to remain a global leader in these important fields without more than 50 percent of our Nation's brainpower sitting on the sidelines.

H.R. 967 doesn't go quite as far as I'd like it to go in addressing these education challenges, but it still sends an important message about the need to educate more of our students in our NIT fields and provides the necessary authority for the agencies to play an important and appropriate role here.

Finally, I would be remiss not to mention that the NITRD program serves as a coordinating and planning umbrella for all unclassified Federal cybersecurity R&D. Our committee addressed specific needs in cybersecurity R&D separately in H.R. 756; but in

doing so, we made sure that both the intellectual and financial resources for cybersecurity R&D are appropriately integrated with the rest of the Federal NIT portfolio. Information security R&D should not take place in its own silo. IT bears on all networking and information technologies.

□ 1330

In closing, NIT technologies cut across every sector of our economy and our national defense infrastructure. Our relatively modest 20-year investment in the NITRD program has contributed immeasurably to our economic and national security by enabling innovation and job creation in NIT and providing American students with the skills to fill these jobs. Let's reauthorize this program today and ensure that it remains strong.

I want to thank my friend Ms. Lummis for reintroducing our bipartisan bill once again in this Congress. I'd also like to thank my staff—and in particular Dahlia Sokolov—for their hard work on this bill.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 967, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. Lummis), who is the sponsor of this legislation and who also chairs the Energy Subcommittee, the Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to start out by thanking Chairman SMITH and Ranking Member JOHNSON for their support in bringing this bipartisan legislation to the floor.

I have found, since being on the Science Committee, that it is an acronym-rich environment. Mr. Speaker, I'm an acronym-challenged individual, so I'll be talking about the Network and Information Technology Research and Development program. In the future, I'm just going to call it "the program." It's the Federal Government's main research and development effort in unclassified network, computing, software, cybersecurity, and related information technologies.

Research conducted under this program has led to scientific growth and innovation in several areas, including visualization technologies in science, engineering, and medicine; computer-based education and training; and near-real-time weather forecasts, which is really important in my State of Wyoming.

Currently, 15 Federal agencies are contributing members to the program, and even more participate.

H.R. 967, the bill in front of us, does two things: it updates the High-Performance Computing Act of 1991, and it reauthorizes the program to advance our Nation's networking and information technology research and development.

It's the digital age, Mr. Speaker. Advances in networking and information technology continue to transform our

quality of life, our economy, U.S. competitiveness, and our national security. This bill provides the coordination necessary for the United States to respond to rapid changes in these areas, it encourages innovation, and it protects our economy.

My home State of Wyoming is best known for its stunning mountains and open spaces. But not long ago, Wyoming also became home to a supercomputing center. It houses one of the world's most powerful supercomputers. Mr. Speaker, it makes a mind-boggling number of computations every second. It's sponsored by the University Coalition on Atmospheric Research, which sponsors the National Center on Atmospheric Research, and so it's partially funded by the National Science Foundation, which is the taxpayers. So they help fund it. These computations enable world-leading research projects in areas including atmospheric and geosciences. So this bill facilitates work in these fields, ranging from research being conducted at the supercomputing center to big data—and I mean big data—and cybersecurity as well.

H.R. 967 implements several recommendations from the 2007 and 2010 President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology assessments to improve government coordination and planning with input from policy and technical experts. It adjusts research and development portfolios so we're focusing less on short-term goals and more on really long-term goals.

Now, specific to cybersecurity, the program includes research and development to detect, prevent, and recover from actions that compromise or threaten computer and network-based systems. Now, you heard from Congressman MCCAUL just moments ago some of the specific examples of the real threats that are directed at computer networks. So reauthorizing this program is an important step.

I thank the chairman, and I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI).

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady for yielding and for her work on this legislation. I'd also like to thank Chairman SMITH and Chairwoman LUMMIS for all their work on this bill.

It's been nearly 4 years since we last reauthorized and updated the NITRD program, and it's time we get this job done. The House, again, on this bill has passed legislation since that time, but we need to get this done today here and get this through the Senate and to the President's desk.

The NITRD program evolved from the High Performance Computing Act of 1991, which funded the development of Mosaic—the first commercial Web browser which made the Internet user friendly and led to its explosion in the 1990s. This innovation was created by a team of programmers at the National

Center for Supercomputing Applications at the University of Illinois.

As a brief aside, I was just at the NCSA in Urbana-Champaign at the University of Illinois for the launch of the Blue Waters supercomputer, one of the most powerful supercomputers in the world, which is also there at the University of Illinois. But Marc Andreessen, one of the lead programmers on the original project that created Mosaic and the founder of Netscape, summed up the importance of Federal investment in this research by saying:

If it had been left to private industry, it wouldn't have happened, at least, not until years later.

Innovative breakthroughs like the Mosaic Web browser changed our everyday lives and established the United States as the world leader in networking and information technologies, and the Federal Government played an important role in that. But today we find ourselves in a world in which we can no longer take U.S. supremacy for granted. As we heard during committee consideration of the bill, China, Japan, Germany, and several other countries are increasing their investments in NIT R&D as well as their capacity to convert R&D into new commercial technologies. We must prioritize cutting-edge, large-scale R&D and effective technology transfer policies, focused on the most advanced areas of network and information technology, in order to preserve our lead in these sectors.

H.R. 967, the Advancing America's Network and Information Technology Research and Development Act, achieves these ends through the development of a coordinated Federal R&D investment strategy. This bill requires Federal agencies involved in the R&D program to develop 5-year plans specifying near- and long-term objectives and to assess and evaluate progress periodically to ensure we maintain U.S. leadership in these fields.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation will focus our scientific community towards the innovative, large-scale, and collaborative R&D we need to remain a leader in networking and information technologies. This is a good, bipartisan bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am very supportive of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time as well.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 967, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 1163, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 756, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 967, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

FEDERAL INFORMATION SECURITY AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1163) to amend chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, to revise requirements relating to Federal information security, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 416, nays 0, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 106]

YEAS—416

Table listing names of members of the House of Representatives who voted 'YEAS' on H.R. 1163. The names are arranged in three columns: Aderholt, Bucshon, Costa; Alexander, Burgess, Cotton; Amash, Bustos, Courtney; Amodei, Butterfield, Cramer; Andrews, Calvert, Crawford; Bachus, Camp, Crenshaw; Barber, Campbell, Crowley; Barletta, Cantor, Cuellar; Barr, Capito, Cummings; Barrow (GA), Capps, Daines; Barton, Capuano, Davis (CA); Bass, Cárdenas, Davis, Danny; Beatty, Carney, Davis, Rodney; Becerra, Carson (IN), DeFazio; Benishek, Carter, DeGette; Bentivolio, Cartwright, Delaney; Bera (CA), Cassidy, DeLauro; Bilirakis, Castor (FL), DelBene; Bishop (GA), Castro (TX), Denham; Bishop (NY), Chabot, Dent; Bishop (UT), Chaffetz, DeSantis; Black, Chu, DesJarlais; Blumenauer, Cicilline, Deutch; Bonamici, Clarke, Diaz-Balart; Bonner, Cleaver, Dingell; Boustany, Clyburn, Doggett; Brady (PA), Coble, Doyle; Brady (TX), Coffman, Duckworth; Braley (IA), Cohen, Duffy; Bridenstine, Cole, Duncan (SC); Brooks (AL), Collins (GA), Duncan (TN); Brooks (IN), Collins (NY), Edwards; Broun (GA), Conaway, Ellison; Brown (FL), Connolly, Ellmers; Brownley (CA), Cook, Engel; Buchanan, Cooper, Enyart.

Table listing names of members of the House of Representatives who voted 'NAYS' on H.R. 1163. The names are arranged in three columns: Eshoo, Lance, Rahall; Esty, Langevin, Rangel; Farenthold, Lankford, Reed; Farr, Larsen (WA), Reichert; Fattah, Larson (CT), Renacci; Fitzpatrick, Latham, Ribble; Fleischmann, Latta, Rice (SC); Fleming, Lee (CA), Richmond; Flores, Levin, Rigell; Forbes, Lewis, Roby; Fortenberry, Lipinski, Roe (TN); Foster, LoBiondo, Rogers (AL); Foxx, Loeb sack, Rogers (KY); Frankel (FL), Lofgren, Rogers (MI); Franks (AZ), Long, Rohrabacher; Frelinghuysen, Lowenthal, Rokita; Fudge, Lowey, Rooney; Gabbard, Lucas, Ros-Lehtinen; Gallego, Luetskemeyer, Ross; Garamendi, Lujan Grisham, Rothfus; Garcia, (NM), Roybal-Allard; Gardner, Luján, Ben Ray, Royce; Garrett, (NM), Ruiz; Gerlach, Lummis, Runyan; Gibbs, Maffei, Ruppertsberger; Gibson, Maloney, Rush; Gingrey (GA), Carolyn, Ryan (OH); Gohmert, Maloney, Sean, Ryan (WI); Goodlatte, Marchant, Salmon; Gosar, Marino, Sánchez, Linda; Gowdy, Massie, T.; Granger, Matheson, Sanchez, Loretta; Graves (GA), Matsui, Sarbanes; Graves (MO), McCarthy (CA), Scalise; Grayson, McCarthy (NY), Schakowsky; Green, Al, McCaul, Schiff; Green, Gene, McClintock, Schneider; Griffin (AR), McCollum, Schock; Griffith (VA), McDermott, Schrader; Grijalva, McGovern, Schwartz; Grimm, McHenry, Schweikert; Guthrie, McIntyre, Scott (VA); Gutierrez, McKinley, Scott, Austin; Hahn, McMorris, Scott, David; Hall, Rodgers, Sensenbrenner; Hanabusa, McNerney, Serrano; Hanna, Meadows, Sessions; Harper, Meehan, Sewell (AL); Harris, Meeks, Shea-Porter; Hartzler, Messer, Sherman; Hastings (FL), Mica, Shimkus; Hastings (WA), Michaud, Shuster; Heck (NV), Miller (FL), Simpson; Heck (WA), Miller (MI), Sinema; Hensarling, Miller, George, Sires; Herrera Beutler, Moore, Slaughter; Higgins, Moran, Smith (NE); Himes, Mullin, Smith (NJ); Hinojosa, Mulvaney, Smith (TX); Holt, Murphy (FL), Smith (WA); Honda, Murphy (PA), Southerland; Horsford, Nadler, Speier; Hoyer, Napolitano, Stewart; Hudson, Neal, Stivers; Huelskamp, Negrete McLeod, Stockman; Huffman, Neugebauer, Stutzman; Huizenga (MI), Noem, Swalwell (CA); Hultgren, Nolan, Takano; Hunter, Nugent, Terry; Hurt, Nunes, Thompson (CA); Israel, Nunnelee, Thompson (MS); Issa, O'Rourke, Thompson (PA); Jackson Lee, Olson, Thornberry; Jeffries, Owens, Tiberi; Jenkins, Palazzo, Tierney; Johnson (GA), Pallone, Tipton; Johnson (OH), Pascrell, Titus; Johnson, E. B., Pastor (AZ), Tonko; Johnson, Sam, Paulsen, Tsongas; Jones, Pearce, Turner; Jordan, Pelosi, Upton; Joyce, Perlmutter, Valadao; Kaptur, Perry, Van Hollen; Keating, Peters (CA), Vargas; Kelly (IL), Peters (MI), Veasey; Kelly (PA), Peterson, Vela; Kildee, Petri, Velázquez; Kilmer, Pingree (ME), Visclosky; Kind, Pittenger, Wagner; King (IA), Pitts, Walberg; King (NY), Pocan, Walden; Kingston, Poe (TX), Walorski; Kinzinger (IL), Polis, Walz; Kirkpatrick, Pompeo, Wasserman; Kline, Posey, Schultz; Kuster, Price (GA), Waters; Labrador, Price (NC), Watt; LaMalfa, Quigley, Waxman; Lamborn, Radel, Weber (TX).

Webster (FL) Wilson (SC) Yoder
Welch Wittman Yoho
Wenstrup Wolf Young (AK)
Whitfield Womack Young (FL)
Williams Woodall Young (IN)
Wilson (FL) Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—16

Bachmann Holding Miller, Gary
Blackburn Kennedy Payne
Clay Lynch Roskam
Conyers Markey Westmoreland
Culberson McKeon
Fincher Meng

□ 1405

Messrs. SENSENBRENNER and TURNER changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CYBERSECURITY ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida). The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 756) to advance cybersecurity research, development, and technical standards, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 402, nays 16, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 107]

YEAS—402

Aderholt Campbell Cuellar
Alexander Cantor Cummings
Amodei Capito Daines
Andrews Capps Davis (CA)
Bachus Capuano Davis, Danny
Barber Cárdenas Davis, Rodney
Barletta Carney DeFazio
Barr Carson (IN) DeGette
Barrow (GA) Carter Delaney
Barton Cartwright DeLauro
Bass Cassidy DelBene
Beatty Castor (FL) Denham
Becerra Castro (TX) Dent
Benishek Chabot DeSantis
Bera (CA) Chaffetz DesJarlais
Bilirakis Chu Deutch
Bishop (GA) Cicilline Diaz-Balart
Bishop (NY) Clarke Dingell
Bishop (UT) Cleaver Doggett
Black Clyburn Doyle
Blumenauer Coble Duckworth
Bonamici Coffman Duffy
Bonner Cohen Edwards
Boustany Cole Ellison
Brady (PA) Collins (GA) Ellmers
Brady (TX) Collins (NY) Engel
Braley (IA) Conaway Enyart
Brooks (AL) Connolly Eshoo
Brooks (IN) Conyers Esty
Brown (FL) Cook Farenthold
Brownley (CA) Cooper Farr
Buchanan Costa Fattah
Bucshon Cotton Fitzpatrick
Burgess Courtney Fleischmann
Bustos Cramer Fleming
Butterfield Crawford Flores
Calvert Crenshaw Forbes
Camp Crowley Fortenberry

Foster Lowey Rokita
Foxy Lucas Rooney
Frankel (FL) Luetkemeyer Ros-Lehtinen
Franks (AZ) Lujan Grisham Ross
Frelinghuysen (NM) Rothfus
Fudge Luján, Ben Ray Roybal-Allard
Gabbard (NM) Ruiz
Gallego Lummis
Garamendi Maffei
Garcia Maloney, Carolyn
Gardner Maloney, Sean
Garrett Marchant
Gerlach Marino
Gibbs Matheson
Gibson Matsui
Gingrey (GA) T.
Gohmert McCarthy (CA)
Goodlatte McCarthy (NY)
Gowdy McCaul
Granger McClintock
Graves (MO) McCollum
Grayson McDermott
Green, Al McGovern
Green, Gene McHenry
Griffin (AR) McIntyre
Grijalva McKeon
Grimm McKinley
Guthrie McMorris
Gutierrez Rodgers
Hahn McNerney
Hall Meadows
Hanabusa Meehan
Hanna Meeks
Harper Messer
Harris Mica
Hartzler Michaud
Hastings (FL) Miller (FL)
Hastings (WA) Miller (MI)
Heck (NV) Miller, George
Heck (WA) Moore
Hensarling Moran
Herrera Beutler Mullin
Higgins Mulvaney
Himes Murphy (FL)
Hinojosa Murphy (PA)
Holt Nadler
Honda Napolitano
Horsford Neal
Hoyer Negrete McLeod
Hudson Neugebauer
Huffman Noem
Huizenga (MI) Nolan
Hultgren Nugent
Hunter Nunes
Hurt Nunnelee
Israel O'Rourke
Issa Olson
Jackson Lee Owens
Jeffries Palazzo
Jenkins Pallone
Johnson (GA) Pascrell
Johnson (OH) Pastor (AZ)
Johnson, E. B. Paulsen
Johnson, Sam Pearce
Jordan Pelosi
Joyce Perlmutter
Kaptur Perry
Keating Peters (CA)
Kelly (IL) Peters (MI)
Kelly (PA) Peterson
Kildee Petri
Kilmer Pingree (ME)
Kind Pitts
King (IA) Pittenger
King (NY) Pocan
Kingston Poe (TX)
Kinzinger (IL) Polis
Kirkpatrick Pompeo
Kline Posey
Kuster Price (GA)
LaMalfa Price (NC)
Lamborn Quigley
Lance Radel
Langevin Rahall
Lankford Rangel
Larsen (WA) Reed
Larson (CT) Reichert
Latham Renacci
Latta Ribble
Lee (CA) Rice (SC)
Levin Richmond
Lewis Rigell
Lipinski Roby
LoBiondo Roe (TN)
Loeb sack Rogers (AL)
Lofgren Rogers (KY)
Long Rogers (MI)
Lowenthal Rohrabacher

NAYS—16
Amash Gosar Massie
Bentivolio Graves (GA) Sensenbrenner
Bridenstine Griffith (VA) Stockman
Broun (GA) Huelskamp Yoho
Duncan (SC) Jones
Duncan (TN) Labrador

NOT VOTING—14

Bachmann Holding Miller, Gary
Blackburn Kennedy Payne
Clay Lynch Roskam
Culberson Markey Westmoreland
Fincher Meng

□ 1413

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADVANCING AMERICA'S NETWORKING AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 967) to amend the High-Performance Computing Act of 1991 to authorize activities for support of networking and information technology research, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 406, nays 11, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 108]

YEAS—406

Aderholt Butterfield Cramer
Alexander Calvert Crawford
Amodei Camp Crenshaw
Andrews Campbell Crowley
Bachus Cantor Cuellar
Barber Capito Cummings
Barletta Capps Daines
Barr Capuano Davis (CA)
Barrow (GA) Cárdenas Davis, Danny
Barton Carney Davis, Rodney
Bass Carson (IN) DeFazio
Beatty Carter DeGette
Becerra Cartwright Delaney
Benishek Cassidy DeLauro
Bentivolio Castor (FL) DelBene
Bera (CA) Castro (TX) Denham
Bilirakis Chabot Dent
Bishop (GA) Chaffetz DeSantis
Bishop (NY) Chu DesJarlais
Bishop (UT) Cicilline Deutch
Black Clarke Dingell
Blumenauer Cleaver Doggett
Bonamici Clyburn Doyle
Bonner Coble Duckworth
Boustany Coffman Duffy
Brady (PA) Collins (GA) Duncan (TN)
Brady (TX) Collins (NY) Edwards
Braley (IA) Conaway Ellison
Brooks (AL) Connolly Ellmers
Brooks (IN) Conyers Engel
Brown (FL) Cook Enyart
Brownley (CA) Cooper Eshoo
Buchanan Costa Esty
Bucshon Cotton Farenthold
Burgess Courtney Farr
Bustos Courtney Fattah

Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxy
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin

Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell

Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schradler
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack

Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—11

NOT VOTING—15

□ 1420

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, today I was unable to cast my vote for H.R. 1163, H.R. 756 and H.R. 967 due to my duties as part of a delegation of Members of the U.S. House of Representatives attending the funeral services of Baroness Margaret Thatcher in London. Had I been present to cast my vote, I would have voted "yes" on all three bills.

ELECTING A MEMBER TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 163

Resolved, That the following named Member be and is hereby elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

(1) COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM.—Ms. Kelly of Illinois (to rank immediately after Ms. Duckworth).

(2) COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY.—Ms. Kelly of Illinois.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1287

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 1287.

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

There was no objection.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF FORMER CONGRESSMAN CHARLIE WILSON

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in remembrance and to honor our dear friend and former colleague, Congressman Charlie Wilson of Ohio.

On Sunday, we learned that Congressman Charlie Wilson passed away from complications from an operation following a serious stroke he endured in February, living each moment thereafter with great courage. Today, the Ohio delegation honors his life and his achievements for the State of Ohio, his Sixth District that he represented with such dignity, and his impact on our Nation.

Surely, his work on jobs, health care, veterans benefits were truly a benefit to not just his district, but to the Nation. He was such a relentless advocate.

Charlie Wilson embodied the ethic of public service. His political demeanor, his civility, his gracious manner characterized his exemplary service. Throughout his 16 years in public service, 12 in the Ohio House and 4 here in the United States House of Representatives, he served as a true advocate for his constituents in the hard-scrabble economy of eastern and southeastern Ohio.

He embodied the aspirations of our middle class. He dedicated his life to public service with unwavering energy, selfless dedication, and a kindness that should be emulated by all Members. I never heard him raise his voice in anger.

How proud he was of his family, his son, Jason, who succeeded him in the Ohio Legislature, all of his children, his family. And may Angela and his family be comforted during these difficult times.

Congressman Wilson had an uncanny ability to make people laugh and make everyone around him feel at ease. He genuinely cared about improving the lives, not only of his constituents, but of all people around him.

His last political race in 2012 showed the measure of the man, as millions and millions of dollars poured in from out of State against him, and he kept going, no matter what.

Our delegation's thoughts and prayers are with Charlie, with his entire family, his four children, his nine grandchildren and, of course, his beloved Angela.

We are all saddened by his death but encouraged by his legacy, his achievements, and the memories that he leaves with all of us.

I know that each Member of the Ohio delegation shares in my desire to honor Congressman Charlie Wilson's memory.

NABEEL RAJAB—DEFENDING FREEDOMS PROJECT

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, this weekend, the international sports spotlight will focus on the Bahrain Grand

Prix. But will that spotlight shine into Bahrain's prisons as well?

Nabeel Rajab, a Bahraini human rights activist sentenced to 2 years in jail simply for engaging in nonviolent political protest, is one prisoner who deserves public attention. Nabeel is a focus of the Defending Freedoms Project, a collaborative initiative spearheaded by the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission that invites Members of Congress to stand up for individual prisoners of conscience around the world. Today, I invite my colleagues to take part in this important, nonpartisan opportunity.

Nabeel is not alone. The Bahraini Government has also imprisoned 13 prominent activists, and Amnesty International reports that it may soon jail anyone found guilty of insulting the King.

It is time for the leadership of Formula One Racing to end their silence on Bahrain's crackdown. It is time for them to take a stand in favor of human rights, and it is time for each of us to speak out for the nonviolent human rights defenders like Nabeel Rajab.

10 YEARS SINCE THE DECLARATION OF GENOCIDE IN DARFUR

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

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, let me first send also my well wishes, prayers, and my sympathy to the city of Boston, the families and friends, and all of those touched by yesterday's horrific tragedy.

Ten years ago this month, the international community joined together to bring the world's attention to the brutal attacks by the Government of Sudan against the people of Darfur.

The Congressional Black Caucus, Leader PELOSI, and others stood united and, led by our beloved, the great gentleman from New Jersey, Congressman DON PAYNE, introduced H. Con. Res. 467, declaring that genocide was occurring in Darfur. Many of us also traveled to the region several times and later passed the Darfur Peace and Accountability Act.

Yet even after then—Secretary of State Powell finally declared genocide in 2004—the international community failed to act decisively to stop it. If we had acted then, we could have saved many innocent lives. If we do the right thing now, we could end the suffering, violence, and insecurity that tragically continues to plague the region to this day.

Now is the time for the United States to provide high-level leadership and press for full humanitarian assistance in memory and in honor of our beloved DON PAYNE, our great warrior. He did so much for the people of Darfur. Let us do the right thing in his memory so that the next time we say, "Not on our watch," we will mean it.

PAUSING FOR A MOMENT OF REFLECTION

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, last night I received a phone call from our former colleague and my good friend, Jean Schmidt of Ohio. As you know, Jean is an avid runner, and she has participated in many, many marathons.

She was at the Boston Marathon yesterday; and 13 minutes after she crossed the finish line, she heard the bombs go off and saw debris and people running and things were falling all over the place, and called me to tell me that she was okay. She was waiting for her sister to finish when this happened.

You know, when tragedy like this happens, you think, there, but for the grace of God, go I; and that was clearly the case with Jean and so many others.

I just wanted to take this opportunity to pause for a moment and reflect on what happened in Boston yesterday, and pour my heart out to the injured and to those that were killed and their families, including an 8-year-old boy we heard about today.

Whoever would do such a horrible thing to take innocent lives and cause terror amongst the population has to just be horrible people and people who care nothing about their fellow human beings.

I want to take this opportunity to let the people who are injured and families of those who are injured and the families of those who perished know that we, in the Congress, are thinking about them, that we care about them, that we will reflect on what they went through. And we won't stop until those who committed the crimes will be brought to justice.

□ 1430

REMEMBERING CONGRESSMAN CHARLIE WILSON

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

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I also join with my colleagues from Ohio to honor the memory of Congressman Charlie Wilson. He was just a fun guy for so many of us who spent a lot of time in Washington, D.C. We shared a district in southeastern Ohio, and Charlie was one of the most popular politicians in the history of southeastern Ohio. He loved bonding with Members. He could very easily work across the aisle with Democrats and Republicans. He always had a funny story or something to tell.

I always appreciate when someone talks about their parents. He would always talk about growing up in southeastern Ohio and his dad and the furniture store and the funeral home and picking Democrats up in funeral cars to take them to the polls to make sure that they can vote. He loved telling

those stories. But he loved his kids and grandkids. He would beam when he would talk about being with them for the holidays.

And so we honor him and send our heartfelt wishes to Angela, who was just a lot of fun to be with, too. I know her and Charlie had a lot of good times and a lot of good years together. And I want to say, Charlie, thanks for being a great friend to us and a great Member of the United States Congress. Southeast Ohio is a better place because of your service and your life.

REMEMBERING CONGRESSMAN CHARLIE WILSON

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

Mrs. BEATTY. I come to join my colleagues with a heavy heart to honor the memory of Charlie Wilson. I had the opportunity of having my House of Representatives office across from him in the early years of my career. Charlie is a great mentor and someone who always took the time to help others.

I also had the opportunity to hear those stories about the funeral home. It was Charlie's family's funeral home that would actually take African American families when other funeral homes wouldn't. So I always respected that he looked at all people the same.

Like many others, I had the opportunity to spend time with him on Lake Erie in the summers because we were both boaters, and had the opportunity for him to join my husband and Angela as we took trips together.

So to his four sons and to Angela, know that you are in our hearts and our prayers. And I say to you, celebrate his life, because he had a life that was full of honor and celebration.

FAIR TAX ACT OF 2013

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

Mr. WOODALL. Yesterday was tax day, and I've got taxes on my mind, Mr. Speaker. You know, as most folks in this Chamber do, that H.R. 25, the Fair Tax Act of 2013, is the most widely cosponsored, most widely supported fundamental tax reform legislation in the House and in the Senate. In fact, both the House and the Senate. Sixty-four of our colleagues in the House, Mr. Speaker, have put their name on H.R. 25, the Fair Tax Act. Eight of our Senate colleagues have put their name on H.R. 25, the Fair Tax Act.

The FairTax is a revolutionary proposal, Mr. Speaker, in that it takes all of the power of the Tax Code out of Washington, D.C., and returns it to men and women back home. You know that we can manipulate the behavior of absolutely anyone in America through the Tax Code. If I want folks to wear

more pink ties and fewer blue ties, I'll subsidize pink ties to the tune of 50 percent and I'll tax blue ties to the tune of 50 percent and we'll change behavior overnight.

Do you remember, Mr. Speaker, when we had the Electric Vehicle Tax Credit back in 2010? It was a \$7,500 tax credit. And we said we're going to give \$7,500 to every American who goes out and buys an electric car. Now the plan was folks were going to go out and buy these \$100,000 electric cars and we were going to defray a little of that price. But it turns out the lawyers got involved and figured out that golf carts were electric cars. And if only we put seatbelts and rearview mirrors and brake lights on these golf carts, every American could get a free golf cart.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to ask if you got one of those free golf carts, and I'm not going to ask my colleagues who are back in their offices watching on TV to send me a note if they got a free golf cart. It was the law of the land. And if you got a free golf cart, I guess you deserved it.

But so abused was that tax provision, Mr. Speaker, that at the end of 2010 the IRS released tax guidance that said, We wanted you to have to take delivery of these golf carts before the end of 2010 to get the tax credit, but the demand has been so great, the manufacturers cannot fill it fast enough. Actually, you just need a VIN number and you can take delivery into 2011. Well, that's not the way the American Tax Code ought to be used, Mr. Speaker, and it's not the way American tax dollars ought to be used.

There are so many challenges we have in the American economy and so many reasons that American-made products cost more than the products that our competitors produce overseas—and so many of those reasons we do not want to change. The fact that American wages are higher than Chinese wages, I want to celebrate that. I don't want to bemoan that. The fact that environmental regulations in America are stricter and protect us in ways environmental regulations in India do not, I don't want to bemoan that. I want to celebrate that. But the fact that the American Tax Code places the highest burden on businesses and employers in America than any other place in the world, that's a problem.

We live in a very fluid economy, Mr. Speaker. Folks can locate their business anywhere on the planet they want to. They don't have to come to America. Why is it that America's not the magnet for capital around the globe? Why do we have the absolute worst Tax Code in terms of rates instead of the absolute best? And that's what I want to talk about. Because it's one of those areas of agreement, Mr. Speaker.

This is a quote from President Barack Obama in his 2011 State of the Union address. He said:

To put us on solid ground, we should also find a bipartisan solution to strengthen Social Security for future generations.

I mention Social Security, Mr. Speaker, because the Fair Tax Act, that bill, H.R. 25, the most widely co-sponsored bill in the U.S. House of Representatives for fundamental tax reform, replaces income taxes and the payroll taxes—payroll tax is that 15.3 percent that comes out of every Americans' paycheck in order to fund Social Security and Medicare. It replaces both of those with this 23 percent sales tax. It replaces all your income taxes, all your payroll taxes with a sales tax.

And so for the first time, Mr. Speaker, we would begin to link the size of the Social Security trust fund not with wages in this country but with the size of the economy in this country. So when we double the size of the economy, we double the contributions to the Social Security trust fund, we protect Social Security for future generations.

Mr. Speaker, in a poll, I think it's been 3 years ago now, they asked young people, college-aged students, Do you believe in UFOs? Folks said yes, folks said no. They said, Do you believe you're ever going to see a Social Security check? Folks said yes and folks said no. Do you know that more of those young people believed in UFOs than thought they'd ever see a Social Security check, Mr. Speaker? That's outrageous. Because Social Security, by the very nature of its name, is to provide security. And if you don't believe it's going to be there, it provides no security whatsoever.

We can guarantee Social Security not just for the current generation but for future generations by reforming the way that we pay for it, by reforming our Tax Code, by moving to a pro-growth system like the FairTax.

□ 1440

The President knows we need to, and yet in his budget this year we did nothing to extend the life of the Social Security trust fund. In fact, the Social Security disability trust fund, Mr. Speaker, that trust fund that so many Americans depend on, that runs out of money before this President even leaves office. It runs out of money within 4 years, Mr. Speaker, and yet the budget proposal this year provided absolutely no certainty that changes would be made in order to protect that for future generations. That's wrong, and it's an opportunity for us to come together and do things that we all agree on.

Here's another quote, this time from President Obama's 2013 State of the Union Address:

Broad-based economic growth requires a balanced approach to deficit reduction, with spending cuts and revenue, and with everyone doing their fair share.

Who disagrees with that, Mr. Speaker? We talk so much about fair share here; I can't find anyone who disagrees with fair share.

I think about Dr. Carson at the annual Prayer Breakfast. Did you see that, Mr. Speaker? Dr. Carson was

speaking at the Prayer Breakfast right down the street this year, and he was telling a tale of billionaires and someone who might have made \$10 billion but they were taxed to the tune of \$1 billion. They chipped in \$1 billion to help fund America and folks were complaining that they hadn't done enough. I have not chipped in \$1 billion, Mr. Speaker, far from it.

What does it mean to do your fair share? For me, it means having skin in the game. One of my great regrets, Mr. Speaker, is that during the Bush administration, for the first time in American history, we cut taxes and went to war at the same time. I think that's wrong, Mr. Speaker. I think about all the young people who had skin in that game.

In my part of the world down in Georgia, Mr. Speaker, a lot of folks are in the military, a lot of sons and daughters in uniform. Those families have skin in the game of foreign policy. But if you don't have a son or daughter in uniform, if you don't have a husband or wife in uniform, where is your skin in that game when you're not paying for those decisions? And when we make decisions that we don't have to pay for, we make bad decisions.

I agree with the President: folks need to pay their fair share. I think we all need to have some skin in the game. Folks who make more ought to pay more; folks who make less ought to pay less. But we are all members of the board of directors of the United States of America, Mr. Speaker. All 320 million of us sit on the board of directors of the United States of America, and, yes, you ought to have skin in the game when you're making decisions about how this organization runs. How do we create revenue? How do we reduce deficits? How do we make sure that folks are paying their fair share?

Well, the good news is, Mr. Speaker, the President is aware of the FairTax. I'm not willing to call him a FairTax President yet—again, the Fair Tax Act, that's H.R. 25, Mr. Speaker. I don't think the President is quite on board. We're not going to wait on the President to get on board though. We're going to go ahead and drive forward here in the House.

The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee here in the House, Mr. Speaker, that committee that has jurisdiction over all tax legislation, they are serious about fundamental tax reform in this Congress like I have never seen in my lifetime. I dare say that folks with a lot more gray hair than I have, Mr. Speaker, who've been here since 1986—the last time we did fundamental tax reform—looked at the kind of work that Chairman DAVE CAMP and his entire committee, majority and minority alike, have put into fundamental tax reform. And I have more hope that we are going to see fundamental tax reform—not just in this Congress, Mr. Speaker, but in this calendar year—than I have ever had before. The FairTax is going to be a part of that discussion.

The White House, to its great credit, Mr. Speaker, the White House is just leaps and bounds ahead of other White Houses in terms of how it deals with the public. They have this online petition process, Mr. Speaker, where anybody can go out there, and if you have enough folks sign your petition, you can ask the White House to do whatever you want to do. Well, here in FairTax world—which is where I come from down in Georgia, Mr. Speaker, where folks believe in the FairTax, believe in its power to reenergize the economy, believe in its power to return freedom to families and individuals and take it away from the Federal Government—we started a petition to say, Mr. President, please meet with Neal Boortz. He's one of the leaders of the FairTax movement. He has a radio program and has spent a lot of time investing in the kinds of freedom and opportunity the FairTax would bring us. It said, I want you to meet with Neal Boortz to talk about the FairTax. I want you to give Neal Boortz 1 hour.

Well, we got all the signatures that were required on that petition, and the White House's response was this:

The FairTax would apply to virtually all expenditures on goods and services, including tuition, medical care, and new homes, all typical family purchases.

Well, he's partly right. I highlighted tuition here, Mr. Speaker, because the FairTax doesn't tax tuition; it taxes all consumption. Tuition is more of an investment in your future, so it's not taxed. But the question isn't: Why does the FairTax tax everything? The question is: Why are some things exempted in the current Tax Code, Mr. Speaker? Why do Americans get free golf carts? Why is that? Is that a real national priority that we make that happen? Why is it we subsidize some loans and we don't subsidize other loans? Why is it folks are able to deduct some interest but not other interest? Why is it that we're willing to help people get some businesses started but not other businesses started? That doesn't speak to fair share to me, Mr. Speaker.

Running for Congress, you get this voting card and you slide it in the little slot here on the House floor, Mr. Speaker, and you get to make some decisions. For me, it's on behalf of about 640,000 people back home in Georgia. But even more power than that voting card, Mr. Speaker, is the way people use their wallet. Those 640,000 people back in Georgia, Mr. Speaker, use their wallet every day to make millions of decisions: Am I going to buy this or that product? Am I going to support this service or that service? Am I going to be involved in this activity or that activity? We run this country, Mr. Speaker, not just through our votes in November, but through the power of our wallet every single day.

In order to find the broadest tax base of all—because economists tell us, Mr. Speaker, if you have a lower tax rate and a broader tax base, you get more economic growth in your economy. The

Joint Tax Committee did a symposium on that, Mr. Speaker, in the late 1990s—because we didn't have a computer model at that time that would model a consumption tax system—and they asked eight macroeconomic modeling groups: What would happen if we switched from the income tax America has today and moved to a consumption tax? Well, these economic modeling groups from the left and from the right, Mr. Speaker, some in the center—you know, economists, for Pete's sake, they don't agree on much. In fact, the results of these modeling groups were all across the charts, across all of the metrics that they were working on, except for one.

When the question was would the economy grow faster under a consumption tax than under the current income tax system, every single group said yes. Now, some of those said it would grow a little bit faster, some of those said it would grow a lot faster, but every single macroeconomic modeling group said the economy would grow faster, that Americans would generate more wealth, that employment would be more available if we moved to a consumption tax system.

The question isn't, Mr. Speaker, why we tax some things. The question is, today, in the current system, why don't we tax everything, tax everything once, but only once, because when we don't, we pick winners and losers.

Again, through the power of my voting card here in the House of Representatives, Mr. Speaker, I can manipulate the lives of every single American back home by taxing this good and subsidizing that good. That's wrong. That's wrong. Because as all members of the board of directors of the United States of America, Mr. Speaker, the entire United States of America, all of our citizens, we have the power to make those decisions with our wallet; we don't need the law to tell us.

Now, what price, Mr. Speaker, today do we pay for that law? Thirteen hours is the time the average taxpayer spends paying their taxes.

Mr. Speaker, #taxreform will bring folks to all the information that has been coming out of the House this week during tax week—hour after hour, 13 hours of productivity for the average tax filer. Now, of course, some people's taxes are simple and some people's taxes are complicated, Mr. Speaker, and we're sucking that time out of their day.

What does it turn into in dollars, Mr. Speaker? \$168 billion American taxpayers spend each year to comply with tax rules. \$168 billion produces nothing. It doesn't help us with our trade deficit with China. It doesn't help us export more grain to Russia. \$168 billion we ask American taxpayers to dig into their pocket and pay for the pleasure of paying their income taxes.

More and more Americans every year, Mr. Speaker, find they cannot do

their own taxes, that they have to go to a professional tax preparer. Doggone it, Mr. Speaker, I don't mind paying my taxes. In fact, I think America is a great country and I think I'm getting my money's worth, but to have to pay somebody to help me pay the taxes makes me angry. And it's wrong. It's wrong.

I look at what's happened in those former Soviet Bloc countries, Mr. Speaker. Do you know those former Soviet Bloc countries have all moved to flat taxes? What they found is, when they had really high tax rates and they were very difficult to comply with, folks just didn't pay their taxes at all; but when they lowered that rate, made it flat and applied it across a very broad base, folks began to voluntarily remit their taxes. That's not rocket science.

□ 1450

Well, that's not rocket science. That's exactly what we've seen in example after example after example around the world; \$168 billion, Mr. Speaker, Americans waste simply trying to pay their taxes each year.

Now, why is tax reform so complicated? I have another quote from the President here, Mr. Speaker. This is from his weekly address back in December. He was talking about the fiscal cliff, to be fair, to put this into context. He said:

We've got to do what it takes to protect the middle class.

Now, there's great disagreement about who the middle class is, Mr. Speaker. When I go back home to townhall meetings, absolutely everyone I meet believes they're in the middle class. Whether they're at the low end of the income spectrum or at the high end of the income spectrum, that's who we are in America. We believe in that middle class dream, that upward mobility to move from that space on the bottom rung of the economic ladder up to that middle class rung.

Folks worry about the middle class, as well we should. FairTax takes that into account. The big knock, Mr. Speaker, on consumption taxes, is that rich people have to spend less of their income buying things than lower income people do. Now, that's absolutely true. At my first job out of school, Mr. Speaker, I was making under \$20,000 a year. I was trying to pay rent and pay back student loans and pay insurance on my automobile. It was tough to sort all those things out in a high-rent district, high cost of living. I had to spend every penny of that \$20,000 just to make ends meet.

Now, if I had been making \$100,000 at that time, Mr. Speaker, I would have had a lot left over. So, yes, if you make more, as a percentage of that income, you consume less.

Well, we take that into account with the FairTax, Mr. Speaker. This is what we say. The poverty level—the poverty level in America—is calculated on

what it takes for the average individual, the average family to pay for their basic necessities. We all have rent, we all have clothes, Mr. Speaker, we all have to eat, we all have health care expenses. What is it that is kind of that basic level of subsistence? We call that the poverty level.

Now, what the FairTax does is through a tax rebate check—it's actually a prebate check because it goes out the beginning of the month instead of the end of the month—it indemnifies every American, every American family from the tax consequences of spending up to the poverty level. So that, in effect, if you're a miser, Mr. Speaker, you save every penny you have, and you're only spending up to the poverty level, you would pay no taxes. I don't care if you're Warren Buffett, I don't care if you're Bill Gates, I don't care if you're that young person just graduating from high school and getting your first job. No one taxed up to poverty level spending; everyone taxed on every penny of spending beyond that.

Here's the thing. When you open up *The Wall Street Journal*, Mr. Speaker, and it bemoans consumption declining in America, it hurts me. Because when consumption is declining, that means savings are rising. We need more savings in this country, Mr. Speaker. Oversaving is not a problem in America. I wish that problem upon us all. And we have a unique—a unique—window in the world economy right now, Mr. Speaker.

For years, it's been America that has been consuming everything that the world has been producing. We used to be the manufacturer for the world; now we're the consumer for the world. But as literally millions and millions and millions of new middle class consumers are coming online in China and in India, millions and millions and millions that are going to continue to grow, we have a window of opportunity right now to quit being the consumer for the world, as we have been for the past few decades, and return to our status as manufacturer for the world.

We're having this natural gas boom right now, Mr. Speaker, that's driven the cost of manufacturing down in America, the likes of which we haven't seen in decades; that's made us competitive, even with our higher wages, even with our more aggressive environmental protection regulations, made us more price competitive with goods from all across the world. We can be the producer for the world, Mr. Speaker. We don't need to be the consumer.

That's why the FairTax taxes consumption. We shouldn't tax people based on what they earn. If you're earning a lot and you're saving a lot, we should applaud you for that, not punish you for that. Mr. Speaker, when you're in the low-income class today and you're trying to move into the middle class, you begin to lose benefits—you lose your health care, you lose your education subsidy, you lose some food subsidies.

The marginal tax rate, Mr. Speaker, when you're trying to get from the lower rung of the ladder to the next rung of the ladder, can be upwards of 60 percent—60 percent on folks who are trying to make it. The FairTax says, no, no, we shouldn't tax anyone up to poverty level spending, and we should applaud anyone who finds a penny to save, because savings is what drives an economy, not consumption.

So here we have a chart, Mr. Speaker, of what happens to the FairTax rate for a two-adult, two-child household. And what you see is if you're down at a lower income bracket, Mr. Speaker, earning under \$20,000 a year, you're not going to pay a penny in taxes, not a penny in taxes. In fact, you're actually going to get some money back through the FairTax rebate. If you get up to \$30,000 a year, you're still not going to pay a penny in taxes; you're going to break even paying zero. If you're doing better, if you're making \$45,000 or \$60,000 or \$121,000, you're going to see your rate continue to climb. Not the marginal rate, Mr. Speaker, but the effective rate. That's what's so lost in this body.

So often when we have our tax debates, I can have a single flat rate for everyone, a single rate; but based on what the standard deduction is at the bottom of that rate, I make that rate progressive such that folks at the bottom end of the income spectrum are getting a check back so that folks in the middle aren't paying a penny at all and so the folks at the top are paying more and more and more, depending on how much they spend. Progressive tax with the FairTax, Mr. Speaker.

You can't see this chart, Mr. Speaker, but it's the most dangerous chart that anyone is going to have on the House floor today. It shows two diverging lines. It's a chart that goes back to 1979, Mr. Speaker. The last time we had a President from the great State of Georgia was Jimmy Carter. We go back to 1979, and we chart who's paying the taxes in America, going back to the President's vision of having a FairTax system.

This blue line, Mr. Speaker, is the bottom 80 percent of all Americans, bottom 80 percent. Most of us—80 percent. It's tough to call yourself the bottom when you're the majority. But 80 percent of income earners, just distinguishing that part of America from the top 20 percent—80 percent of income earners.

What percentage of the American tax burden, income tax burden, is that 80 percent of America paying? And conversely, because we talk so much about the 1 percent, Mr. Speaker, what percentage of the American tax burden is the 1 percent paying?

And I have something that's just staggering, Mr. Speaker. Folks wouldn't believe it if you didn't see the data. Back in 1979, when Jimmy Carter was leaving office, 80 percent of Americans paid 35 percent of all the tax bills in this country, all the income tax

bills; 80 percent of Americans paid a total of 35 percent of the burden. Now, we can argue whether that's too much, too little; but 80 percent were paying 35 percent of the burden.

Today, Mr. Speaker, go all the way out to 2009—it's the last year for which the IRS produced this record, that's why it's the last year that we have information for—come out to 2009, 80 percent of Americans are now paying 6 percent of the bills in this country. Eighty percent of Americans, 80 percent of the voters, are paying 6 percent of the bills. That's staggering. Most of us are in the 80 percent, Mr. Speaker, and we think that we are paying our fair share. In fact, so many of us think we probably ought to cut taxes a little bit more, and yet we're only paying 6 percent of the bills.

I want to tell you that that's dangerous. It's dangerous because that free golf cart I talked about earlier, there is no way I'm paying \$7,500 for a golf cart. I would rather walk. I don't need a golf cart, don't have any place to put a golf cart, don't know how much it costs to charge a golf cart, don't really have any place I can go on a golf cart. I'm not paying \$7,500 for a golf cart. But if you give me the golf cart for free, I'm going to tell you where to deliver it. I'm going to phone it in today—free golf cart—and tell you right where to send it.

□ 1500

When we don't have skin in the game, we make different decisions. In fact, we make bad economic decisions. They may be good decisions for us, right? It's a good deal if you can get a free golf cart. I recommend it to everyone. But it's a bad deal for the American taxpayer who's giving away those free golf carts.

When we, the 80 percent, Mr. Speaker, are only paying 6 percent of the burden, we begin to make bad voting decisions about what the cost of government is. And here's the other thing: it goes again to that innate sense of fairness that everyone in America believes in. We all believe in fairness. We may not believe in equal outcomes, but we believe in equal opportunity, that everyone should have a fair shot at success.

That top 1 percent that we talk about so much about, Mr. Speaker, I'm not in it, but I aspire to be in it one day. I hope I'm successful. I don't see the pathway from here to there yet, but I'm going to keep working at it. In 1979, when Jimmy Carter was President, that 1 percent paid 18 percent of all the bills in the country. Today, Mr. Speaker, 1 percent of the people pay 38 percent of the bills. The 1 percent are paying more than 80 percent combined. In fact, the 1 percent is paying more than 90 percent combined.

When you live in a land of self-governance, the biggest experiment in self-governance the world has ever known, an experiment about which Alexis de Tocqueville said, when he wrote about

it in the mid 1800s. As soon as the American people can decide they can vote themselves benefits, that will signal the end of the Republic.

They wonder how does America work, how can self-governance work. And de Tocqueville said, It's working today because everybody is pulling the wagon together, but as soon as they figure out that 51 percent of the Americans can tax the other 49 percent of the Americans, that's going to signal the end of self-governance.

We all believe in the fair share, Mr. Speaker. Folks ought to do their fair share of the work; folks ought to get the fair share of the benefit. We all believe in fairness. It's something that every preschool in America is teaching children, every family in America is teaching their children. But in the past four decades in my lifetime, every single year we've shifted the burden so that most of us don't have to shoulder the burden as heavily as we did the year before, such that 80 percent of us in 1979 were carrying 35 percent of the weight, and now we're only carrying 6 percent.

I don't know whose definition of fairness that falls into, Mr. Speaker. It threatens self-governance. I want a seat at the decisionmaking table. I want to be a part of the solutions for everything that happens in this country. I want to pay my fair share, and I want to do my fair share. And I think that is the feeling, the sense, the commitment of every single American today, Mr. Speaker, but we hide those results in a Tax Code that folks can't see: 80 percent of the people paying 6 percent of the bills.

Now, I know what you're saying Mr. Speaker. You've looked at some of those income distribution tables too, and you're thinking, Well, golly, ROB, maybe that 1 percent is just earning that much of the income. No, that's not true. Again, this is the latest year, 2009, for which the IRS has produced records. The top 1 percent, as the share of the pretax income, all the income earned in America, the top 1 percent earned 13 percent of the income and paid 38.7 percent of the taxes.

Now, here's the question, Mr. Speaker: If the top 1 percent—again, I'm not there. I don't know if I'll ever get there. If I stay in public service, I will absolutely never get there. If the top 1 percent are paying 38 percent of the bills while earning 13 percent of the income, in what world are they doing less than their fair share?

Here's the thing: I need to borrow money from time to time, Mr. Speaker. I borrowed money for my house. I borrowed money for my car. I need to borrow money. If folks aren't saving money, I can't borrow the money they put in the bank. I want folks earning money and saving money so that I can borrow money. Every single one of us who borrows money, we're not borrowing the bank's money; we're borrowing another citizen's money who put that money in the bank so the

bank could lend it to us. We need those savings in this country, Mr. Speaker. I'm glad folks are successful. I'm glad they're creating businesses. I'm glad they're employing me and my neighbor's and my neighbor's children. I'm glad they're building my community back home.

I don't demonize success. I celebrate success. You know, Bono from U2, Mr. Speaker—I don't know if you're a fan of U2 like I am. Those were some coming-of-age albums they were producing back in my youth. Bono said what he loved about America is that in America you put your arm around your son, you take him and you look up at the big house on the hill, and you say, Son, one day if you work hard, that could be you. Bono then said over in Ireland, they put their arm around their son, they look up at the big house on the hill, and they say, Son, one day we're going to get that guy.

That's not who we are in America. We celebrate success, and we believe—in fact, we're certain of it—that if we work hard, we apply ourselves by the power of our ideas, the sweat of our brow, we can move our fate from yesterday to tomorrow. We can elevate ourselves pursuing whatever it is that we want to pursue from yesterday to tomorrow because we live in America. But something has gone on in this body, Mr. Speaker, not just in the House of Representatives, but across the street in the Senate and down the street at the White House, where folks have begun to demonize success.

Home Depot came out of the great State of Georgia, Mr. Speaker. I love Home Depot. I encourage everybody to get themselves an orange apron, put that on and get some work projects done. They do great activities for the kids on Saturday morning. They get folks started with building activities at an early age, Mr. Speaker. That company was started in the great State of Georgia, and the four men who started Home Depot—and you all know Home Depot as well as I do—they said if they got together today to try to start Home Depot, they would fail.

In America today, we are so demonizing success, we are so punishing success, we are making it so difficult for entrepreneurs to get started, that if the same four people with the same good idea got together today, they would fail. The only way this country works is if entrepreneurs succeed.

The Department of Labor, Mr. Speaker, they keep statistics on these things. They say today in America, these years during the President's administration, we've had the lowest level of entrepreneurial activity since the Department of Labor began keeping records. It's not the lowest level of people succeeding, but the lowest level of people trying. The word is out, Mr. Speaker, that you cannot succeed in America any longer, and it's just not true. If it is true, we have the power to change it. We get to decide the rules of this country, Mr. Speaker. We sit on the board

of directors of America, and we get to make these rules.

Success, Mr. Speaker. Opportunity. America. Those are synonyms. They have been synonyms since 1776. They will be synonyms until the day that I die unless you and I trade those things away.

The FairTax says we're not going to be in the business of punishing people any longer; we're going to be in the business of celebrating success. The more you save, the less you'll be taxed; the more you spend, the more you'll be taxed.

Now, you all know, Mr. Speaker, about jealousy just as well as I do. I don't know if you had this same issue, Mr. Speaker. When I got ready to apply for college, I applied for all the Federal grants. I filled out that big FAFSA form trying to get some help from the Federal Government. I got nothing. They said, Sorry, your family has saved too much money.

Now, we come from a single-income family, Mr. Speaker, but my buddy down the street, he came from a two-income family. His mom was an architect and his dad was a lawyer. They had money stacked up in the windows, Mr. Speaker. They had vacation homes. They went skiing in Vail. They had boats. They all drove—I say all. There were four of them in the family, and three of them drove Mercedes and one of them drove a BMW. They all were new. When he applied to get money from the Federal Government, the government said, You know what, we've looked at your savings account for the family and you don't have a penny in it. You need help. Here's some money for you.

Something's wrong in our Tax Code, Mr. Speaker. It celebrates the consumption of goods, and it penalizes savings. We need to be in the opposite camp. The reason we have to go to China and to Germany to borrow money to fund America is because Americans can't fund it any more. Back in the 1970s, Mr. Speaker, we were still borrowing money, we still had a national debt, but Americans lent the Federal Government the money to fund the processes of the Federal Government.

□ 1510

Today, almost 50 percent of the money we spend and 50 percent of the money we borrow comes from foreign nations. We as a people can't even save enough money to fund the United States Government any longer, and our Tax Code encourages that conspicuous consumption at every level.

Mr. Speaker, let me just show you some of the things that are in the Tax Code. Again, these are all complicated questions. You've got to make these decisions for yourself. If they were easy questions, Mr. Speaker, they wouldn't need you and me and these two new freshman classes to sort them out. The easy questions were sorted out long, long ago.

Again, Mr. Speaker, you wouldn't believe this unless you dig deep into the numbers. We spend more in tax credits and tax loopholes and tax giveaways than we do on all other discretionary spending accounts combined.

What do I mean by that?

We have what we call "mandatory spending" here. That's Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, and interest on the national debt. We call that "mandatory spending." Everything else—roads, bridges, courts, parks, the environment—is what we call "discretionary spending." Everybody knows what the tax rate is. Everybody knows they're paying into the tax system. We give away things in the tax system—promote this idea; promote that idea; give away this pot of money. We give away more through the Tax Code—we spend more through the Tax Code—than we spend on all other aspects of government combined, but the spending is hidden.

I've put up a few of what we'll call "income tax expenditures" here. Let's see what that is.

For example: exclusion of interest on public purpose State and local bonds. Right? That seems pretty innocuous, State and local bonds. We want to encourage State and local governments to take responsibility, so we're going to allow those bonds to pay interest tax-free. Well, okay, but it's not free. Somebody else is paying for it. Those folks who have those bonds aren't paying for it, but the rest of America has to pick up the tab.

Here is one: individual retirement accounts. Right? If you put money in your IRA, we want you to save for your retirement. We don't tax you on that money, but it's not free. Somebody else is paying that tax. It's just not those folks who are saving their money in their IRAs.

I'm not saying these things aren't good ideas. I'm saying we have to talk about where this money is coming from. I'm closer to death than I am to birth, Mr. Speaker. This \$16.7 trillion that we've borrowed from America's kids, I'm going to be dead before we pay that back, but it is going to be an albatross around their economic neck for another generation or two or three, and we're making those choices today. We're spending money through the Tax Code instead of through the appropriations process.

The FairTax says: no more. The FairTax says: a tax isn't about manipulating behavior. A tax is about collecting revenue to fund the necessities of a government.

We can argue about what those necessities are. Should it include the President's health care bill? Should it not? Should it include wars in Iraq and Afghanistan? Should it not? Should it include environmental protections? Should it not? We can argue about all of those things, but that's what revenue is for. You collect the revenue to fund those priorities that we, the American people, believe in.

But what we use our Tax Code for today is for the Congress of the United States, for the President of the United States and other folks with political power and influence to pick winners and losers through the Tax Code, so much so that we spend more money through the Tax Code than all other aspects of government combined—everything on the discretionary side.

It wasn't this way when we got started. Back in 1913, the passage of the 16th Amendment allowed Americans to have an income tax for the very first time. Do you know what they said, Mr. Speaker? You've probably heard this before. They said, This is only going to be a very small tax on the very wealthiest of Americans.

My calculations, using CPI, Mr. Speaker, tell me that it was a 1 percent tax on folks who made over \$9 million a year. On \$9 million a year, a 1 percent tax—I'm pretty sure we could get 51 percent of the folks to vote for that—but over time, that income tax grew so that it touches every single American family. Thirteen hours, on average, an American family spends to comply with the Tax Code. And for what? It destroys opportunity. It hides spending. It protects from scrutiny those items that this U.S. House of Representatives has decided are worthy of taxpayer expense.

We have a choice: don't lower wages in America. In fact, study after study says, if we pass the FairTax, we're going to see wages go up. It's going to increase economic activity and make us a magnet for capital from around the world. Why in the world are we borrowing money from China when we could just change our Tax Code, and money that American companies have already earned would flow back into this country in order to create jobs?

The FairTax says: no more. Let's have one tax rate on everything that Americans buy and consume.

I'll close with this, Mr. Speaker. Here is the catch. We are the only OECD country in the world—the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development—that does not have a consumption tax.

Now, what does that mean?

It means, when we build a Ford right here in the United States of America, that Ford has buried in the cost of that Ford that 15.3 percent payroll tax that every employee and employer has to pay, the income tax that every employee and employer has to pay—all of the tax burdens of the United States of America. Again, the highest corporate tax rate in the world is buried in the price of that Ford. When it gets to Germany, they add their Value Added Tax on top of that, and they ask, Who wants to buy a Ford? But the BMW that's leaving Germany, where they have a consumption tax, doesn't have those taxes buried in it, Mr. Speaker. In fact, it's tax free because the tax goes on top of it at the sale. So, when they ship that BMW overseas, it comes over here completely tax free, and then

we add on top of it our income taxes, our payroll taxes, our corporate taxes.

That's an unlevel playing field, and the person it disadvantages is not the owner of Ford. The person it disadvantages is the employee at Ford, who needs that job. We used to have a Ford line and a GM line in the city of Atlanta, Mr. Speaker. They're both closed. They are both closed today because they couldn't make it work.

We can bring those jobs back to America. More importantly, we can prevent jobs from leaving America, not because we're making them stay, not because we're going to tax them if they leave, but because we make America the magnet for job creation and economic activity across the planet. Today, we're the worst. Tomorrow, we can bring ourselves back to the middle.

My question to the body today is: Why don't we commit ourselves to making America the very best place to do business on the planet?

We can continue to borrow money from the Chinese if we want to. We can continue to add burden to all the young people in America if we want to—or we can take America back to our roots. There is no more productive worker on the planet than the American worker. If we free the American worker, if we free the American entrepreneur through a Tax Code that the American people can understand, we will bring a new era of prosperity to America, the likes we have not seen in my lifetime.

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

IMMIGRATION REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my privilege to address you here on the floor of the House of Representatives.

It's a bit of a frustration not to be picking up after Mr. WOODALL in support of the FairTax; although, I want to let you know that I had long been a supporter of the FairTax before it had a name, before it had a bill, before it had a concept that was nationally discussed. I just began to discuss it from my own business perspective because of my experience in starting a business in 1975, employing people and seeing what happens when you have a tax system that doesn't tax consumption but punishes productivity in America.

□ 1520

But I came here, Mr. Speaker, to bring up the immigration issue, which has been operating in the media to some degree, but mostly behind the scenes, delivered by the Gang of Eight over in the Senate and a group behind the scenes here in the House of Representatives. They will put out a little

trial balloon of what they want the press to talk about, and maybe have a little press conference to launch their endeavor. We saw that with the Gang of Eight. And yet, the deliberations, the discussions, the input, the ideas that are injected, versus the ideas that are rejected, haven't had the light of day.

Now we understand that perhaps tomorrow there will be a release of a bill, and I have in my hand a preview of what that bill is most likely to be. Of course, there are changes that could be made, and I want to qualify my delivery here, but I want to discuss what I think about the pieces of it that I've read so far, Mr. Speaker.

So the Gang of Eight's proposal, which we think will emerge tomorrow or perhaps the next day, it works out to be this: the case, the goal for border security, Mr. Speaker, is for the achievement of a 90 percent effectiveness rate of border security. Ninety percent. How do you measure that? Well, there are some metrics there, but it is an equation that essentially says that those that we stop, interdict, perhaps deport, divided by the number who attempt to cross. Now, that's a nice little formula, and it would make sense until you think a little more deeply into it. These are human beings that are being counted. They act in ways that are perhaps wiser than the numbers. But in any case, a 90 percent effectiveness rate can't be measured in an objective way.

We know that there was a sector of the border that was surveilled by drone; 150 square miles was reported to be surveilled, and I know that's not linear, it's square. And out of that, there were nearly 4,000 illegal border crossings in that period of time in that section of the border that they surveilled, for roughly not 24-7 but roughly 8 hours a day kind of on average for a period of time from October 1 until January 17 of this year. The border crossings that they interdicted with the help of the drone came to a number in excess, some number approaching 1,700 or so. And those who got by, even though they were observed by the drone, was a number greater. Even with drone assistance, they weren't able to interdict 50 percent of those that they observed cross the border.

We don't have full-time surveillance over the border. And by the way, that is not something that works as effectively in all weather conditions and all light conditions. There are still circumstances where we can't see from the air, certain conditions when we can't fly. But even under the best of conditions when they had surveillance from the air, they still, with all of the forces they could bring to bear or did bring to bear on it, they still couldn't interdict half of the people coming across the border through a 150-square mile section of the border.

So the promise is that we would have 90 percent enforcement effectiveness of the high-risk sectors of the southern

border; high-risk sectors of the border to be designated by the Secretary of Homeland Security, who is no doubt presiding over the current situation that we have. They would also appropriate \$3 billion to implement the strategy, and another \$1.5 billion for infrastructure along the border. That would be southern border fencing strategy established by the Secretary. Now we're up to \$4.5 billion additional dollars applied to the southern border. We have applied billions of dollars to the southern border. We've ramped up the number of Border Patrol agents and CBP agents that we have on the southern border. We passed the Secure Fence Act here in this Congress. It passed the House, passed the Senate, and was signed by the President. And still, that was about 854 miles of border altogether, but the linear section, there are a lot of crooks in that border along the way so it is roughly 700 effective miles of the border. We can't build that because of political opposition that took place on the Senate side. A former Senator who was a Republican put an amendment in to block some of the construction of the fence on the border. We can't get access to the border over some of the areas because it's national park or national monument land, and so we let that be under the control of illegal immigrants to a point where a Member of Congress is locked out, blocked out of national park, national monument land, because it's too dangerous from a security standpoint for a Member of Congress to go down into that area.

Now I admit that this bill does address some of that, but I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that the last time I calculated the cost of our investment to secure our southern border, and it has been several years ago, we had gone from \$4 million a mile to \$6 million a mile in our investment. And we've gone up substantially since then. But think of what that means: \$6 million a mile, and we still have a porous southern border. That says lack of will. It doesn't say lack of resources.

Now for those of us that are thinking about how that applies, people, especially rural people, and where I come from, we have a gravel road every mile and a grid system. So where I live on the corner of a gravel road, there is a gravel road that runs a mile in each of four different directions. And if Janet Napolitano came to me and said, STEVE KING, I'm going to offer you \$6 million a mile to guard your west road, and I want you to make sure that only 10 percent of the people who want to go across there get across, and I recognize that 60, 70, 80 or more percent of them are crossing now. In fact, we have Border Patrol testimony that shows that they're only interdicting perhaps 25 percent of those that cross the border, and those are the ones that we do see.

When I go down to the border and ask the people who are front line, boots on the ground people, the most consistent number I get from them is 10 percent.

But even if it is 25, and even if at the peak of the illegal crossings that we had several years ago, as reflected in that fashion, that 25 percent, that means that we were having 11,000 a night go across our southern border, 4 million illegal crossings a year. Maybe that's down to only 2 million now, but I suspect it's more than that. But in any case, the \$6 million a mile, plus what we've added since the last time I calculated it, plus the numbers they have here, this \$4.5 billion that they would add, takes us up to at least \$8.25 million a mile.

Now if Janet Napolitano says, STEVE KING, I have \$8.25 million for you for this year, and I want you to achieve more efficiency and security along your west mile than we've had before, would I then hire myself a whole group of Border Patrol agents to stand there and buy them Humvees and put on uniforms and buy their arms and set up the health care plan and the retirement plan and take that perpetual liability for the balance of their lives for the purpose of guarding that mile? Some of it I would, Mr. Speaker. Some of it I would.

But some of it, I would put an infrastructure in place. I would build a fence, a wall, and a fence across the areas where people are crossing. And I have not advocated that we build 2,000 miles of fence on our southern border, but I have consistently advocated that we build it, keep extending our fence at the most illegally crossed places until such time they stop going around the end. And if it happens that they don't stop going around the end, ultimately we'd end up with 2,000 miles—a fence, wall, and a fence on the southern border.

If you think it's too expensive or too difficult, no, Mr. Speaker, it's not—\$8.25 million a mile. And we do our budgeting here for a 10-year budget window, so that's over \$80 million that Janet Napolitano would offer me to guard one mile of it, if this were the scenario that I painted. For \$80 million and a 10-year contract, do you think we couldn't find a little more efficiency on my west mile than we have today? Of course we could. You could guarantee a very high degree of efficiency, substantially higher than 90 percent.

I would submit that the Israelis, who built a fence on their border to protect them from people that were coming in, have not spent as much money on the border to construct a fence as we're spending every year to watch the desert, and they get a 99-point-something percent efficiency. In fact, I'd suggest it's 99.9 percent. And why? Why do they have that efficiency, because their very lives depend upon it, Mr. Speaker. Because they have people coming into Israel who are willing to walk onto a bus with a bomb strapped on them and blow themselves up for the purpose of killing Israelis.

Now most of the time in this country that's not the circumstance we are faced with today, thankfully, but occasionally it is. And this needs to be part

of our dialogue, too, Mr. Speaker. But the cost on the southern border of adding another \$4.5 billion, getting us up to over \$8 billion in order to try to get the promise of security, and what's the tradeoff that comes? The tradeoff is they want to promise border security. They want to promise workplace enforcement by adding to this legislation mandatory E-Verify. Now without looking at the language, I don't think that language is going to include that mandatory E-Verify will even allow the employer to check his current employees.

What they're going to say is, if you came into the United States and you're unlawfully present in America, they under their bill will instantaneously legalize everyone who's here illegally, with some exceptions.

□ 1530

Some of the exceptions would be if you've been guilty of a felony, or if you're convicted of three misdemeanors, not serious, but three misdemeanors, and then, if you have been in the United States since December 31 of 2011.

Here's the inadmissible. You can't be admitted for criminal, national security, public health or other morality grounds. No definition of "other morality grounds."

But if you were previously here before December 31, 2011. Why is that?

Well, I think that probably is the date when they began talking openly about their plan, so they don't want to have the responsibility of being the magnet that has attracted people to come into the United States illegally in order to access the amnesty plan that they're devising in the Senate and they're devising behind closed doors here in the House.

Now, amnesty. Some of them have even tried to define amnesty. I've consistently defined it, Mr. Speaker. To grant amnesty is to pardon immigration lawbreakers and reward them with the objective of their crime. It's a pardon and a reward. That's exactly what is in this document that represents a summary of perhaps 1,500 pages that's about to emerge in a day or so.

And if we are to pardon and reward and instantly legalize everyone that's here in the United States, with exceptions of those who have committed a felony or those who have three misdemeanors, then what are we to expect?

Oh, even with this bill, they would reach out and say to people, if you have been deported, we invite you to come back to America and you can sign up under our plan that is called the RPI plan. It's a little bit bizarre so I didn't get the—it's the Registered Provisional Immigrant status plan.

So this country would offer such a thing to people who have already been adjudicated and already been sent back to their home country, bring them back. This doesn't just grant amnesty. It reaches backwards and gets people that have been sent home, where they can wake up in the country legally.

And by the way, that's the minimum penalty that we can have. If we're going to have any kind of immigration law at all in this country, if we're not willing to put people back in the condition that they were in before they broke the law, we have no enforcement whatsoever. There will be no deterrent whatsoever.

And they would ask us to believe that, after they instantaneously legalized everybody that's here in America, that they would slowly pick out those who were felons and those who have been convicted of three serious misdemeanors and slowly send them back to their home countries.

They would also ask us to believe that there's a longer waiting period and a more difficult process to citizenship, so it's not a path to citizenship.

Well, the first thing is, a green card is a path to citizenship. And a path to a green card is a path to citizenship, just as surely as a green card is a path to citizenship.

And they would have us believe that, in the period of 5 or 10 years, depending, if they haven't reached operational control of the border, that somehow this whole thing falls apart and there wouldn't be this promise of amnesty any longer.

So can anyone imagine, after the decades of not enforcing immigration law, if this Congress instantaneously legalized everyone who is here, with exceptions, that after a period of 5 to 10 years of the failure of enforcement—remember that promise of enforcement that Ronald Reagan couldn't keep?

After 5 to 10 years of the failure of enforcement somehow there will be a change of heart and there will actually be enforcement of immigration law? No.

In fact there'd be a promise, if a bill like that is passed, that there would never be enforcement of immigration law, that this would be the most recent amnesty, and that anyone who could come in the United States and live in the shadows would eventually be the beneficiary of the next amnesty, at the price of the rule of law, Mr. Speaker.

And when I make the point for them, take a deep breath, step back, look at this thing, get it in focus, turn it into focus, they say, well, we recognize that maybe this doesn't do the things electorally on the path of political expediency that we would like, but we have to start the conversation.

Can anyone point to a successful model in history where any culture,

any civilization, let alone the unchallenged greatest Nation of the world, sacrifices the rule of law, a pillar of exceptionalism, in order to start a conversation?

That's what's happening coming out of the Senate tomorrow, Mr. Speaker. That's what some would like to see happen here in the House of Representatives very soon. That's what I will resist very vigorously.

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

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1801

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. Foxx) at 6 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 624, CYBER INTELLIGENCE SHARING AND PROTECTION ACT

Mr. WOODALL, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113-41) on the resolution (H. Res. 164) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 624) 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, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CULBERSON (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 17, 2013, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the first quarter of 2013 pursuant to Public Law 95-384 are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL TO BELGIUM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN FEB. 23 AND FEB. 25, 2013

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Mike Turner	2/23	2/25	Belgium		728.00		(³)				728.00
Hon. David Loebsack	2/23	2/25	Belgium		728.00		(³)				728.00
Hon. Rob Bishop	2/23	2/25	Belgium		728.00		(³)				728.00
Hon. Brett Guthrie	2/23	2/25	Belgium		728.00		(³)				728.00
Hon. Thomas Marino	2/23	2/25	Belgium		728.00		(³)				728.00
Janice Robinson	2/23	2/25	Belgium		728.00		(³)				728.00
Tim Morrison	2/23	2/25	Belgium		728.00		(³)				728.00
Committee total					\$5,096.00						\$5,096.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
³ Military air transportation.

HON. MICHAEL R. TURNER, Mar. 22, 2013.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2013

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return.

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. DOC HASTINGS, Chairman, Apr. 10, 2013.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2013

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return.

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. LAMAR SMITH, Chairman, Apr. 1, 2013.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2013

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return.

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. BILL SHUSTER, Chairman, Apr. 3, 2013.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2013

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return.

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. DAVE CAMP, Chairman, Apr. 10, 2013.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1119. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Manpower and Reserve Affairs, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter regarding the Army's additional recruitment incentives; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1120. A letter from the Acting Chief Policy Officer, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing and Paying Benefits received April 8, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1121. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting annual financial report as required

by the Animal Generic Drug User Fee Act of 2008 for FY 2012; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1122. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Standards for Business Practices and Communication Protocols for Public Utilities [Docket No.: RM05-5-020; Order No. 676-G] received April 8, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1123. A letter from the Director, Equal Employment Opportunity and Inclusion, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's annual report for FY 2012 prepared in accordance with Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1124. A letter from the Staff Director, Federal Election Commission, transmitting the Commission's annual report for FY 2012 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.

1125. A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's annual report for FY 2012 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.

1126. A letter from the Chairman, Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting the Board's annual report for FY 2012 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.

1127. A letter from the Chairman, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's annual report for FY 2012 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.

1128. A letter from the Chief Human Resources Officer and Executive Vice President, Postal Service, transmitting the Service's annual report for fiscal year 2012, 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.

1129. A letter from the Associate Commissioner for Civil Rights and Equal Opportunity, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's annual report for FY 2012 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.

1130. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Foreign Species, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Technical Correction for African Wild Ass [Docket No.: FWS-R9-ES-2011-0095; MO92210-0-0010 B6] (RIN: 1018-AY31) received April 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1131. A letter from the Acting Chief, Branch of Recovery, State Grants, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Reinstatement of Removal of the Virginia Northern Flying Squirrel From the List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife [Docket No.: FWS-R5-ES-2013-0035; FXES11130900000C6-134-FF09E30000] (RIN: 1018-AZ31) received April 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1132. A letter from the Acting Assistant Regional Director; Acting Chair, Federal Subsistence Board, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Subsistence Management Regulations for Public Lands in Alaska — 2013-14 and

2014-15 Subsistence Taking of Fish Regulations [Docket No.: FWS-R7-SM-2011-0015] (RIN: 1018-AX64) received April 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1133. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Listing, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Revised Designation of Critical Habitat for *Allium munzii* (Munz's Onion) and *Atriplex coronata* var. *notator* (San Jacinto Valley Crownscale) [Docket No.: FWS-R8-ES-2012-0008] (RIN: 1018-AX42) received April 1, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1134. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands; 2013 and 2014 Harvest Specifications for Groundfish [Docket No.: 121018563-3148-02] (RIN: 0648-XC311) received April 8, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1135. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catch Vessels Using Trawl Gear in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 111207737-2141-02] (RIN: 0648-XC522) received April 8, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1136. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area; Groundfish Retention Standard [Docket No.: 110321210-3057-02] (RIN: 0648-BA93) received April 8, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1137. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder Fishery; Quota Transfer [Docket No.: 121009528-2729-02] (RIN: 0648-XC499) received April 8, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1138. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Office of Government Contracting and Business Development, Small Business Administration, transmitting the Administration's annual report for fiscal year 2011 on Minority Small Business and Capital Ownership Development; to the Committee on Small Business.

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. 1163. 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. 113-40). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WOODALL: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 164. Resolution providing

for consideration of the bill (H.R. 624) 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 (Rept. 113-41). Referred to the House Calendar.

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. POE of Texas:

H.R. 1576. A bill to stimulate the economy, provide for a sound United States dollar by defining a value for the dollar, to remove the authority of Federal Reserve banks to pay earnings on certain balances maintained at such banks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and 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. POE of Texas:

H.R. 1577. A bill to protect prosecutors, judges, law enforcement officers, and their families; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PALLONE (for himself, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. TONKO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. RUSH, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. CAPP, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN):

H.R. 1578. A bill to amend section 1101 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to provide additional funds to permit additional individuals to enroll under the pre-existing condition insurance program and expand eligibility, to be funded through a temporary increase in the cigarette tax, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. ELLISON (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. CHU, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 1579. A bill to impose a tax on certain trading transactions to strengthen our financial security, reduce market volatility, expand opportunity, and stop shrinking the middle class; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALDEN (for himself, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. HALL, Mr. LANCE, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. OLSON, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. LONG, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. LATTI, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. ROYCE, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. SCALISE, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. TERRY, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. WELCH, Mr. BARTON, and Mr. PITTS):

H.R. 1580. A bill to affirm the policy of the United States regarding Internet governance; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 1581. A bill to provide for the conveyance of unused Federal property administered by the Department of the Navy at the

site of the former Oxnard Air Force Base, Ventura County, California; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CASSIDY:

H.R. 1582. A bill to protect consumers by prohibiting the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency from promulgating as final certain energy-related rules that are estimated to cost more than \$1 billion and will cause significant adverse effects to the economy; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. CLARKE (for herself and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 1583. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish an appeal and redress process for individuals who are screened against the terrorist watchlist and wrongly delayed or prohibited from boarding a flight, or denied a right, benefit, or privilege, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Ms. CLARKE:

H.R. 1584. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to prevent terrorism, including terrorism associated with home-grown violent extremism and domestic violent extremism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 1585. A bill to require the establishment of a Consumer Price Index for Elderly Consumers to compute cost-of-living increases for Social Security benefits under title II of the Social Security Act and to provide, in the case of elderly beneficiaries under such title, for an annual cost-of-living increase which is not less than 3 percent; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, 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. GOHMERT (for himself, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. BARTON, and Mr. SCALISE):

H.R. 1586. A bill to direct the Architect of the Capitol to acquire and place a historical plaque to be permanently displayed in National Statuary Hall recognizing the seven decades of Christian church services being held in the Capitol from 1800 to 1868, which included attendees James Madison and Thomas Jefferson; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MARINO (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. REED, and Mr. TURNER):

H.R. 1587. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to issue permits for rights-of-way, temporary easements, or other necessary authorizations to facilitate natural gas, oil, and petroleum product pipelines and related facilities on eligible Federal lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, 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. WAXMAN (for himself, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. McDERMOTT, and Mr. ANDREWS):

H.R. 1588. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require drug manufacturers to provide drug rebates for drugs dispensed to low-income individuals under the Medicare prescription drug benefit program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall with-

in the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself and Mr. GIBSON):

H.R. 1589. A bill to expand the noninsured crop assistance program established by the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 to provide coverages for eligible crops under the program equivalent to additional coverage available under the Federal Crop Insurance Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS:

H. Res. 162. A resolution electing a Member to a standing committee of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BECERRA:

H. Res. 163. A resolution electing a Member to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER:

H. Res. 165. A resolution supporting the goals of Golf Day in America and congratulating the communities of Pittsford and Rochester, New York, which are hosting the Ladies Professional Golf Association and the Professional Golf Association Championships in 2013; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

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. POE of Texas:

H.R. 1576.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 5 & 6

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 1577.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 of the United States Constitution, section 8, clause 18

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 1578.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 1579.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 7, Clause 1 and Section 8, Clause 1.

By Mr. WALDEN:

H.R. 1580.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 1581.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. CASSIDY:

H.R. 1582.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. CLARKE:

H.R. 1583.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Ms. CLARKE:

H.R. 1584.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 1585.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under the following provisions of the United States Constitution:

Article I, Section 1.

By Mr. GOHMERT:

H.R. 1586.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 17, providing Congress with exclusive jurisdiction over the District of Columbia.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, providing Congress with the authority to enact legislation necessary to execute one of its enumerated powers, such as Article I, Section 8, Clause 17.

By Mr. MARINO:

H.R. 1587.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3: "... The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States . . ."

By Mr. WAXMAN:

H.R. 1588.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clauses 3 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 1589.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, 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 this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof . . .

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 3: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. TIPTON, and Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 75: Mr. YOHO.

H.R. 147: Mr. SHUSTER.

H.R. 182: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 183: Mr. WOODALL.

H.R. 250: Mr. MCCLINTOCK and Mr. STEWART.

H.R. 258: Mr. LUCAS and Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 292: Ms. CLARKE.

H.R. 324: Mr. AMODEI and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 346: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. POMPEO.

H.R. 351: Ms. JENKINS.

H.R. 362: Ms. CLARKE.

H.R. 363: Ms. CLARKE.

H.R. 367: Mr. RICE of South Carolina.

H.R. 430: Mr. QUIGLEY and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 481: Mr. STOCKMAN.

H.R. 495: Mr. WESTMORELAND, Ms. SHEAPORTER, Ms. CHU, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. ROKITA, and Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 503: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.

H.R. 508: Mr. SRES and Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 519: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 569: Mrs. ROBY, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. GALLEGRO.
 H.R. 570: Mrs. ROBY, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. RUIZ, and Mr. GALLEGRO.
 H.R. 574: Ms. TITUS.
 H.R. 580: Mr. FLORES.
 H.R. 630: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mrs. BEATTY, and Ms. EDWARDS.
 H.R. 661: Mr. TIERNEY.
 H.R. 683: Mr. RANGEL.
 H.R. 684: Mr. RUSH, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. CUMMINGS.
 H.R. 686: Mr. NOLAN.
 H.R. 693: Mr. GARAMENDI.
 H.R. 698: Ms. MOORE.
 H.R. 713: Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. TITUS, Mrs. CAPPAS, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. SESSIONS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. BARROW of Georgia.
 H.R. 714: Ms. CHU.
 H.R. 717: Mr. HUFFMAN.
 H.R. 724: Mr. ROKITA, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. POSTER, Mr. ROSS, Mr. BARR, and Mr. MATHESON.
 H.R. 752: Mr. RUIZ.
 H.R. 755: Mr. LATHAM and Mr. VALADAO.
 H.R. 806: Mr. RUIZ.
 H.R. 833: Mr. CHABOT.
 H.R. 845: Mr. BENTIVOLIO.
 H.R. 850: Mr. PETRI, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. HOYER, and Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.
 H.R. 920: Mr. GIBBS.
 H.R. 940: Mr. POSEY.
 H.R. 961: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
 H.R. 992: Mr. BACHUS.
 H.R. 1000: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 1020: Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. GERLACH, and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
 H.R. 1024: Mr. SCHOCK and Mr. CRAMER.
 H.R. 1026: Mrs. NOEM.
 H.R. 1029: Mr. POCAN and Ms. EDWARDS.
 H.R. 1079: Mr. FARR and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 1081: Mr. FORBES and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
 H.R. 1094: Mr. SARBANES, Ms. CHU, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, and Mr. ROSKAM.
 H.R. 1099: Mr. LABRADOR.
 H.R. 1125: Mr. FARR.
 H.R. 1141: Ms. TITUS.
 H.R. 1145: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
 H.R. 1151: Mr. POMPEO, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Mr. BROUN of Georgia.
 H.R. 1153: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
 H.R. 1226: Mr. MULLIN.
 H.R. 1250: Mr. RIBBLE.
 H.R. 1276: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, and Mr. QUIGLEY.
 H.R. 1285: Mr. CAMP, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, and Mr. WOLF.
 H.R. 1288: Mr. BENTIVOLIO and Mr. RIGELL.
 H.R. 1312: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
 H.R. 1313: Mr. STUTZMAN.
 H.R. 1326: Mr. CASSIDY.
 H.R. 1331: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. FORTENBERRY.
 H.R. 1339: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
 H.R. 1354: Mr. ROONEY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Mr. POLIS.
 H.R. 1406: Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. ROSS, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. HURT, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. LONG, Mr. FLORES, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. OLSON, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. STEWART, and Mr. CRAMER.
 H.R. 1416: Mr. GOWDY, Mr. HALL, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Mr. POSEY.
 H.R. 1432: Mr. ROYCE, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. SIMPSON, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. HANNA, Mr. VELA, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. KIND, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. ROSS, Mr. OLSON, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. COSTA, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. COLE, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr.

STEWART, Mr. JONES, Mr. LUCAS, and Mr. YODER.
 H.R. 1433: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Ms. TITUS.
 H.R. 1438: Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. FATTAH, and Mr. PETERS of California.
 H.R. 1479: Mr. PETRI, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. HARPER, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. SALMON, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. BARTON, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. LANKFORD, and Mr. GOODLATTE.
 H.R. 1493: Mr. FARENTHOLD.
 H.R. 1496: Mr. DENHAM.
 H.R. 1502: Mr. SMITH of Texas.
 H.R. 1523: Mr. POCAN, Mr. FARR, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. MORAN, and Ms. HAHN.
 H.R. 1526: Mr. BENISHEK.
 H.R. 1528: Mr. FARR, Mr. RIBBLE, and Mr. LUCAS.
 H.R. 1549: Mr. HARPER, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. LANCE, and Mr. WHITFIELD.
 H.R. 1567: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
 H.J. Res. 28: Mr. PERRY and Mr. WEBER of Texas.
 H. Con. Res. 23: Mr. SMITH of Texas and Mr. WOODALL.
 H. Con. Res. 30: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. ROSS, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. MULVANEY, and Mr. FLEMING.
 H. Res. 30: Ms. EDWARDS.
 H. Res. 36: Mr. BARTON, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. BARR, Mr. AMASH, and Mr. BOUSTANY.
 H. Res. 90: Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Ms. EDWARDS.
 H. Res. 147: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia and Mr. FORBES.
 H. Res. 160: Mr. CALVERT.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:
 H.R. 1287: Mr. HOLT.