



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 17, 2013

No. 52

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER. 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 AMERICAN PEOPLE DESERVE A BALANCED BUDGET

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. HURT) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HURT. Mr. Speaker, the American people know that a budget is one of the most important documents produced by any legislative body. It is a document that reflects the values and priorities of our government and our Nation; and while it is a document that is a reflection of today, more importantly, it is a document that lays out a vision for our Nation's future—the future for our children and the future that they will inherit.

So now, for the first time in 4 years, the American people are able to compare, side by side, the three competing visions for our future as proposed by the House, as proposed by the Senate, and as proposed by the President. Two of these proposals would give to our children more taxes, more spending—and neither ever reaches balance. There is only one proposal, the House budget, that would instead give to our children a balanced budget and a brighter future of freedom and opportunity.

Now is the time to choose the budget that reflects our American values. The American people and future generations of Americans deserve a balanced budget.

JOHN BERRY

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

Mr. HOYER. Preliminary, however, to my remarks, I want to say I thank the previous speaker for his remarks, and I would hope that with the Senate's having passed a budget, our having passed a budget, and the President submitting a budget that we will now, hopefully as soon as this week, go to conference so that we might discuss the differences and get that budget to which the gentleman addressed himself.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a wonderful individual who has served our country in government service for many years and has spent the last four in overseeing our Federal workforce as the Director of the Office of Personnel Management. I am speaking of my dear friend John Berry, who retired last week as Director of the Office of Personnel Management.

America, Mr. Speaker, is blessed with a Federal workforce composed of hard-working, talented, and dedicated men and women. Too often, however, their contributions are overlooked or are even denigrated by those who would use our Federal employees as an easy target to attack the institution of government.

John Berry made it one of his central missions at OPM to stand up for Federal workers' achievements and remind the American people of the true value we get from recruiting and retaining the best public workforce in the world. He came to OPM with plenty of experience in fighting for Federal employees

and their families. When he served for 10 years as my legislative director, John was instrumental in crafting the Federal Employee Pay Comparability Act and in making sure Congress passed it into law. Mr. Speaker, that was a bipartisan law, and it was President George Bush I who signed that piece of legislation into law in 1990.

In that undertaking and in many others, John Berry made a real difference for the more than 62,000 Federal workers and everyone else who calls my district home. Just as we look to our Federal workers to watch out for us, our Federal employees have looked to John to watch out for them—to make sure that they have a safe work environment, that their paychecks will arrive on time, and that the benefits they earn are the ones they receive.

Under President Clinton, John served as deputy Assistant Secretary and acting Assistant Secretary for Law Enforcement at the Treasury Department, overseeing the United States Secret Service and the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms. He later moved to the Interior Department where he was Assistant Secretary for Policy, Management and Budget, essentially the manager of the Department of the Interior.

Before coming to the Office of Personnel Management, John spent nearly a decade working on conservation as Director of the Fish and Wildlife Foundation. Then, arguably, the job he perhaps enjoyed most was that of Director of the National Zoo. At the National Zoo, he was so successful at turning around a faltering institution that after he left they named a lion in his honor.

John, indeed, was a lion—a lion on behalf of the Federal employees, a lion on behalf of good government, a lion on behalf of integrity. Those who know John can attest that he is not only a true leader and an effective manager but also an incredibly warm person with an unfailingly positive outlook.

☐ 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.

H2069

John Berry will be greatly missed by all who serve our country in its civilian workforce, and I wish John and his partner, Curtis, all the best as he begins the next phase in his career.

I hope my colleagues will join me in thanking John for his service, for his leadership, for his insights, for his inspiration, and for being an example to all of us of a positive, constructive, supportive, and successful career in Federal service.

Mr. Speaker, our country has been the beneficiary of his character, integrity, and extraordinary ability. We wish him well in all that he will be doing. I'm sure it will be extraordinarily productive and of service to our country as he moves on from Federal service at the OPM to a new challenge and a new career.

THE VETERANS TIMELY ACCESS TO HEALTH CARE ACT

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

Mr. ROSS. Yesterday, I had the distinguished opportunity to greet three busloads of Florida World War II veterans participating in an Honor Flight.

In total, more than 80 proud Floridians who bravely fought to free the world of evil during World War II had the wonderful opportunity to visit and reflect at their memorial. As the son of a World War II veteran, I was blessed to have the opportunity to join my father as he participated in a previous Honor Flight just 2 years ago. Although he has since passed on, I know he truly cherished this great experience.

American veterans are the backbone of the freedom and prosperity this country has enjoyed for over 200 years. Without their service, we would not be the Nation we are today. We would not enjoy the privileges of this democracy—the greatest experiment in government known to mankind. Unfortunately, veterans across the country continue to encounter unacceptable problems and delays in receiving appointments from the Veterans Administration for essential medical and special health care needs.

That is why I am proud to introduce H.R. 241, the Veterans Timely Access to Health Care Act.

This legislation, supported by the Military Officers Association of America, will ensure that veterans seeking medical care from the VA facility receive an appointment within 30 days. Moving forward, this legislation will go a long way in ensuring veterans' critical medical needs no longer slip through the cracks of the system.

As I continue to reflect on the proud history and service of the many World War II veterans like my good friend Charlie Clark, with whom I visited yesterday and whom I had the pleasure of knowing for several years as a member of the local YMCA, I will also look forward to ensuring that our youngest

generation of veterans receives the support and timely access to health care that they have so honorably earned.

□ 1010

END-OF-LIFE CARE

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, Monday in the blink of an eye, hundreds of people at the Boston Marathon were faced with an awful decision. None of them woke up that morning expecting they, or a loved one, was going to need emergency care in a life-threatening situation. We tend to think of end-of-life care as the province of a terminally ill person, often elderly, but that's just one circumstance, and not necessarily the most common.

The decisions need to be made instantly about whether to amputate a limb, and a decision must be made that moment. If a person is in shock or unconscious, who helps make that decision for them?

Last week, I had two more circumstances where people in my life were faced with totally unexpected life-threatening circumstances that brought these questions into sharp perspective. Anybody, anywhere, any time. How do we make sure that these decisions, which are made every day in every State in virtually every city, are made in accordance with the best interest and wishes of the patient and the patient's family?

I've been working for the last 5 years for the Federal Government to be a better partner with families. It's called end-of-life care, and the Federal Government, the Department of Health and Human Services, and Congress are missing in action. Medicare will spend billions of dollars on the most expensive, invasive, painful, and in some cases, if not unnecessary, at least questionable care, often regardless of the wishes of the patient and their family. Yet Medicare won't pay \$100 or \$200 for that medical professional to have a conversation with the patient and their family.

It's time for us to step up. We need to make sure that we clear up the questions in everyone's minds about the choices, the consequences, what the patient and the family want, and most critically, make sure those wishes are honored. Like my friend, whose heart stopped this weekend, totally unexpectedly, we don't know when or where a loved one will be in this position. But there's no excuse we don't do everything we can to help families and encourage everyone that is close to us, that works with us, to take their own steps to identify who speaks for them when they can't, and what they want to happen.

This is personal for me. I had these jarring reminders that one of the

greatest gifts each of us can give our families is to have a thoughtful and frank discussion about what our wishes would be for medical care if we're unable to suddenly make those decisions. It's also one of the greatest gifts that this Congress can make to the people we represent by doing our job so that the Federal Government is a better partner in making sure those conversations are possible.

Please cosponsor our bipartisan Personalize Your Care Act, H.R. 1173, and then sit down and have this conversation with your family. It's not always the easiest, but it is far better than making your loved ones guess and feel guilty.

PATH TO STATEHOOD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. PIERLUISI) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PIERLUISI. Mr. Speaker, in November 2012, Puerto Rico held a referendum on its political status. The results demonstrated that a clear majority of the U.S. citizens of Puerto Rico want to end the island's current territory status, that a supermajority prefers statehood among the possible alternatives, and that—for the first time in history—more voters favor statehood than the current status.

As I have remarked before, not a single one of my stateside colleagues in Congress would accept territory status for their own constituents. So they must recognize and respect that the American citizens of Puerto Rico no longer accept it either. I also trust that my colleagues who represent States will credit my constituents for aspiring to have the same rights and responsibilities as their constituents.

Last week, the President took an important step. As part of the proposed budget the administration submitted to Congress, the Justice Department is seeking \$2.5 million to conduct the first Federally sponsored vote on Puerto Rico's political status in the 115 years that the territory has been under the U.S. flag. The funding would be granted to Puerto Rico's Elections Commission to conduct objective voter education and a vote on "options that would resolve Puerto Rico's future political status."

Key congressional leaders in the House and the Senate, Republican and Democrat alike, have already issued statements of support for the President's action, calling it an appropriate response to the local referendum.

Mr. Speaker, my constituents may not have a vote in the government that makes their national laws, but they do have a voice—and they made that voice heard loud and clear in November. A budget reflects one's priorities and values. I support the President's budget because it shows respect for the democratically expressed aspirations of the U.S. citizens who reside in Puerto Rico. And it demonstrates a clear desire to

move forward on this complex but critical issue.

As the budget request states, the Federally sponsored vote is to be among options that would resolve Puerto Rico's political status. The only way to resolve the island's status is through statehood or national sovereignty. Puerto Rico cannot resolve its status by maintaining the same undemocratic status that my people have endured since 1898 and that they soundly rejected in November. The current status is the root cause of Puerto Rico's political, economic, and social problems, so it cannot also be the solution to those problems.

In addition, the budget language clearly states that the Department of Justice shall not provide funding until it certifies that the ballot and voter education materials are consistent with the Constitution, basic laws, and policies of the United States. The purpose of this language is to ensure that the ballot does not include impossible status proposals that have been repeatedly declared unworkable as a matter of both law and policy by the Federal Government. I am pleased that the administration understands that true self-determination is a choice among options that can be implemented, not an exercise in wishful thinking.

The President's request represents one path forward, but it is important to underscore that it is not the only path forward. In the coming weeks, I will introduce stand-alone legislation on the status issue that will both complement President Obama's request and reflect the undisputable fact that statehood won the November referendum.

Puerto Rico stands in a far different place today than it did six months ago. A historic referendum was held, the President responded to the results, and Congress now has a responsibility to act. Those who seek democracy, equality, and progress for Puerto Rico are on the forward march, while those who support the failed status quo are in retreat. We drive the debate, while they merely react to the debate. And, in the end, mindful that the arc of history is long but that it bends towards justice, I am confident we will prevail.

HONORING MAUELLE SHIREK

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

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, let me first send my thoughts and prayers to the city of Boston, the families and friends of all of those touched by Monday's horrific tragedy. Incredible strength was in full display in the streets of Boston when untold numbers of people—the police, firefighters, volunteers, runners, and bystanders—ran towards the explosions to try to help in any way they could without regard for their own safety.

As we learn the details of this attack, let us remember that what makes

us strong as a Nation is the tremendous care we have for our fellow Americans, especially during the hardest times. This is a lesson that I learned deeply from my friend and mentor, Maudelle Shirek. Maudelle died last week at the age of 101. She would have been 102 June 18. My heart and my prayers go out to her friends and family.

□ 1020

Maudelle was truly the "godmother of East Bay progressive politics." The former city of Berkeley vice mayor and eight-term council member was born and raised in Jefferson, Arkansas. As the granddaughter of slaves, she was passionate about justice and civil rights.

After moving to Berkeley in the 1940s, she became active in the antiwar movement, fought on behalf of unions, advocated for HIV and AIDS awareness, care, and treatment, and helped organize the Free Mandela Movement. She was also the first elected official in the United States to advocate for needle exchange programs.

During her tenure as a Berkeley elected official, she was instrumental in creating multiple city commissions, including the Berkeley Commission on Labor. When she retired, mind you, at 92 years of age, she was the oldest elected official in California at that time. In 2007, the Berkeley City Council renamed city hall in her honor.

She not only urged me to get involved in politics, but also inspired my predecessor, Congressman Ron Dellums, to run for Congress. Her understanding of the importance of investing in people won the solid support of voters in her district and across the country.

I met Maudelle in the early seventies while I was a student at Mills College. She widened my perspective on global politics during our travels around the world. She reinforced the idea that we are all part of a global family and what happens here in the United States affects our brothers and sisters in other parts of the world and vice versa. Maudelle was a personal friend, mentor, and confidante.

Maudelle actually was a health aficionado. She was committed to educating seniors and the entire community on the benefits of healthy living. She loved shopping for fresh fruits and vegetables, and you would often find her cooking nutritious meals at the West Berkeley Senior Center.

We loved to walk Lake Merritt and the Berkeley Marina together, where she talked to me about acupuncture and natural remedies like cayenne pepper and warm water for colds and the importance of exercise.

Maudelle was a woman of great faith. During the seventies, we enjoyed attending the Church for Tomorrow, which formerly was the Church for Today. We went there together, and this is where I realized that her passion for service and justice was driven by

her commitment to what she called doing the Lord's work on this Earth.

She was a woman who understood that she had to have a comprehensive agenda. It just couldn't be a single issue like health care or seniors or peace and justice, but it had to be about being committed to comprehensive and positive changes that seek to improve the lives of all Americans.

Maudelle worked at the Berkeley Co-Op Credit Union. She engaged all of us, in the seventies, mind you, in financial literacy, and urged me, as a young single student to buy a house because she reminded me over and over again that one's equity in one's home was the primary path to the middle class, and that that was the main way that I could get the resources to take care of my kids and send them to school, a lesson we should teach our own children today.

Several years ago, I tried to name the Berkeley Post Office after Maudelle. While this body has a tradition of supporting post office bills in a bipartisan way, Congressman STEVE KING from Iowa came to this floor and tried to tarnish her character. He brought groundless accusations, and this body voted against—mind you, against—naming the post office in my district after this great icon. I hope one day, in her memory, Representative KING will apologize to Maudelle and her family and the city of Berkeley for such an unfair and unwarranted attack. She was deeply hurt by it, but kept her head high and lived to see the Berkeley City Hall named after her.

Maudelle refused to accept arbitrary limitations. That's one of the best things we all respected about her. Maudelle is one of the best examples of how one person can make a difference. She was a fearless and inspirational woman who tirelessly fought to make this world a fair and just place. She spoke for the voiceless and was such a staunch defender of our basic civil rights.

I believe, like many, that Maudelle's legacy of over 70 years of service to Berkeley, the East Bay, the Nation, and the world will inspire many to speak for the voiceless and to stand up for justice, both here in America and around the globe. I will deeply miss her wise counsel, love, and support.

LET'S DO OUR PATRIOTIC DUTY AND VOTE ON GUN CONTROL

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

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, our hearts as well go out to the victims and the families of those who were killed and seriously wounded in Boston on Patriots' Day.

This has been a very difficult time for our country. At that event in Boston were families from Newtown, Connecticut, invited to celebrate Patriots' Day in Boston. The Red Sox play in the

morning, the Marathon takes place, families gather, and again, America faces another tragedy.

Last week, family members from Newtown came to the Hill to lobby Congress, to ask Congress what the President of the United States has asked of us, both in the State of the Union and in his two trips up to Connecticut.

What the President has said is: however you feel about the issue of gun violence, however you feel about the Second Amendment, we deserve a vote, both in the other body, in the Senate, and here, on the floor of the House of Representatives; a vote not only for the 20 children and six teachers and administrators who died in that tragedy on December 14, but for people in Tucson and Aurora and on virtually every street in cities all across America where we have seen this needless and senseless violence take place. Patriots' Day, another act of violence.

Strides are being made in the United States Senate. Compromise is being offered on something that 92 percent of the American people agree with: universal background checks, universal background checks to keep guns out of the hands of terrorists.

The United States of America is currently mocked by Adam Gadahn, an American al Qaeda on the FBI's Most Wanted List, who taunts America and says this, and you can see it on BuzzFeed:

America is absolutely awash with easily attainable firearms, large-capacity clips. You can get them, even without any identification.

This from the most wanted on the FBI list.

We need to vote in the United States Congress. If these young children had the courage to go after their assailant, if the teachers stepped in the way to protect, does Congress have the will and the courage to stand up and merely do what it was elected to do? Cast a vote in both Chambers. Cast a vote on behalf of the American people. Cast a vote on behalf of these children, on behalf of these parents who have come here to beseech the United States Congress only to do its responsibility, to do what we take the oath of office for.

Ninety-two percent of the American people believe that we need universal background checks. We have to make sure that our bodies, both the Senate and the House, take up this legislation. In the aftermath of yet another tragedy, on Patriots' Day, the most patriotic thing we can do is vote.

□ 1030

AWARDING THE CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO PROFESSOR MUHAMMAD YUNUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, for centuries, we have lauded the achieve-

ments of great entrepreneurs, whether the automobile industry of Henry Ford or the iPhone of Steve Jobs. Business was the province of people with money. As the old cynical joke goes, banks would loan money only to people who don't need it.

So throughout the world, and especially in the post-colonial developing world, the chance of escaping poverty and living a dignified life seemed an impossible dream for millions and millions. One person has helped transform the dream into a possibility—in fact, a reality—of family sufficiency for people all over the planet.

When the Nobel Committee awarded Dr. Muhammad Yunus and the financial institution he created, the Grameen Bank in Bangladesh, the Nobel Peace Prize a few years back, the Committee made the award for “their efforts to create economic and social development from below.” I'll phrase it differently. Muhammad Yunus and Grameen Bank received the award for treating people with dignity and giving millions around the world hope.

Today, in the rotunda here at the U.S. Capitol, we honor Dr. Yunus with the Congressional Gold Medal. Muhammad Yunus has shown us being a visionary does not mean promoting the impractical or the impossible. Unlike some economic theories advanced over centuries, Dr. Yunus' theories have been proven to work. To date, the Grameen Foundation and the bank and its partners have helped 9.4 million of the world's poorest people receive microloans. The bank has given loans of a few dollars to millions to those who, by traditional standards, are not worthy of credit.

His idea of a socially conscious business focused on serving the poor flew in the face of conventional economic theory and certainly in the face of existing banking practice. But it worked. Recipients paid back the loans and got ahead financially.

The Grameen Foundation's financial outreach to people living below the poverty level has been life-altering for women in Nigeria and Haiti and Cambodia and Peru. Dr. Yunus has inspired similar local efforts in dozens of nations, including our own. His life and work are a testament to the difference a single person can make here on Earth.

Dr. Yunus' legacy will be measured not simply by the many awards he has won over his career, such as we honor him with today, but by the current and future generations of people who will travel the road from poverty to success and sufficiency because of Dr. Yunus' vision and commitment. He believes that we have the power to end poverty—not just to alleviate it, but end it—and we should take him seriously. Muhammad Yunus is showing us how.

I ask my colleagues to join me in giving Dr. Yunus congratulations on receiving the Congressional Gold Medal today, and join me in giving thanks to him for making many, many lives around the world better.

WVON RADIO'S 50TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. I rise to congratulate WVON Radio on 50 years of broadcasting.

On April 1, 1963, WVON Radio in Chicago, Illinois, was launched, and since that time has gone from being “the voice of the Negro” to “the voice of the Nation.”

WVON began when two brothers, Leonard and Phil Chess, the owners of a successful music business, Chess Records, with a plentiful supply of local music under their banner such as Muddy Waters, Lil' Howlin' Wolf, Jimmy Reed, and others, needed a way to express their music. Therefore, the brothers bought WHFC-1450 AM, a 1,000-watt station licensed in Cicero, Illinois.

On April 1, 1963, WVON hit the airwaves in Chicago with a group of hand-picked personalities: Franklin McCarthy, E. Rodney Jones, Herb Kent, Wesley South, and Pervis Spann. They became known as “The Good Guys.” Ric Ricardo, Bill “Butterball” Crane, Ed Cook, Joe Cobb, Roy Wood, Ed Maloney, Bill “Doc” Lee, Don Cornelius, Richard Pegue, Isabel Joseph Johnson, Cecil Hale, and McKee Fitzhugh eventually joined the roster.

Under the direction of the station's general manager, Lucky Cordell, and its “Ambassador of Goodwill,” Bernadine C. Washington, The Good Guys held black radio listeners hostage in Chicago for a number of years. It became the hottest station in the market. Not only did it convey music, it also conveyed public information, public events, and what was going on. It was the voice during the civil rights movement, and individuals were often given the opportunity to speak. Dr. Martin Luther King was interviewed by Leslie South, as well as Elijah Muhammad and others.

These personalities became so informational and influential that during the riots after the death of Dr. Martin Luther King, they called for calm and peace. And people began to listen to them. They were very influential throughout what was called the civil rights movement, and individuals often went to them.

They also had a relationship with Berry Gordy in Detroit, when he formed Motown Records; and every time a record would come out, he would send it to the WVON station before sending it anywhere else.

WVON actually was instrumental in electing Harold Washington, the first black mayor of Chicago. Lou Palmer, who had a radio series called “Lou's Notebook,” had a slogan: “We shall see in '83.” And that became the rallying cry. It was also instrumental in electing Carol Moseley Braun to the United States Senate, electing Barack Obama to the United States Senate, and ultimately electing Barack Obama President of the United States of America.

Always more than a radio station, it belonged to the community and was the heart of the community. So I congratulate Melody Spann Cooper and all of those who have made WVON what it is today: the voice of the Nation.

Congratulations to WVON Radio on fifty years of broadcasting.

Mr. Speaker, On April 1, 1963, WVON Radio in Chicago, Illinois was launched and since that time has gone from being “the voice of the negro” to “the voice of the Nation.” WVON began when two brothers, Leonard and Phil Chess, the owners of Chess Records, a successful record company with a plentiful supply of local music talent under their banner, such as Muddy Waters, Lil’ Howlin Wolf, Jimmy Reed and others, who needed an outlet for their music. Therefore, the brothers bought WHFC–1450 AM, a 1000 watt station licensed in Cicero, Illinois.

On April 1, 1963, WVON hit the airwaves in Chicago with a group of hand-picked personalities: Franklin McCarthy, E. Rodney Jones, Herb Kent, Wesley South, and Pervis Spann. They became known as “The Good Guys” and Ric Ricardo, Bill “Butterball” Crane, Ed Cook, Joe Cobb, Roy Wood, Ed Maloney, Bill “Doc” Lee, Don Cornelius, Richard Pegue, Isabel Joseph Johnson, Cecil Hale, and McKee Fitzhugh eventually joined the roster. Under the direction of the station’s general manager, Lucky Cordell, and its “Ambassador of Good Will”, Bernadine C. Washington, The Good Guys held Black Chicago captive for more than a decade and ranked consistently in the top five of the most listened to stations in the market.

The power of WVON went beyond the Chicago market. Berry Gordy, the founder of Motown Records had a special arrangement with WVON that every song he produced would be sent immediately to WVON before any other station. WVON was so powerful that it produced airplay in other markets, which impacted the overall sales and success of the project.

WVON has always been more than a radio station. During a time when Blacks were actively involved in the civil rights movement, WVON was the voice of information for local and national affairs. During the riots that followed the death of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., WVON on-air personalities were there to lift the tension that had erupted in neighborhoods across the city. They pleaded for calmness.

Following the death of Chess in 1969, the family decided to sell WVON to George Gillette (heir to the Shaving Products Company) and to Potter Palmer (heir to Palmer house) who formed Globetrotter Communications.

Their first order of business was to take WVON from 1450 frequency to 5,000 watt 1390 signal, which would improve their coverage of Chicago. The 1450 frequency was left dormant.

In 1977, Globetrotter Communications sold WVON to the Gannett Company, whose major holdings were in print media. Gannett had purchased an FM station in Chicago which became known as WGCI. In 1979, Wesley South and Pervis Spann formed Midway Broadcasting Corporation and purchased the license for the 1450 AM frequency.

Their station WXOL premiered in August of 1979 and remains one of the few minority-owned stations in the market. WVON became a mixed music/talk radio station and with Wes-

ley South, the hotline show in the evening with journalist Lu Palmer doing a notebook series called “Lou’s notebook.” Lou spearheaded the election of Harold Washington as Chicago’s first Black mayor with the slogan, “We Shall See in ‘83.”

Upon the urging of Wesley South, a radio talk show pioneer, WVON changed to a talk format and has never looked back. It has been instrumental in not only electing Harold Washington as Chicago’s first Black mayor, but also in electing Carol Mosley Braun, U.S. Senator; Barack Obama, United States Senator; and Barack Obama, President of the United States of America.

WVON’s current line-up of hosts are some of the best in the Nation: Cliff Kelly, called the governor of talk radio; Matt McGill; Perry Small; Reverend Al Sharpton; Saleem Muwakil; Kendall Moore; Dr. Leon Finney; and from time to time, Pam Morris, Dr. Terry Mason, and countless others who buy time like Garfield Major, talking to the people.

Congratulations to Melody Spann Cooper and all of those who have helped to make WVON Radio what it is today.

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 37 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

Rabbi Robert Silvers, Congregation B’Nai Israel, Boca Raton, Florida, offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, we children of humanity pray to You by many names, but in our hearts we all know You as One. Your unity creates the common bond between us and is our common bond with You. And though Your absolute truth eludes us, nonetheless we strive to be more like You and to carry out Your will for humanity: that we live together in peace.

And though some seek to disrupt the peace and deprive us of our very lives, as we witnessed in Boston, we pray, O God, that their actions be thwarted and that You continue to shelter us with Your canopy of peace. Send healing of body and soul, O God, to the victims of this act of terror, to our Nation, and to all who grieve with them. Keep forever in Your loving embrace the souls of those who lost their lives.

We pray that those who do harm be brought to justice and that You, O God, instill in all peoples everywhere a love of humanity and a respect for each and every human being created in Your divine image.

Help us, O God, to realize that each of us holds a glimpse of something

greater; though created mortal and fallible, we need Your gifts of wisdom and patience to find partners, even in surprising and unlikely places, with whom we must work together to benefit our country and our world.

We turn to You, Source of Peace, to inspire and support the leaders of our Nation to find accord even in these times of challenge. May it be Your will that in recognizing the Unity of the Divine, they will strive to foster a similar unity among themselves for the sake of this great Nation.

Joining together, we say the Hebrew word affirming faith; faith in each other, continued faith in humanity, and faith in the Holiness beyond us.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. LANKFORD 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.

WELCOMING RABBI ROBERT SILVERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I’m proud to have the opportunity to welcome one of my constituents, Rabbi Robert Silvers, of the Congregation B’Nai Israel in Boca Raton, Florida, as he offered the opening prayer here today. He is a leader in the Jewish community in south Florida. His life epitomizes the Jewish tradition of tikkun olam—bettering the world.

Rabbi Silvers’ impact is felt well beyond the 1,200 families of Congregation B’Nai Israel, with pastoral work and care that he provides not only to his own congregation but also to the greater local community as a volunteer chaplain for the Palm Beach County Sheriff’s Office. He has served as president of the Palm Beach County Board of Rabbis and as president of the Greater Boca Raton Religious Leaders Association, an interfaith coalition of clergy. Rabbi Silvers has been involved in education and interfaith dialogue throughout south Florida.

I’m proud to call Rabbi Silvers and his wife, Ava, friends. I welcome them and all of his congregants who watched

on C-SPAN as he delivered this meaningful prayer.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

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

THE SPIRIT OF AMERICA

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

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. As we gather today in this House, we opened it with prayer—prayer to remember those families, those children, those runners, those spectators that were lost in Boston. As I watched that horrific incident, I paused for a moment. At the same time that I saw this tragic incident, I also saw the spirit of America. The spirit of America was with those individuals who rushed in to help, not knowing whether they would be injured or not, not knowing what would happen to them. But they rushed to help one another.

I want this body to instill that same American spirit—that we are bound together—so that we will remember those lost, but more importantly, we will bring to justice those that perpetrated this action and that we will be stronger in the end as a Nation and never forget those who were lost.

BOSTON MARATHON ATTACK

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

Ms. CHU. Imagine what the front page of The Boston Globe should have looked like yesterday: marathon winners jubilantly accepting medals; throngs of people triumphantly crossing the finish line; bystanders passing out Gatorade; families and friends cheering on loved ones. Instead, the front page depicted a war zone.

This vicious, senseless attack left nearly 200 people injured, some critically, and three dead. My heart breaks for everyone affected, and justice must be served.

But even this dark act couldn't blot out the examples of love, compassion, and selflessness on display. Volunteers and officers raced to aid blast victims. Marathon runners continued running—straight to the nearest hospital to donate blood. And thousands of people opened their homes to athletes who had nowhere else to go.

These are the stories that define us as a Nation. This is the spirit that no terrorist attack will break.

CHARLES C. GATES CENTER FOR
REGENERATIVE MEDICINE AND
STEM CELL BIOLOGY

(Mr. COFFMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to draw attention to cutting-edge research now underway at the Charles C. Gates Center for Regenerative Medicine and Stem Cell Biology at the University of Colorado in Aurora. As you know, our Nation faces major deficiencies in its ability to maintain an adequate blood supply for civilian and military demands. Traditional methods for obtaining blood or producing a new supply fall far short of current demand.

But a collaborative effort at the Gates Center at the University of Colorado is working to develop a new technology that enables the rapid growth of adult blood stem cells. This proprietary technology can generate large numbers of cells that can be frozen and thawed while retaining their stem cell characteristics. This also means that soon there will be an ability to culture adult blood stem cells in an almost indefinite manner.

This research is being funded with peer-reviewed grants from NIH, and they have joined a consortium funded by DARPA to further help develop the Red Blood Cell program. I'm very hopeful about the research at the Charles C. Gates Center, and I urge support for their efforts.

PASS GUN CONTROL LEGISLATION

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Today, Mr. Speaker, the other body has an opportunity to do what 90 percent of the American people would like us to do—to be prayerful and to come together to respond to the horrific siege of gun violence in America.

It is important to note that, on average, 13 young people from ages 10 to 24 are victims of homicide every day, and 82.8 percent of these youth are killed by a gun. 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 from a firearm. In 2010, 82 children under the ages of 5 lost their lives due to guns. To put that number in perspective, 58 law enforcement lost their lives.

And so today, we don't have to violate the Second Amendment. As I said, we can be prayerful. We can pass universal background checks—the same thing we do with registering our cars, getting licenses. This is a time for America to rise to our higher angels and do what our children need them to do. I ask the Senate to challenge its conscience and to vote for universal background checks to stop the violence.

□ 1210

THE FINE LINE BETWEEN CHOICE
AND MURDER

(Mr. LANKFORD asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, in a historic red brick building in Philadelphia, a man and his staff performed thousands of abortions under horrid conditions, which has led to a murder trial which is currently under way for seven children and one adult. Some children were torn apart with surgical instruments in the womb. Some mothers were given abortion-inducing drugs and were seated on a toilet until they delivered their baby into that toilet. Other women had their labor induced; and when they delivered, an assistant flipped the baby over and used the scissors to cut their spinal cord.

The horrific murder of innocent children was repeated over and over again in the clinic; but amazingly enough, only the children fully out of the womb are considered murder victims. Can someone explain to me how the children of the same age, size, and development, who were still in the womb when they were torn to pieces by surgical instruments, are not victims of murder, but those who were delivered and then their spinal cord was cut three feet from their mother are victims of murder?

I will never understand the strained logic that says if a child is killed where you cannot see them in the womb, it's choice; but if you kill that child in the daylight, it's murder.

CONGRATULATING MIROSLABA
"LILI" VELO ON BEING NAMED
2013 OUTSTANDING SENIOR HIGH
SCHOOL TEACHER OF THE YEAR

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

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Many students often remember that one engaging and empowering teacher who inspired them to change the course of their lives. I am proud to recognize one of those teachers, Ms. Mirosłaba "Lili" Velo, a social studies teacher from Hayward's Tennyson High School in my congressional district.

Ms. Velo was named the 2013 Outstanding Senior High School Teacher of the Year by the California Council for Social Studies. As the chair of the Social Studies Department at Tennyson High School, Ms. Velo is a true leader in advancing social studies education by teaching educators in her high school and across California how to engage students with new and innovative teaching methods. This is something we will need as we continue to lead our students to be competitive in a changing global economy.

Ms. Velo is a wonderful example of the most dedicated teachers from across the Nation, who strive every day to better the lives of their students and assist the teachers around them.

Once again, I congratulate Ms. Velo on receiving this well-deserved recognition.

DEFENDING OUR HOMELAND

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

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay respect and grief for those who suffered loss of life and harm in Boston. I had two of my own constituents who suffered grievous loss and one of them the loss of a leg. It reminds us once again that those who seek our destruction are fully committed to that objective.

While the terrorists and others work in a very open way, seeking public notoriety, they have also learned to work in a very quiet and sophisticated and tactical way in cyber warfare.

Mr. Speaker, we have a very important bill before us today, H.R. 624. We need to really look at it, and we need to pass it. We need to show the world that we are fully committed to defending our homeland.

300,000 cyber attacks occur on major industry every single day—on each industry. We must stop this. They are bent on our destruction. We can do what it takes today to show the world that we are fully committed to defending our homeland.

MEMPHIS SOUL

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

Mr. COHEN. Last night, PBS aired the “Memphis Soul” performance recorded last week at the White House. The performance featured many songs that were recorded at Stax Records located in Memphis.

In 1998, Memphis civic leaders raised more than \$10 million to build the Stax Museum on the original site of Stax Records. The museum honors all of the artists who recorded at Stax, including Isaac Hayes, Al Green, Otis Redding, Booker T and the MGs, and others.

From Eddie Floyd’s “Knock on Wood” to Booker T and the MGs’ classic “Green Onions,” Isaac Hayes’ “Shaft,” and Sam and Dave’s “Soul Man,” the recordings at Stax Records made significant contributions to the music of the era.

Beyond honoring its history, Stax is about education. In 2005, the Soulsville Charter School opened its doors to 60 sixth graders. Now expanded to grades 6–12, the 2013 class of Soulsville Charter School has a 100 percent college acceptance rate and scholarships.

I encourage everyone to come to Memphis to visit the Stax Museum and see the Soulsville Charter School to learn more about Memphis’ contribution to music. I also hope you will tune in to PBS this afternoon to watch another performance of “Memphis Soul” at 5 o’clock eastern, 4 o’clock central.

CONGRATULATING ASHLAND UNIVERSITY WOMEN’S BASKETBALL TEAM FOR WINNING NCAA DIVISION II CHAMPIONSHIP

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

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and congratulate the Ashland University women’s basketball team for winning the NCAA Division II Championship. The Ashland Eagles earned Ashland University’s first basketball national championship with a 71–56 victory over New York’s Dowling College on Friday, March 29, 2013.

I would like to congratulate the Eagles MVP, AU senior Kari Daugherty, for contributing 26 points to the win. Ms. Daugherty was also honored with the Player of the Year title for the division.

I would also like to congratulate Coach Sue Ramsey for leading her team to victory. This sportsmanship, determination, and hard work displayed by the Ashland Eagles throughout the season has been unparalleled. This momentous accomplishment deserves the most sincere congratulations, and we’re very proud of Ashland University and the Ashland Eagles. Go Eagles.

IMMIGRATION

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

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Last week, right here in D.C., I hosted farm workers from all over this country that only ask for fair treatment and compensation as they do their work. As they chanted “Si, se puede”—yes, it is possible—with 20 of us congressional Members, I saw the look of hope on their faces—hope that they would soon have a pathway to citizenship, fair wages, and adequate worker protections. I saw the same hope in the eyes of my parents who came here as farm workers.

With the introduction of the Senate’s immigration bill, farm workers are one step closer to gaining legal status and the right to feed their families as they feed America. However, as any legislation moves forward, I will remain vigilant against any effort to legalize farm worker mistreatments.

I look forward to working with both sides of the aisle and both of our Houses to make sure that we fix this broken immigration system.

SENIORS’ TAX SIMPLIFICATION ACT

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

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Speaker, the American people have just finished the annual aggravation of tax preparation. Every year, individuals and businesses spend more than 6 billion hours and about \$168 billion just to meet the filing requirements of the IRS.

Among those hit hardest by our 4-million-word Tax Code are senior citizens. Many live on fixed incomes and have common forms of income, like dividends, Social Security benefits, and IRA distributions; yet they face the high cost of compliance. That’s why I introduced the Seniors’ Tax Simplification Act. This commonsense bill—and it is bipartisan—would create one simple form, much like the popular 1040EZ form. It would be used for the relatively simple tax filing situations that are common for seniors anyway. Creating a no-nonsense 1040SR form would reduce compliance costs for seniors and lessen the burden of the tax season for them.

The Seniors’ Tax Simplification Act is a straightforward, no-cost bill that has bipartisan support and has been endorsed by many senior citizen groups and deserves a vote in this House.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

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

Ms. TITUS. After far too long, there is finally real bipartisan momentum in Washington towards implementing much-needed comprehensive immigration reform.

Our immigration system today is crowded and confusing. It divides families, it stifles the American Dream for high-skilled foreign students and entrepreneurs, and it does not address the exploitation of many immigrants in the workplace.

The proposals unveiled last night are not perfect. For example, they eliminate diversity visas and certain family visas. But we are making progress. I look forward to supporting a bill that secures our borders, makes our existing laws more efficient and timely, promotes entrepreneurship and innovation, provides a fair pathway to citizenship for the millions of immigrants already in the United States, and includes the DREAM Act. It must also include humane provisions to keep families of all kinds together. We can and must get this done.

□ 1220

IN MEMORY OF FORMER MEMBER CHARLIE WILSON

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

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, as dean of the Ohio Republican delegation in the House, I was greatly saddened to hear of the untimely passing early Sunday morning of our friend and former colleague, Representative Charlie Wilson. Although Charlie and I were on different sides of the aisle and often disagreed on policy, I always admired his dedication to our State and his tireless energy as he worked to serve his constituents to the best of his ability.

I am not alone when I say that a conversation with Charlie was always

memorable and usually ended with broad smiles as you parted company. One thing that Charlie and I did have in common is that we played college football, and we were both defensive linemen. And at least in our own minds, the older we got, the better we had been.

Charlie Wilson was an honorable man, a trusted ally, and a worthy opponent. I ask my colleagues to join in wishing his four sons and nine grandchildren our condolences. His 14 years of government service in Ohio and in Washington, D.C., is a legacy they should always cherish and be proud of. God bless Charlie Wilson.

NOAA PROPOSES FURLOUGHS

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

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, like many Americans, I began my morning this morning with a check of the local weather forecast. It actually helps me answer questions, important questions, such as what should I wear, do I need an umbrella, or is a storm approaching that's going to tie up traffic.

The weather forecast is really important, but too often it's taken for granted. And, unfortunately, thanks to the Republican insistence that sequester cuts take effect, our access to these timely and reliable weather forecasts may be impacted negatively.

On Monday, the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Agency, which includes the National Weather Service, proposed 4 furlough days, with a potential for 10. The cash-strapped Weather Service provides predictions for the ever-more-frequent extreme weather events, such as Superstorm Sandy, the historic drought impacting our agricultural sector last year, and the tornados that ravished the South in 2011.

On a daily basis, it impacts the lives of Americans across the country. Even today, severe storms are ravaging the midsection of the country. The Weather Service is already understaffed. Sequestration could further deteriorate forecasting abilities. So, once again, they've made indiscriminate spending cuts our top priority. We need to stop this and protect our economic safety and our national security.

IN RECOGNITION OF FIRST RESPONDERS

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

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, our hearts and prayers go out to those in Boston and Massachusetts and all the States where people came from to participate in the marathon.

I, in particular, Mr. Speaker, wanted to stand and thank those first responders. They're firemen and they're police

officers and they're paramedics and they're doctors and nurses, and sometimes they're just somebody who never expected to be in that situation at that time. And yet, our fellow countrymen respond; they're there.

And right now we have people responding in the Senate. They've put themselves out there. They've run to the challenges. It is the American spirit. They touch the heart of all of us.

And, Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to say God bless them, and God bless the United States of America.

SUPPORT BACKGROUND CHECKS ON GUN SALES

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, this is what my constituent, Barbara Kelty, wrote to the Louisville Courier-Journal this morning:

While polls continue to say that a majority of NRA members and a sizable majority of the American people support background checks and a majority of citizens support limiting magazine size, a majority in Congress at this point apparently does not favor either.

How can that be? To me, it is evident that these Members of Congress do not feel obligated to us, the people who elected them, whom they represent. Rather, they feel beholden to the gun lobby which fattens their campaign chests. And it is obvious that the gun-making industry, which does not condone or support gun violence, benefits from the emotional rush of citizens exercising the right to buy protection for their families after these tragedies.

We, the citizens, must do our bit to lobby Congress and remind them that our will takes precedence.

Ms. Kelty is right. In Kentucky, three out of four people support background checks for every gun sale. More than 90 percent of the American people, and three-quarters of NRA members, support background checks, which have stopped nearly 2 million people from illegally buying guns. Still, 40 percent of guns are purchased without a background check.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues in the Senate to listen to the vast majority of Kentuckians and the American people and support background checks.

SENATE IMMIGRATION BILL WORSE THAN WE THOUGHT

(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's hard to believe, but the Senate immigration bill is worse than we thought.

Despite assurances, the border is not secured before almost everyone in the country illegally is given amnesty. So the bill guarantees there will be a rush across the border to take advantage of massive amnesty.

And the bill offers amnesty to far more illegal immigrants than we

thought. In addition to most of the 11 million illegal immigrants already in the country, it offers to legalize their relatives outside the country and even others who have already been deported home. So current immigration laws are shredded.

The good news is that the House Judiciary Committee will come up with a better plan.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

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

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today encouraged that comprehensive immigration reform is moving now that a framework has been released by our colleagues in the Senate.

The 23rd Congressional District, which I represent, runs some 800 miles along the Texas-Mexico border and includes five ports of entry. No other congressional district shares a larger border with Mexico.

After more than two decades, I'm encouraged that our friends in the Senate are taking steps and we finally have this framework. I look forward to working in a bipartisan and bicameral way to get it done this way.

Our values teach us that our families should stick together and that hard work, not circumstance, should shape our future. I believe that our Nation becomes stronger as more people pledge allegiance to our flag and commit themselves fully to our Nation and to our economy.

Last week I asked the Senate Gang of Eight to give special consideration to members of the armed services who risk their lives every day for our country and our families—it's particularly important to folks and families at Joint Base Lackland in San Antonio, Laughlin Air Force Base in Del Rio, and Fort Bliss in El Paso—and requested that comprehensive immigration reform eliminate the 3- and 10-year bar on spouses for spouses, prevent the termination of petitions of spouses and children of fallen heroes, and streamline the naturalization process for those deployed overseas.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to getting it done this year.

TAXES

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

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, as you all know, Monday was tax day, so it's an appropriate time to talk about the need for tax reform. We need a simpler, more competitive Tax Code that's flatter and fairer so that we can create jobs and put Americans back to work.

We need a simpler code. In fact, the code, when you include all its regulations, annotations, and explanations, totals 74,000 pages. And according to

the latest estimate from the United States Treasury, Americans spent 6.1 billion hours complying with the Tax Code. We also need a more competitive Tax Code. The United States has the highest corporate tax rate in the world.

Simplifying our Tax Code and closing loopholes for everyone will help create an environment that encourages job growth and increases wages. The Ryan budget is based on such reforms. These reforms can help get Americans back to work.

RECOGNIZING THE MERCED COMMUNITY VIOLENCE INTERVENTION AND PREVENTION TASK FORCE

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, in Boston, we were reminded how vulnerable we all are as Americans and how important it is that we stay together.

Today, I rise to recognize the Merced Community Violence Intervention and Prevention Task Force. This hardworking organization in the San Joaquin Valley that I represent is the 2013 recipient of the Lois Haight Award of Excellence and Innovation from the Victims' Rights Caucus, of which I am a cochair.

The task force is an innovative collaboration of local leaders that was formed in 2006 in response to gang-related violence throughout the Merced community. The task force makes Merced a safer place by educating the community about violence, promoting character development, and providing information to families and, most importantly, our youth.

From gang awareness workshops to Merced County's first anonymous "text a tip" line, the task force has contributed greatly to our Merced community and throughout the area.

On behalf of the Victims' Rights Caucus, congratulations and thank you to the Merced Community Violence Intervention and Prevention Task Force.

□ 1230

TAX REFORM

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

Mr. STEWART. Like all Americans, my heart and prayers go out to the people of Boston.

Mr. Speaker, I'm grateful for the opportunity to stand and speak on a very important issue today. It may not be as interesting, it may not grab as much attention as any other issue, but I'm not aware of any other thing that we could talk about that has the potential to invigorate our economy, to expand personal freedoms, and restore faith in our government and, frankly, in our future like this issue could. Of course I'm

talking about meaningful, strategic tax reform.

I was a business owner and CEO for 12 years. Because of that, I understand in a very personal way that the current tax system is rife with waste. It invites abuse. Worst of all, it creates so much uncertainty as to make it difficult, if not impossible, to make good decisions about our future.

Again and again, we read stories and we see examples where the current Tax Code punishes success while ignoring the economic impacts of poor government policy. We can do better than this. We have an opportunity to do better than this. We must do better. Everyone will benefit.

Let's do this now.

REMEMBERING THE VICTIMS IN BOSTON

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, last Monday, men and women from around the world traveled to the beautiful city of Boston to take part in the 117th running of the Boston Marathon.

But this longstanding American tradition, this celebration of athletic achievement was shattered at 2:50 eastern time when two bombs went off along the finish line, killing three spectators, including an 8-year-old child, and injuring nearly 200 more.

At times like this, words fail to capture the sense of our disbelief, the pain in our hearts, and the anger we feel towards anyone who would do such great harm to so many innocent lives.

Although we do not yet know the identity of the perpetrators, what we do know is that our country will not rest until they are brought to justice. The American people will emerge from this horrific incident stronger and more united than ever before.

Like all Rhode Islanders since last Monday, my thoughts have remained with the people of Boston and all of the victims of this vicious act of violence and their loved ones, and I pray that the passage of time might bring them some level of comfort.

TAX REFORM

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

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Mr. Speaker, this week, many of my constituents filed tax returns. Unfortunately, their taxes weren't the only thing that they had to pay. Hardworking Americans will spend \$168 billion completing their taxes under our country's 4-million-word Tax Code.

America's tax system is broken and simply doesn't meet the needs of the 21st century economy. It is time for a simpler, fairer, flatter code, one that eliminates special interest loopholes to ensure that everyone pays what they

owe. But what we don't need is higher taxes.

The government is already poised to take in record revenues this year, yet the President insists on calling for another \$1.1 trillion in new taxes. Levying more taxes on families and businesses won't create jobs and won't lead to economic prosperity. Rather, we need to cut spending, balance the budget, and rein in excessive government.

Comprehensive tax reform is something that the American people overwhelmingly support and something that House Republicans remain committed to addressing.

GUN REFORM

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

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, background checks may not have changed what happened at Sandy Hook, but I hope Sandy Hook changes what happens here.

Ninety percent of the American people agree that expanding background checks for gun sales is the right thing to do. These checks will help keep guns out of the hands of the mentally unstable, convicted felons, and domestic abusers who threaten the safety of our families and our communities.

It's time for Congress to listen to common sense and the voices of the American people.

I say to my Senate colleagues: You came here to work for the American people, not just to work for your reelection. We're here to do a job, not just keep our jobs.

I support Senators MANCHIN and TOOMEY for coming together in a bipartisan way to push forward this legislation for expanded background checks. All we need is 60 Senators who have the courage to stand up and do the right thing.

Commonsense measures to fight tragedy shouldn't be a heavy lift. This should be an easy vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor here to announce that the Senate released their Gang of Eight immigration bill sometime around 2:45 a.m. this morning. It didn't take very long for the secret group in the House to release their support for the bill. They had time, apparently, to analyze the 844 pages that are in this bill.

I've had time to analyze a little bit of it. Mr. Speaker, what it says is this: they want to instantaneously legalize everybody that's here in America illegally, with a few exceptions, in case they decide to enforce the law against them.

That doesn't satisfy them, Mr. Speaker. They even want to legalize the people that have been deported and sent to their home countries and bring them back to the United States. If that occurs, 11 million to 20 million becomes at least 30 million people.

Because we have what they call a "de facto" amnesty now, it is, in fact, literally amnesty now, and making that promise is going to start another rush over our borders.

We must restore the rule of law.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, creating an immigration process for new American immigrants is not just an issue that will shape the future for one group.

So much is at stake for 3 million African and Caribbean immigrants that live and work here. They're a vital part of our future as hardworking, upstanding individuals in search of freedom and a better life. They also deserve a fair system that works, and they are more than just a number on a page.

Last week, a young lady came to my office who was born in America to Haitian parents. Her name is Natalie. Natalie is a graduate student who has job offers lined up. She is ready to work and commits herself to this country. But Natalie can't do those things because of our broken immigration system. She is neither recognized as a citizen here nor in Haiti. While in tears, she said she has no home. She can't see her family. She's scared and feels alone. Natalie is one of those 11 million people that are looking for a pathway to citizenship.

It is time to pass commonsense legislation that fixes our immigration system once and for all, one that serves our interests and reflects our values for Natalie and the 11 million other Natives who call America home.

AMERICA'S ECONOMY CAN THRIVE AGAIN

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

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, the solution to our economic challenges is one simple word: growth. Unfortunately, the only place really growing in our country today is Washington, D.C.

As I travel my district, workers, job seekers, and small business owners tell me they're concerned about jobs and economic security.

Washington must unleash their economic potential by spending less, taxing less, and regulating less. Washington has to stop growing so the rest of the country can start to grow.

Small business owners this year spent upwards of 2 billion hours trying to comply with our Tax Code. Simpli-

fying the Tax Code will help them save time and money that they can then put towards growing their businesses, hiring new employees and raising wages.

Washington must also streamline regulations that are strangling growth. The REINS Act would require that any regulation with an annual impact of \$100 million or more be subject to a vote of this House.

With the right tax and regulatory policies, America's economy can thrive again.

□ 1240

CLOSE GUANTANAMO BAY

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, about 12 years ago, 779 people were gathered initially and sent to the prison at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba. About 85 percent of them had never actually engaged in direct combat against the United States. A report was issued by an independent, authoritative commission yesterday that I want to bring attention to. It was headed by Asa Hutchinson, a former Republican colleague of ours, and 4 star General Jim Jones, who was head of the National Security Council in the Obama administration.

It concluded that the United States engaged in the practice of torture at Guantanamo Bay. It concluded that the methods we used, like waterboarding, slamming prisoners into walls, chaining them in stress positions for hours, violated international legal obligations with "no firm or persuasive evidence that they produced valuable information that could not have been obtained by other means." It also concluded that what we did had "no justification" and "damaged the standing of our Nation, reduced our capacity to convey moral censure when necessary, and potentially increased the danger to U.S. military personnel taken captive."

It concluded that President Bush and Vice President Cheney were directly involved in condoning such tactics and that their legal advisors engaged in "acrobatic" legal analysis to attempt to establish legal justification.

There was no legal precedent. Guantanamo Bay should be closed—now.

TAX REFORM

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

Mr. SOUTHERLAND. Mr. Speaker, it's tax week. As you know, that means that Americans' heads are chock-full of all kinds of numbers. We've done all kinds of itemizations, deductions, and calculations in our personal finances just to make sure that we know how much we are going to hand over to Uncle Sam. Let me share with you some more numbers.

How about \$168 billion? That's how much our fellow Americans spend each year just to make sure they comply with our overcomplicated Tax Code. Just how complicated are the tax rules in this country? Well, here is another number—4 million. That's how many words there are in the U.S. Tax Code. There are 4,500 words in the U.S. Constitution. There are 775,000 words in the Bible. Yet there are 4 million in our Tax Code.

What does this all add up to?

It means that our current tax system is broken. We need fundamental, comprehensive tax reform to make our Tax Code fairer and simpler for all Americans. That is the House Republican plan.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 624, CYBER INTELLIGENCE SHARING AND PROTECTION ACT

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 164 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 164

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 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. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113-7. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any

amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 1 hour.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WOODALL. I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I always enjoy the reading of the resolution. There are a lot of readings that you can waive on the floor of this House, but not so with a Rules resolution because this resolution is framing the nature of the debate we are going to have perhaps on the most important issue that we've taken up so far in this Congress.

The underlying bill is H.R. 624. It's the Cyber Intelligence Sharing and Protection Act.

Whenever we start talking about cyber intelligence sharing and protection, folks often think that sharing and protection are oxymorons—you can't have protected sharing, and you can't have shared protection. It's not an easy nut to crack, Mr. Speaker. I don't sit on the Intelligence Committee, but I've been down to the classified briefings where folks are sharing details of the amazing successes that our teams, both domestically and abroad, are having and combating in cyber threats; but it's getting harder and harder every day, and we have to balance the national security implications of failing to address these threats with what we, as all Americans, love, which is our liberty here at home—our liberty here at home, our privacy here at home.

In order to try to crack that, Mr. Speaker, you'll know that we brought this bill to the floor in the last Congress, and it has been changed and improved since that time. Today, this rule makes in order an additional 12 amendments. Now, of course we'll have the traditional 1 hour of debate on the underlying bill, but there will be another 12 amendments, each debated—2 hours of total additional time—so that Members can have their voices heard. Of these additional 12 amendments, four of them were offered by Republican Members; seven of them were offered by Democratic Members; and one

of them is a bipartisan amendment. But the rule is designed to allow that further discussion because of the very important nature of the underlying bill.

I rise, of course, in support of the rule to allow for that debate, and I rise in support for the underlying bill. In today's world, you don't have to have a battlefield full of tanks to wage war on your enemy. A nation-state can have a roomful of young computer scientists and a couple of computers and begin to be a threat to the largest, most democratically controlled country in the world.

How do we stop that, Mr. Speaker? Because we don't want to close our borders. We don't want to have Federal control over the Internet. In so many of these nation-states, the government does control the Internet. That's never going to happen here in America. That's not who we are. That's not what we're about. In fact, 10 private sector providers control about 80 percent of the networks here in America—as it should be.

But what can we do to make ourselves safer tomorrow than we are today? Here is what the underlying bill does, Mr. Speaker: it enables, for the very first time, businesses and governments to share information about the threats that they are facing.

If you go up the road to Maryland, where the NSA is operating today, there are some smart, smart folks there, and I'm glad we have every single one of them on the front lines of cyber warfare—protecting America, protecting American enterprise. Yet today, when they are aware of threats that are impending threats to our financial system, threats to our economic system, they can't share that information with the private sector.

Back in my home district, Mr. Speaker, we're home to UPS—the United Parcel Service—Delta, Home Depot. If those companies come under attack today, Delta can't share that information with American Airlines and say, Look at what has just happened to us. Be on the lookout. It might happen to you. Home Depot can't share with Lowe's today. This is what has happened to us. We want you to be on the lookout. Don't let it happen to you.

□ 1250

This bill changes that. This bill, for the first time, says in the name of defending America and American interests against cyber threats around the globe, you can begin to share with one another what your experiences are and opportunities to protect yourself from having that happen to you again in the future.

Now, the real important thing to me about this bill, and I will just hold it up for you, Mr. Speaker, the Cyber Intelligence Sharing and Protection aspect of this bill, it's the important part. It's the meat of this bill. It's what's going to allow us to be safer to-

tomorrow than we are today, but the bulk of the words in this bill don't speak to the sharing in terms of enabling it. It speaks to the sharing in terms of restricting it. Page after page after page after page of this short, 24-page bill talks about how we as citizens must, must, must continue to be safe and secure in the privacy of our own information.

It's a four-step process the bill lays out, Mr. Speaker, in terms of how we can ensure that no personally identifiable information is being shared from Home Depot or Delta or UPS or any of the other folks who are out there on the Internet when they're sharing that with the government or with one another in order to prevent threats to American security or economic prosperity, to ensure that personally identifiable information is not a part of that information that's shared, because privacy is paramount.

I've been tremendously impressed through this process, Mr. Speaker, because I'm one of the folks who is most likely to be suspect when we start talking about sharing information with the government. I'm a big lover of liberty. There's not many things I'm willing to give liberty up for. In fact, I dare say there's not a one that I'm willing to give liberty up for.

But the Intelligence Committee, from which this bill came, has worked with Members month after month after month after month to ensure that privacy is protected, that we as citizens can be secure. At the same time that we're fighting threats that perhaps we're not allowed to talk about on this floor, we're protected from threats that each and every one of us experiences in our day-to-day lives—a threat to privacy.

It's not been easy to craft this bill, and it has been an incredible bipartisan effort throughout, Mr. Speaker, in order to put this language together. Again, we have four Republican amendments made in order by this rule, seven Democratic amendments made in order by this rule, and one bipartisan amendment made in order by this rule. It is my great hope that we can move forward today with this rule, with debate on the underlying bill, and move forward with something that is far, far, far overdue, Mr. Speaker, and that's protecting America—American business and American individuals, American citizens—from the threats posed by nation states through cyber warfare from abroad.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Georgia for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Before I begin, I would like to take a moment, as have almost all of our colleagues that have spoken here today, to offer my sincerest condolences to the people of Boston, Massachusetts, following the deadly explosions at

Monday's marathon. I can't speak for everyone here, but I believe that most of us would say that the thoughts and prayers of the United States Congress are with the victims, their families and friends at this most difficult time. Those responsible for this act of terror will be brought to justice.

Mr. Speaker, while I rise today in support of H.R. 624, the Cyber Intelligence Sharing and Protection Act, better known as CISA, I do not support the rule. My friend from Georgia spoke about how important it is that we have the reading of the rule, and one of the particular efforts of Congress that allows for there not to be any abridgement of that, but I do believe that we would be better served if this were an open rule.

Last night, during our Rules Committee hearing, the majority blocked several germane Democratic amendments which would have further helped to balance cybersecurity concerns with smart policies that protect our citizens. I spoke to those issues last night, and I raise them again, particularly the two amendments offered by our colleagues, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. SCHIFF, and others.

However, the underlying CISA legislation is, as my friend from Georgia said, a bipartisan bill that aims to safeguard our Nation's computer networks and critical infrastructure by allowing for two-way cyber threat information sharing on an entirely voluntary basis, both between the private sector and the Federal Government, and within the private sector itself.

In his March 12, 2013, testimony before the Senate Intelligence Committee, the Director of National Intelligence, James Clapper, stated for the first time that cyber attacks and cyber espionage have supplanted terrorism as the top security threat facing the United States.

In recent months, media reports have highlighted cyber attacks on several major U.S. companies, including Facebook, Google, and the network security firm RSA, as well as The New York Times, Bloomberg News, and The Washington Post newspapers.

Furthermore, government networks such as those of the Central Intelligence Agency and the United States Senate have also been targeted by hackers. Waves of cyber attacks have sought to disrupt operations at financial institutions and service providers, including American Express, JPMorgan Chase, Citigroup, Wells Fargo, Bank of America, MasterCard, PayPal, and Visa.

The fact of the matter is that state actors, terrorist organizations, criminal groups, individuals, and countless persons that describe themselves as hackers attack our public and private computer networks thousands of times every day. Many foreign hackers seek to steal valuable trade secrets, which results in the loss of countless American jobs. There are estimates that have been quoted of loss from economic

espionage that range as high as \$400 billion a year.

Unfortunately, the same vulnerabilities used to steal trade secrets can be used to attack the critical infrastructure we depend on every day. Our economy, our power grids, and our defenses are increasingly reliant on computers and network integration. These networks power our homes, provide our clean water, protect our bank accounts, defend our intellectual property, guard our national security information, and manage other critical services. In addition to intellectual property and national security intelligence, personal finance, health care, and other private records are prime targets for hackers to steal.

According to the Information Technology Industry Council, 18 adults become victims to cyber crime—including identity theft and phishing campaigns—every second. This adds up to 1.5 million cyber crime victims each day.

□ 1300

Cyber attacks present a very real and dangerous threat to the United States. However, the government currently does not have the authority to share classified cyber intelligence information with the private sector.

While private companies have taken considerable measures to protect their networks, they often have limited information and can only respond to known threats.

Cyber threats evolve at the speed of technology, and CISA, this measure, helps the private sector protect against cyber attacks by providing companies with the latest cyber threat information from the intelligence community, which has timely, classified information about destructive malware. This cyber threat intelligence is the information that companies and the government need to protect and defend their networks.

The so-called "signatures" are primarily made up of numerical codes consisting of zeros and ones, without any personal information attached.

CISA is the product of close cooperation between the intelligence community, the private sector companies, and trade groups and, to a certain degree, the White House, as it pertains to many of the measures that are included in this legislation.

During their efforts to improve the bill, they also maintained a dialogue with privacy advocates in an effort to strengthen civil liberties protections and oversight.

I add a personal note here for the reason that, over a period of 10 years, I served 8 of those years on the Intelligence Committee, and the now-chairman of the Intelligence Committee and ranking member were both junior members of the committee that I served on. They have risen to the position that they are in and have acted in an extremely responsible way, over a 2-year period of time, trying to bring a

measure as complicated as this one, contemplating all of the factors that I've identified and more, including the members of the committee.

I would urge Members of the House of Representatives—many of them continue to have concerns, not only about this particular legislation, but about other intelligence matters, and rightly so are they concerned. But let me remind them that they are Members of a body that allows, if they wish to go into the spaces of the Intelligence Committee and to be briefed by staff and Members there on classified information, upon appropriate undertakings, they too can gain the information and insight that's needed in order to make an intelligent determination when they are voting, rather than come out here and criticize the people that do that hard work. They get no benefits, no concerns from the Members, and yet, cannot say all of the things that are needed to say or be said to the American public.

The same holds for ADAM SCHIFF and JAN SCHAKOWSKY and others that I won't mention that I served on that committee with. These are conscientious people who spend more time than almost any Member of Congress on any matter that he or she is attending to, and I have great respect for them. I don't agree with everything that either or all of them say, but I know they put their heart and time, both in the amendments that are offered, as well as in this bill and the particulars that are being put forward to this body.

As a result of their work, 19 improvements to enhance privacy and protect Americans have been adopted. Chief among them, this CISA measure that requires the government to eliminate any personal information it receives that is not necessary to understand the cyber threat.

It creates no new authorities for any agency, and I can't say that enough. It creates no new authorities for any agency.

It gives companies the flexibility to choose which agency within the intelligence community they would like to work with to protect the cyber networks. It requires an annual review and report by the intelligence community's inspector general of the government's use of any information shared by the private sector.

And I would urge Members, when we increase the responsibilities of the inspector general that we also give the inspector general the resources in order to be able to do the necessary oversight that is required in this legislation.

It includes something that I very much support, and that is a 5-year sunset provision. I've supported other 5-year sunset provisions in the intelligence community and would have preferred, in this instance, that it be a 3-year provision. But the fact of the matter is, it's 5, and we will learn an awful lot during that period of time, and we will be back here dealing with

this same subject at some point in the future.

Allowing for the appropriate sharing of cyber threat information between the government and private sector is key to protecting our Nation from those who would do us harm. CISPA balances the critical need to strengthen our cyber defenses while protecting Americans' individual privacy.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, at this time it's my great pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY), one of those Members on the Intelligence Committee my friend from Florida spoke of, a gentleman who serves us all.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak.

I rise in strong support of the rule and the underlying legislation that is before us this afternoon.

I also want to congratulate my colleague from Florida. I agree wholeheartedly with his reasons why this is important. He walked through those very eloquently.

I'd like to speak quickly as to what this bill does not do. It does not create a government surveillance program. It does not give the government the authority to monitor private networks or communications like email or other activities.

And it is strictly voluntary. It does not create a mandate on the private sector that they participate. In fact, these activities, monitoring and surveillance, are specifically excluded from being an activity that would be authorized under this bill.

There are four purposes for which this activity can be conducted, and whatever gets done has to fit within one of these four. One is cybersecurity. Two is investigating and prosecuting cybersecurity crimes. Three would be preventing death and physical injury, and four would be protecting minors from physical and psychological harm. So whatever gets done under this bill has to fit within those narrow categories specifically to make that happen.

As both speakers have said already, great work has been done in trying to protect the privacy and the civil liberties that all of us have. Those who have a grave concern that we've not fixed those, I would ask them to simply go review the contract they have with their Internet service provider. They have ceded immense personal liberties and privacies under that contract to simply sign up with that Internet service provider.

So as they look at what we're trying to do with this bill, I would argue that they may have already gone past that with respect to those guys.

This bill does nothing like that whatsoever. No personal information can be shared. There's a mandate that the government put in place filters so that, as that data's coming in at the speed of light, no one's reading this information. This is machine-to-machine. That

personal information is scrubbed from that as it comes in.

There are immense reporting requirements for this system to be put in place, so that if there are occasional breaches, and there may be, that those breaches are reported on a timely basis to the committee, not at the end of some arbitrary period but as quickly as the system can report it to the oversight committees that have jurisdiction.

There is no ambiguity in this bill. It says what can be done and what cannot be done, and it outlines the consequences for breaking the law.

Let me also agree with my colleague from Florida. It has a sunset provision. Five years from now, future Congresses will have to either deal with this or it goes away. And so unlike many of our bills that just simply go on unless we actually do something, this has the protection of allowing those who disagree with it to know that there will be another bite at this apple 5 years from now if, in fact, there are things we've learned about that intervening 5-year period.

But this is critical for America to have this. If this were a physical attack on this country, there would be no question that the Federal Government, through its military, would stand in the breach and protect this country. There are no less dangerous attacks conducted against infrastructure, banks, airlines, other things every single day that we weren't able to help protect the private sector from, and this bill goes a long way toward doing that.

I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I'm privileged to yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), my colleague on the Rules Committee.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, where to begin?

Let's start with process. This, as has been indicated by everyone who spoke thus far, is a critical issue for our country, getting the balance right between protecting American infrastructure and our way of life, with our civil liberties and confidence in the Internet ecosystem. And yet, this rule only allows 1 hour of debate in the House of Representatives on this bill.

□ 1310

I might add, the amendments that were talked about in the Rules Committee last night, the amendments that actually address some of the deficiencies which I'll be getting into about this bill, are not allowed under this rule. In fact, out of the 12 amendments allowed, two of them are actually the same. The same exact amendment allowed twice. And yet a number of other amendments are not even allowed to be debated or voted on here on the floor of the House.

I hold in my hands many, many amendments that were brought for-

ward by Members of both parties and under this rule were prevented from being debated upon here on the floor of the House, which is why I strongly encourage my colleagues to vote "no" on the rule and "no" on the underlying bill in its present form.

There's no disagreement that cybersecurity is a very real and important issue. Threats come from criminal enterprises, they come from nation states, they come from corporations, they come from 16-year-olds. There's a variety of threats to both the public and private sector both here and abroad. The question is, What's the solution?

One of the first fallacies with the premise of this bill at the 20,000-foot level is, Who helps who? Frankly, it is the government that needs to learn and the private sector that leads the way. I've talked to a number of technology executives, having been a technology executive before I got here, and they are frequently ahead of the government. Because everyday they're fighting hacking attempts and they're on the front lines of cybersecurity.

Now it's not a doubt whether they want free help. Who wouldn't want free help? Should we in fact as taxpayers subsidize the defense of those who have not invested in their own cybersecurity? Should this be a bailout of companies with poor cybersecurity? But the truth of the matter is most of the learning that needs to occur is from the private sector to the government. And, in fact, we're taking some of those steps. The government and the NSA are using private contractors who are in the forefront of this issue every day, and that's more of the direction we need to go.

The notion that somehow the government would be of assistance to companies is laughable to many of the technology executives that I talk to; nor would they expect to call the government for help when they themselves are so far ahead. But to the extent we want to get the government involved with information and with the private sector here, we need to be very careful how this information is used, not just from a civil liberties perspective, which we'll be talking about, but because this is an economic issue; it's a confidence issue.

The Internet has been a tremendous engine of innovation and economic growth. And we should be concerned for the Internet ecosystem, concerned for the millions of jobs, concerned for the great value that's been created, the benefits to consumers across the country, the way it's touched our lives in so many ways.

What's fundamentally flawed in this approach is it trumps privacy agreements in terms of use that Internet companies enter with their users. So you could sign up for a service on the Internet, it could say explicitly we will not share this information with the government unless required by law, in terms of use—and frequently there are

statements analogous to that in there—and the minute you click send and complete it, if this bill were law, the company you gave that information to could then turn around, in violation of their own terms of use, and provide all that information to the government.

The limitations on what the government would do with that information are completely inadequate. There is a section of the bill on pages 10 and 11 that deals with those limitations. First, it says that information can be used for cybersecurity purposes. Okay, that's the purpose of the bill: investigation and prosecution of cybersecurity crimes. That's okay. Then it goes far afield into pretty much everything. It talks about bodily harm, danger of death. When we look at bodily harm and bodily injury, that includes things under USC section 18, 365: cuts, abrasions, bruises, disfigurement, including mental pain.

So this is anything the government wants to use the information for. Paper that can cause paper cuts. The government can collect who's buying paper, who's buying scissors, who's playing football, who's organizing gun shows, who's a Tea Party enthusiast.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. POLIS. And there are absolutely no protections with regard to what is done with that information.

There are a number of improvements that could make this bill viable, and these are not allowed under this rule. My colleague, Mr. SCHIFF, has put forward an amendment that would have simply required that reasonable precautions were taken to ensure privacy was protected. That would be a strong step forward. Real limitations about actually tying the use of this information to cybersecurity would be an important step forward with the bill.

What's at danger is, yes, civil liberties; but the danger is the confidence in the Internet ecosystem that has driven our economic growth over the last decade. There will be great harm if that confidence is shaken, great harm if people know that the information that they provide and sign up for can immediately be turned over to a government agency—indeed, a secretive government agency—with no recourse and completely exempt from any liability for the company that's done it.

It's been noted that this program is voluntary. It may be voluntary for the corporations. It's not voluntary for the individual. It's not voluntary for the citizens of the country who provide that information.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute to say I know my friend from Colorado's concerns are heartfelt, and he shared those last night in the Rules Committee. The gentleman has a great deal of experience in this industry. And as heartfelt as his concerns are, I know, too, equal-

ly heartfelt are his concerns to national security if we fail to come together and address this issue.

I would like to be able to say, Mr. Speaker, that when we pass this bill today, it's going directly to the President's desk for signature. I don't actually believe that to be true. I think it's a long process between now and getting it to the President's desk for signature. And I know the gentleman will be raising these concerns throughout that process.

But I just cannot emphasize enough, Mr. Speaker, the dangers to the liberties of the American people of failing to begin this process today. I'm very proud we're allowing 12 amendments today to work through the concerns that the gentleman has, among others. But the importance of beginning this process today cannot be overstated.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased at this time to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF), my friend and a distinguished member of the Intelligence Committee.

Mr. SCHIFF. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule. At the outset, let me say that the cyber threat is real and its damage already devastating. And I very much appreciate the work that the chair and ranking member of the Intelligence Committee have done on this bill, and I appreciate that we have made and are continuing to make improvements.

But as the bill currently stands and as it will stand even after the amendments allowed by the rule are adopted, the bill simply does not do enough to protect the private information of Americans. Most importantly, I'm disappointed that the proposed rule does not allow an amendment that I offered with Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. My amendment would fix an issue specifically cited by the White House in its Statement of Administration Policy in explaining why the President's advisers would recommend a veto of CISPA without important change. It would require the companies that share cyber threat information either with the government or with another private company to make reasonable efforts to remove personally identifiable information.

As the administration stated in its veto threat, the administration remains concerned that the bill does not require private entities to take reasonable steps to remove irrelevant personal information when sending cybersecurity data to the government or other private sector entities. Citizens have a right to know that corporations will be held accountable—and not granted immunity—for failing to safeguard personal information adequately.

The requirement of government-alone efforts to safeguard or minimize personal information is simply not enough. This is most apparent when,

under the immunized conduct in the bill, private entities can share information with each other without ever going through the government. In those circumstances, how can the government minimize what it never possesses? So government-side minimization alone, which is all this bill includes, is not enough.

We have responded to the concerns of industry by making sure that when we ask them to take reasonable efforts to remove personal information, they can do so in real-time through automated processes. The witnesses who testified before the Intelligence Committee said that often the private parties are in the best position to anonymize the data. This is something they're doing anyway. And it's more than reasonable to require them to do that, particularly if we want to give them a broad grant of immunity.

□ 1320

Mr. Speaker, without an amendment to ensure that companies remove private information when they can do so—when they can do so through reasonable efforts—I cannot support the underlying bill. I believe that Members of both parties who support this change deserve the chance to vote on it. I suspect that because that issue would have gathered broad support, it is not being brought up for a vote here on the floor, and that is very disappointing. Accordingly, I urge a “no” vote on the rule, and I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 60 seconds to say I agree with my friend, that the private sector is often in the best position to get the work done that we're talking about in this bill.

I would refer my colleague, Mr. Speaker, to the Intelligence Committee's Web site—its intelligence.house.gov—where you can see the long list of those private sector actors who are supporting this bill here today, that long list of folks in the private sector responsible for the security of their firms, of the information that Americans have entrusted to them, asking this body to move forward with this bill today.

There's no question, Mr. Speaker, when you're dealing with something of the magnitude of the national security threats posed by cyber warfare and the privacy protections that everyone in this body is committed to, that you're going to end up with conscientious men and women on both sides of this issue. But it is important to note that the private sector—which is being bombarded each and every day with threats from nation-state actors overseas—is asking, pleading with this body to move forward with this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire about how much time remains on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 9 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Georgia has 17 minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. With that, Mr. Speaker, in an effort to respond to my colleague and friend from Georgia, I yield 1 additional minute at this time to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

Mr. SCHIFF. I thank the gentleman for yielding the additional time.

And just to respond to my colleague, I'd be interested to know if there is anything you can point to in those 17 amendments that governs or requires the private sector, when it shares information with other private sector entities, to remove personally identifiable information. Because under the bill, the only minimization that's required is being done by the government; and in the case of private-to-private sector sharing, there is no government role. So this is the big hole.

While there are many private sector companies that may support the bill because it gives them broad immunity without any responsibility, that doesn't mean it's good policy, particularly when private companies have said they would make reasonable efforts. They're willing to do it; they can do it; they have the capacity to do it; we're just not asking them to do it or requiring them to do it. And we're giving something of great value to them, and that is we're giving them broad immunity. I think with that immunity ought to come some responsibility; and it shouldn't be too much to ask that that responsibility take the form of a reasonable effort, not a herculean one, not an impossible one, but a reasonable effort to ensure that Americans' privacy interests are observed and they take out that information when they can.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, again, for purposes of clarity, I yield 1 additional minute to my colleague from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I have three documents to submit to the RECORD: one from former Representative Bob Barr, one Statement of Administration Policy, and a letter from several tech companies and others opposed to the bill.

I quote, in part:

Developments over the last year make CISPA's approach even more questionable than before.

Former Representative Bob Barr:

Congress must take the civil liberties threats created by this bill just as seriously as it takes the cyber threats the legislation purports to address.

Mr. Speaker, we should not hurt the Internet to save the Internet; and this bill, in its current form, leaves the language wide open with potential abuse. Again, when we talk about bodily harm, I have learned that in a California statute that includes dog bites. Essentially, anything is included in this information without limitation with regard to how the government can use it. This is a backdoor attack on the Fourth Amendment against unreasonable search and seizures.

We have criminal procedures and processes around how information can and can't be used. This is the biggest government takeover of personal information that I've seen during my time here in Congress. Again, I believe, on the balance, it harms what it purports to protect.

“JUST SAY NO” TO CYBERSECURITY BILL
(By Former Rep. Bob Barr (R-Ga.), Apr. 16, 2013)

Anyone who has read or watched any news source over the past year knows President Obama, numerous Administration officials, and many leaders in Congress agree that addressing the threat of cyber attacks is a critical national priority. Based on this threat analysis, the administration and many members of Congress continue to push for passage of cybersecurity legislation that would clarify and expand the government's powers to receive and process traffic from American computer networks.

It would, however, be a mistake for Congress to rush to enact legislation that could militarize our computer networks, and pave the way for private companies to share vast quantities of sensitive and highly personal information with the government, all in the name of “cybersecurity.” Although a carefully-crafted “information sharing” program that includes robust protections for civil liberties could be an effective approach to cybersecurity, the bill about to come up for a vote in the House clearly fails this test.

The Cyber Intelligence Sharing and Protection Act (CISPA), H.R. 624, is set to be considered by the full House of Representatives later this month. Although the bill that emerged from markup by the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence (HPSCI) includes some improvements in privacy safeguards over the earlier version, CISPA's proponents have overstated the protections incorporated into the bill. As a result, members of Congress should vote against CISPA when it comes to the House floor.

Last year, The Constitution Project's bipartisan Liberty and Security Committee, on which I serve, prepared a detailed report on ways that Congress could protect our nation's computer networks from cyber threats, while at the same time preserving the constitutionally-guaranteed rights of Americans. Unfortunately, the drafters of CISPA failed to incorporate the robust safeguards we recommended.

Most critical, CISPA's sponsors have resisted all efforts to ensure that the new cybersecurity program would maintain civilian control of our nation's computer networks. CISPA would allow private companies, cloaked with broad immunity from legal liability, to share sensitive information such as internet records or the content of emails, with any agency in the government, including military and intelligence agencies. Sensitive personal information from private computer networks should not be shared directly with the military or the National Security Agency (NSA), the agency that gained widespread public notoriety seven years ago for its warrantless wiretapping program—hardly the agency we want to see tasked with receiving private internet traffic.

Sadly, the members of HPSCI voted down an amendment that would have ensured civilian control of computer networks, by specifying that when private companies share information with the federal government, they should not provide it to the NSA or any other military agency or department. This amendment would still have permitted the NSA to share its own expertise on cyber threats with the private sector, but would

have protected the information flowing into the government.

A second critical flaw with CISPA is that it fails to include meaningful limits on the extent of private sensitive information that companies can send into the government. The HPSCI also voted down an amendment requiring that before sharing cyber threat information with the government, companies must “make reasonable efforts” to remove “any information that can be used to identify a specific person unrelated to the cyber threat.” A similar provision was included in last year's Senate cybersecurity bill, and witnesses at a hearing before HPSCI earlier this year testified that companies can easily strip out personally identifiable information that is not necessary to address cyber threats. Yet CISPA still lacks any such safeguard.

It is true that from a privacy perspective, this version of CISPA is an improvement over last year's bill. Most notably, the bill no longer permits private information to be used for broad “national security uses” unrelated to cybersecurity. But it clearly is not sufficient. Congress must take the civil liberties threats created by this bill just as seriously as it takes the cyber threats the legislation purports to address. CISPA does not meet this test, and members of the House should just say no.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 624—CYBER INTELLIGENCE SHARING AND PROTECTION ACT

(Rep. Rogers, R-MI, and Rep. Ruppersberger, D-MD), Apr. 16, 2013)

Both government and private companies need cyber threat information to allow them to identify, prevent, and respond to malicious activity that can disrupt networks and could potentially damage critical infrastructure. The Administration believes that carefully updating laws to facilitate cybersecurity information sharing is one of several legislative changes essential to protect individuals' privacy and improve the Nation's cybersecurity. While there is bipartisan consensus on the need for such legislation, it should adhere to the following priorities: (1) carefully safeguard privacy and civil liberties; (2) preserve the long-standing, respective roles and missions of civilian and intelligence agencies; and (3) provide for appropriate sharing with targeted liability protections.

The Administration recognizes and appreciates that the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence (HPSCI) adopted several amendments to H.R. 624 in an effort to incorporate the Administration's important substantive concerns. However, the Administration still seeks additional improvements and if the bill, as currently crafted, were presented to the President, his senior advisors would recommend that he veto the bill. The Administration seeks to build upon the continuing dialogue with the HPSCI and stands ready to work with members of Congress to incorporate our core priorities to produce cybersecurity information sharing legislation that addresses these critical issues.

H.R. 624 appropriately requires the Federal Government to protect privacy when handling cybersecurity information. Importantly, the Committee removed the broad national security exemption, which significantly weakened the restrictions on how this information could be used by the government. The Administration, however, remains concerned that the bill does not require private entities to take reasonable steps to remove irrelevant personal information when sending cybersecurity data to the government or other private sector entities. Citizens have a right to know that corporations

will be held accountable—and not granted immunity—for failing to safeguard personal information adequately. The Administration is committed to working with all stakeholders to find a workable solution to this challenge. Moreover, the Administration is confident that such measures can be crafted in a way that is not overly onerous or cost prohibitive on the businesses sending the information. Further, the legislation should also explicitly ensure that cyber crime victims continue to report such crimes directly to Federal law enforcement agencies, and continue to receive the same protections that they do today.

The Administration supports the long-standing tradition to treat the Internet and cyberspace as civilian spheres, while recognizing that the Nation's cybersecurity requires shared responsibility from individual users, private sector network owners and operators, and the appropriate collaboration of civilian, law enforcement, and national security entities in government. H.R. 624 appropriately seeks to make clear that existing public-private relationships—whether voluntary, contractual, or regulatory—should be preserved and uninterrupted by this newly authorized information sharing. However, newly authorized information sharing for cybersecurity purposes from the private sector to the government should enter the government through a civilian agency, the Department of Homeland Security.

Recognizing that the government will continue to receive cybersecurity information through a range of civilian, law enforcement, and national security agencies, legislation must promote appropriate sharing within the government. As stated above, this sharing must be consistent with cybersecurity use restrictions, the cybersecurity responsibilities of the agencies involved, as well as privacy and civil liberties protections and transparent oversight. Such intra-governmental sharing and use should not be subject to undue restrictions by the private sector companies that originally share the information. To be successful in addressing the range of cyber threats the Nation faces, it is vital that intra-governmental sharing be accomplished in as near real-time as possible.

The Administration agrees with the need to clarify the application of existing laws to remove legal barriers to the private sector sharing appropriate, well-defined, cybersecurity information. Further, the Administration supports incentivizing industry to share appropriate cybersecurity information by providing the private sector with targeted liability protections. However, the Administration is concerned about the broad scope of liability limitations in H.R. 624. Specifically, even if there is no clear intent to do harm, the law should not immunize a failure to take reasonable measures, such as the sharing of information, to prevent harm when and if the entity knows that such inaction will cause damage or otherwise injure or endanger other entities or individuals.

Information sharing is one piece of larger set of legislative requirements to provide the private sector, the Federal Government, and law enforcement with the necessary tools to combat the current and emerging cyber threats facing the Nation. In addition to updating information sharing statutes, the Congress should incorporate privacy and civil liberties safeguards into all aspects of cybersecurity and enact legislation that: (1) strengthens the Nation's critical infrastructure's cybersecurity by promoting the establishment and adoption of standards for critical infrastructure; (2) updates laws guiding Federal agency network security; (3) gives law enforcement the tools to fight crime in the digital age; and (4) creates a National Data Breach Reporting requirement.

APRIL 15, 2013.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: Earlier this year, many of our organizations wrote to state our opposition to H.R. 624, the Cyber Intelligence Sharing and Protection Act of 2013 (CISPA). We write today to express our continued opposition to this bill following its markup by the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence (HPSCI). Although some amendments were adopted in markup to improve the bill's privacy safeguards, these amendments were woefully inadequate to cure the civil liberties threats posed by this bill. In particular, we remain gravely concerned that despite the amendments, this bill will allow companies that hold very sensitive and personal information to liberally share it with the government, including with military agencies.

CISPA creates an exception to all privacy laws to permit companies to share our information with each other and with the government in the name of cybersecurity. Although a carefully-crafted information sharing program that strictly limits the information to be shared and includes robust privacy safeguards could be an effective approach to cybersecurity, CISPA lacks such protections for individual rights. CISPA's information sharing regime allows the transfer of vast amounts of data, including sensitive information like internet records or the content of emails, to any agency in the government including military and intelligence agencies like the National Security Agency or the Department of Defense Cyber Command.

Developments over the last year make CISPA's approach even more questionable than before First, the President recently signed Executive Order 13636, which will increase information sharing from the government to the private sector. Information sharing in this direction is often cited as a substantial justification for CISPA and will proceed without legislation. Second, the cybersecurity legislation the Senate considered last year, S. 3414, included privacy protections for information sharing that are entirely absent from CISPA, and the Obama administration, including the intelligence community, has confirmed that those protections would not inhibit cybersecurity programs. These included provisions to ensure that private companies send cyber threat information only to civilian agencies, and a requirement that companies make "reasonable efforts" to remove personal information that is unrelated to the cyber threat when sharing data with the government. Finally, witnesses at a hearing before the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence confirmed earlier this year that companies can strip out personally identifiable information that is not necessary to address cyber threats, and CISPA omits any requirement that reasonable efforts be undertaken to do so.

We continue to oppose CISPA and encourage you to vote 'no.'

Sincerely,

Access; Advocacy for Principled Action in Government; American Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee; American Association of Law Libraries; American Civil Liberties Union; American Library Association; Amicus; Association of Research Libraries; Bill of Rights Defense Committee; Breadpig.com; Center for Democracy & Technology; Center for National Security Studies; Center for Rights; Competitive Enterprise Institute; The Constitution Project; Council on American-Islamic Relations; CREDO Action; Daily Kos; Defending Dissent Foundation; Demand Progress.

DownsizeDC.org, Inc.; Electronic Frontier Foundation; Fight for the Future; Free Press Action Fund; Government Accountability Project; Liberty Coalition; Mozilla; National

Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers; New American Foundation's Open Technology Institute; OpenMedia.org; PolitiHacks; Reddit; RootsAction.org; Tech Freedom.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 60 seconds again to say to my friend from Colorado that I know his concerns are heartfelt; but he knows, as I do, there's nothing that we can do in statute here today that would trump any of our civil liberties that are protected under the Constitution of the United States of America. The Constitution of the United States of America trumps all.

What we're doing here today, Mr. Speaker, is responding to a very serious national security threat, and we're doing so in a way that can give Americans great comfort that their civil liberties are every bit as protected today as they were yesterday. In fact, Mr. Speaker, in that these nation-states are hacking into these accounts and accessing our personal information every single day, I would tell you that we will actually have our privacy more protected in the presence of a secure Internet than we do today, as nation-states are frequently eroding our cybersecurity border here in the United States of America.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would advise my friend from Georgia that I'm the last speaker. If he is prepared to close, I am prepared to close.

Mr. WOODALL. I thank my friend. I have one speaker remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, at this time it is my great pleasure to yield as much time as he may consume to the chairman of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS).

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman, my dear friend from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL), not only for managing his rule, but for the time that he has invested not into just this issue, but the issues that come before the Rules Committee, and I want to thank him for his service.

I also want to thank, if I can, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS)—welcome back to the committee after a couple of days of being out with surgery—and for the vigorous hearing that we had yesterday at the Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, we had an opportunity to have Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, the leader for the Democrats from the Intelligence Committee, as well as MIKE ROGERS from Michigan, the chairman of the committee. Both came and vigorously talked about the things which are aimed at our country—cyber threats, nation-states, nations such as China, North Korea, and others who are trying to invade our Internet here in the United States and to steal not only information and data, but also thoughts, ideas, and money. So it gave

us an opportunity yesterday to have a great hearing, one which was full of detail, one which really offered intrigue by our Members and a lot of thought process by all those who came before the committee.

However, I would like to advise, if I can, that following the closing statements on the rule before us, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) will be offering an amendment to the rule that seeks to address concerns with the role of civilian Federal agencies in receiving the cyber information that would be transmitted from the private sector that is included in the underlying bill. This amendment was in negotiation yesterday and submitted for consideration to the Rules Committee, but the final compromise was not ready at the time that the committee finished its work product yesterday evening, so negotiations continued all last night and through this morning until today.

On a bipartisan basis, these negotiations have given us what I consider to be a good amendment with good merits and should be considered under this rule. The amendment has been vetted thoroughly by the five committees which share jurisdiction in this matter, including Ranking Members THOMPSON and RUPPERSBERGER, and, by the way, my colleague, the ranking member of the Rules Committee, Ms. SLAUGHTER.

If the rule is amended, the language would be offered by Mr. McCAUL, the chairman of the House Committee on Homeland Security. I'm confident that this work product and the work which we are bringing to this floor will continue to support not just the rule, but the legislation that would be before this House tomorrow by the Rules Committee.

So I believe that this helps not just the underlying bill, but really is a testament to the work on a bipartisan basis among our committees, among a lot of people who had a chance to look at not just jurisdictional issues, but the actual substance of trying to make protecting this country, its assets, and its people a reality now in law that the United States House of Representatives will fully debate tomorrow, vote on, and support.

Part of the role of the Rules Committee about this process has been to make sure that the final product that came to the floor of the House of Representatives was well vetted, received the attention that was necessary, and, perhaps more importantly, was leading-edge.

□ 1330

And, lastly, the most important thing is that we know what we've agreed to; that we know what we've agreed to where we're very clear about what the law is and the expectations of that performance.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee, my good friend, Mr. SESSIONS, for his explanation of the measure going forward. I certainly do not anticipate that my side will oppose the measure as offered.

In addition thereto, I would highlight what he did eloquently point out, and that is the bipartisan effort that has been put into this, including all of the negotiations leading up to now what will be the McCaul amendment offered by Mr. WOODALL.

CISPA, Mr. Speaker, provides the government and private sector with the tools they need to secure our networks and prevent future cyber attacks, while respecting the privacy of individuals.

In bringing private companies and trade groups to the table, as well as taking into consideration the concerns expressed by civil liberties organizations, CISPA has been improved to better address the growing cybersecurity risks faced by the Federal Government and private sector, provide greater oversight, and protect Americans' privacy. We can take significant steps to reduce our vulnerability to cyber threats today.

I have had the honor and privilege of meeting many of our intelligence professionals when I served as a member of the Intelligence Committee; and since that time, I cannot overstate how much I appreciate, and am humbled by, their service.

Furthermore, I want to take this moment of personal privilege to thank my good friends, Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member RUPPERSBERGER, and to underscore one of the unnoticed and hardworking staffs' efforts, and that would be the House Intelligence Committee staff, for their hard work and dedication in helping to see this and other measures having to do with the intelligence of this committee to the House floor, as well as in cooperation with their colleagues and ours at the United States Senate.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the rule and "yes" on the underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I thank my friend from Florida for his service on the Rules Committee and his service on the Intelligence Committee.

The work that goes on in the Intelligence Committee, Mr. Speaker, is work that so many Members of Congress do not involve themselves in. It goes on deep in the bowels of the Capitol Complex. It's under great security, all electronic devices left outside the door, so that they can discuss things within the four walls of that committee that we're not allowed to discuss here on the House floor.

In fact, when they asked me to handle the rule today, Mr. Speaker, I was a little concerned because throughout this process of developing CISPA, I traveled down to that committee room

time and time again in order to understand the threats that this Nation is facing, understand the challenges that this community of intelligence professionals is grappling with around the globe, and I don't want to be the one who shares those stories here on the House floor by mistake. I don't envy the gentleman from Florida having to balance being in that committee every single day, trying to protect the security of every single citizen, and not being able to come out of that committee room and share with, not just your colleagues here in the House, but your constituents back home, why it is you're doing the things that you do.

Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, what would have happened in World War II if we had to keep the bombing of Pearl Harbor a secret? It's a secret. Nobody knows. What do you think the support would have been, Mr. Speaker, for taking affirmative action in World War II? It would have been hard to generate that support. I would have voted "no."

There are things going on in this Nation and in this world today, Mr. Speaker, that our Intelligence Committee grapples with, that our intelligence professionals grapple with, things that are frightening, and things that threaten the liberty of this country and the economic security of this country. Now, I don't want to be a fear-monger, Mr. Speaker. What I love about this country is no matter what the challenge is, we are great enough collectively to rise to meet it.

In this case, we happen to need to rise to meet it in a subject matter that is near and dear to the heart of every American, which is my Internet privacy. I care a lot about Internet privacy, Mr. Speaker. I've got a VPN system set up so nobody is listening in on my Wi-Fi. I change my password about every 10 days to make sure nobody is making any progress towards hacking my system. I'll occasionally go on the Internet and use one of those anonymizers to make sure my IP address isn't being tracked when I'm looking at things that perhaps my friends in Congress, I'm trying to get a bill done, I don't want you to know I'm getting that bill done. Who knows what those people down in HIR, House Information Resources, what they're tracking that we do here? We have tools available to us in that way, Mr. Speaker.

But do you know who I can't outsmart? Perhaps I can outsmart my next-door neighbor who wants to piggyback on my Wi-Fi system. Perhaps I can outsmart the guy at the hotel who is trying to piggyback on my information there in the hotel room. Perhaps I can even outsmart the U.S. House of Representatives. But what I can't outsmart is that team of cyber warriors gathered by nation-states around the globe who are hacking my information and your information every single day, stealing our intellectual property, stealing our military technology, threatening the privacies that we've

talked so much about here on the floor today.

I'm very glad, Mr. Speaker, that as you page through this bill, you will find line after line after line aimed at protecting your and my privacy. I think we do a good job of finding that balance. We even will offer amendments today on the floor to do even better. But without security at the Internet border, I have no protection of my privacy because those agents of the state of China, North Korea, and beyond are accessing that information today.

Mr. Speaker, it's been 18 months that we've been working to craft that balance of privacy and security. We'll continue to work on that throughout 12 amendments here today. I urge my colleagues, look through this resolution, look through H.R. 624 to see the efforts that have gone into crafting this bipartisan piece of legislation; and look at those 12 amendments, look at those 12 amendments that we'll have an opportunity to vote on over the next 2 days to make this bill even better. But the time for delay, Mr. Speaker, has passed us, and the cost of delay is most certainly measured in dollars, and I fear it is measured in lives.

Let's move forward with this bill today, Mr. Speaker. I urge strong support for the rule, and I urge strong support after the debate of these 12 amendments on the underlying legislation.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WOODALL

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I offer an amendment to the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, the amendment specified in section 3 shall be in order as though printed as the last amendment in House Report 113-41 if offered by Representative McCaul of Texas or his designee. That amendment shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

SEC. 3. The amendment referred to in section 2 is as follows: After section 1, insert the following new section (and renumber subsequent sections accordingly):

“SEC. 2. FEDERAL GOVERNMENT COORDINATION WITH RESPECT TO CYBERSECURITY.

“(a) COORDINATED ACTIVITIES.—The Federal Government shall conduct cybersecurity activities to provide shared situational awareness that enables integrated operational actions to protect, prevent, mitigate, respond to, and recover from cyber incidents.

“(b) COORDINATED INFORMATION SHARING.—

“(1) DESIGNATION OF COORDINATING ENTITY FOR CYBER THREAT INFORMATION.—The President shall designate an entity within the Department of Homeland Security as the civilian Federal entity to receive cyber threat information that is shared by a cybersecurity provider or self-protected entity in accordance with section 1104(b) of the National Security Act of 1947, as added by section 3(a) of this Act, except as provided in paragraph (2) and subject to the procedures established under paragraph (4).

“(2) DESIGNATION OF A COORDINATING ENTITY FOR CYBERSECURITY CRIMES.—The President

shall designate an entity within the Department of Justice as the civilian Federal entity to receive cyber threat information related to cybersecurity crimes that is shared by a cybersecurity provider or self-protected entity in accordance with section 1104(b) of the National Security Act of 1947, as added by section 3(a) of this Act, subject to the procedures under paragraph (4).

“(3) SHARING BY COORDINATING ENTITIES.—The entities designated under paragraphs (1) and (2) shall share cyber threat information shared with such entities in accordance with section 1104(b) of the National Security Act of 1947, as added by section 3(a) of this Act, consistent with the procedures established under paragraphs (4) and (5).

“(4) PROCEDURES.—Each department or agency of the Federal Government receiving cyber threat information shared in accordance with section 1104(b) of the National Security Act of 1947, as added by section 3(a) of this Act, shall establish procedures to—

“(A) ensure that cyber threat information shared with departments or agencies of the Federal Government in accordance with such section 1104(b) is also shared with appropriate departments and agencies of the Federal Government with a national security mission in real time;

“(B) ensure the distribution to other departments and agencies of the Federal Government of cyber threat information in real time; and

“(C) facilitate information sharing, interaction, and collaboration among and between the Federal Government; State, local, tribal, and territorial governments; and cybersecurity providers and self-protected entities.

“(5) PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES.—

“(A) POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.—The Secretary of Homeland Security, the Attorney General, the Director of National Intelligence, and the Secretary of Defense shall jointly establish and periodically review policies and procedures governing the receipt, retention, use, and disclosure of non-publicly available cyber threat information shared with the Federal Government in accordance with section 1104(b) of the National Security Act of 1947, as added by section 3(a) of this Act. Such policies and procedures shall, consistent with the need to protect systems and networks from cyber threats and mitigate cyber threats in a timely manner—

“(i) minimize the impact on privacy and civil liberties;

“(ii) reasonably limit the receipt, retention, use, and disclosure of cyber threat information associated with specific persons that is not necessary to protect systems or networks from cyber threats or mitigate cyber threats in a timely manner;

“(iii) include requirements to safeguard non-publicly available cyber threat information that may be used to identify specific persons from unauthorized access or acquisition;

“(iv) protect the confidentiality of cyber threat information associated with specific persons to the greatest extent practicable; and

“(v) not delay or impede the flow of cyber threat information necessary to defend against or mitigate a cyber threat.

“(B) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary of Homeland Security, the Attorney General, the Director of National Intelligence, and the Secretary of Defense shall, consistent with the need to protect sources and methods, jointly submit to Congress the policies and procedures required under subparagraph (A) and any updates to such policies and procedures.

“(C) IMPLEMENTATION.—The head of each department or agency of the Federal Govern-

ment receiving cyber threat information shared with the Federal Government under such section 1104(b) shall—

“(i) implement the policies and procedures established under subparagraph (A); and

“(ii) promptly notify the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Attorney General, the Director of National Intelligence, the Secretary of Defense, and the appropriate congressional committees of any significant violations of such policies and procedures.

“(D) OVERSIGHT.—The Secretary of Homeland Security, the Attorney General, the Director of National Intelligence, and the Secretary of Defense shall jointly establish a program to monitor and oversee compliance with the policies and procedures established under subparagraph (A).

“(6) INFORMATION SHARING RELATIONSHIPS.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to—

“(A) alter existing agreements or prohibit new agreements with respect to the sharing of cyber threat information between the Department of Defense and an entity that is part of the defense industrial base;

“(B) alter existing information-sharing relationships between a cybersecurity provider, protected entity, or self-protected entity and the Federal Government;

“(C) prohibit the sharing of cyber threat information directly with a department or agency of the Federal Government for criminal investigative purposes related to crimes described in section 1104(c)(1) of the National Security Act of 1947, as added by section 3(a) of this Act; or

“(D) alter existing agreements or prohibit new agreements with respect to the sharing of cyber threat information between the Department of Treasury and an entity that is part of the financial services sector.

“(7) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—

“(A) DISCUSSIONS AND ASSISTANCE.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit any department or agency of the Federal Government from engaging in formal or informal technical discussion regarding cyber threat information with a cybersecurity provider or self-protected entity or from providing technical assistance to address vulnerabilities or mitigate threats at the request of such a provider or such an entity.

“(B) COORDINATION.—Any department or agency of the Federal Government engaging in an activity referred to in subparagraph (A) shall coordinate such activity with the entity of the Department of Homeland Security designated under paragraph (1) and share all significant information resulting from such activity with such entity and all other appropriate departments and agencies of the Federal Government.

“(C) SHARING BY DESIGNATED ENTITY.—Consistent with the policies and procedures established under paragraph (5), the entity of the Department of Homeland Security designated under paragraph (1) shall share with all appropriate departments and agencies of the Federal Government all significant information resulting from—

“(i) formal or informal technical discussions between such entity of the Department of Homeland Security and a cybersecurity provider or self-protected entity about cyber threat information; or

“(ii) any technical assistance such entity of the Department of Homeland Security provides to such cybersecurity provider or such self-protected entity to address vulnerabilities or mitigate threats.

“(c) REPORTS ON INFORMATION SHARING.—

“(1) INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY REPORT.—The Inspector General of the Department of Homeland Security, in consultation with the

Inspector General of the Department of Justice, the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community, the Inspector General of the Department of Defense, and the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board, shall annually submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report containing a review of the use of information shared with the Federal Government under subsection (b) of section 1104 of the National Security Act of 1947, as added by section 3(a) of this Act, including—

“(A) a review of the use by the Federal Government of such information for a purpose other than a cybersecurity purpose;

“(B) a review of the type of information shared with the Federal Government under such subsection;

“(C) a review of the actions taken by the Federal Government based on such information;

“(D) appropriate metrics to determine the impact of the sharing of such information with the Federal Government on privacy and civil liberties, if any;

“(E) a list of the departments or agencies receiving such information;

“(F) a review of the sharing of such information within the Federal Government to identify inappropriate stovepiping of shared information; and

“(G) any recommendations of the Inspector General of the Department of Homeland Security for improvements or modifications to the authorities under such section.

“(2) PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES OFFICERS REPORT.—The Officer for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties of the Department of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board, the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community, and the senior privacy and civil liberties officer of each department or agency of the Federal Government that receives cyber threat information shared with the Federal Government under such subsection (b), shall annually and jointly submit to Congress a report assessing the privacy and civil liberties impact of the activities conducted by the Federal Government under such section 1104. Such report shall include any recommendations the Civil Liberties Protection Officer and Chief Privacy and Civil Liberties Officer consider appropriate to minimize or mitigate the privacy and civil liberties impact of the sharing of cyber threat information under such section 1104.

“(3) FORM.—Each report required under paragraph (1) or (2) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

“(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ‘appropriate congressional committees’ means—

“(A) the Committee on Homeland Security, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives; and

“(B) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Select Committee on Intelligence, and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate.

“(2) CYBER THREAT INFORMATION, CYBER THREAT INTELLIGENCE, CYBERSECURITY CRIMES, CYBERSECURITY PROVIDER, CYBERSECURITY PURPOSE, AND SELF-PROTECTED ENTITY.—The terms ‘cyber threat information’, ‘cyber threat intelligence’, ‘cybersecurity crimes’, ‘cybersecurity provider’, ‘cybersecurity purpose’, and ‘self-protected entity’ have the meaning given those terms in section 1104 of the National Security Act of 1947, as added by section 3(a) of this Act.

“(3) INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.—The term ‘intelligence community’ has the meaning

given the term in section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 401a(4)).

“(4) SHARED SITUATIONAL AWARENESS.—The term ‘shared situational awareness’ means an environment where cyber threat information is shared in real time between all designated Federal cyber operations centers to provide actionable information about all known cyber threats.”.

Page 5, strike line 6 and all that follows through page 6, line 7.

Page 7, beginning on line 17, strike “by the department or agency of the Federal Government receiving such cyber threat information”.

Page 13, strike line 13 and all that follows through page 15, line 23.

Page 17, strike line 15 and all that follows through page 19, line 19.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the amendment and on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution, as amended.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 227, nays 192, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 109]
YEAS—227

Aderholt, Davis, Rodney, Hudson
Alexander, Denham, Huelskamp
Amash, Dent, Huizenga (MI)
Amodei, DeSantis, Hultgren
Bachus, DesJarlais, Hunter
Barber, Diaz-Balart, Issa
Barletta, Duffy, Jenkins
Barr, Duncan (SC), Johnson (OH)
Barton, Duncan (TN), Johnson, Sam
Benishek, Ellmers, Jordan
Bentivolio, Farenthold, Joyce
Bilirakis, Fincher, Kelly (PA)
Bishop (UT), Fitzpatrick, King (IA)
Black, Fleischmann, King (NY)
Bonner, Fleming, Kingston
Boustany, Flores, Kinzinger (IL)
Brady (TX), Forbes, Kline
Bridenstine, Fortenberry, Labrador
Brooks (AL), Pox, LaMalfa
Brooks (IN), Franks (AZ), Lamborn
Broun (GA), Frelinghuysen, Long
Buchanan, Gardner, Lankford
Bucshon, Garrett, Latham
Burgess, Gerlach, Latta
Calvert, Gibbs, LoBiondo
Camp, Gibson, Long
Campbell, Gingrey (GA), Lucas
Cantor, Goodlatte, Luetkemeyer
Capito, Gosar, Lummis
Carter, Gowdy, Marchant
Cassidy, Granger, Marino
Chabot, Graves (GA), Massie
Chaffetz, Graves (MO), Matheson
Coble, Griffin (AR), McCarthy (CA)
Coffman, Griffith (VA), McCaul
Cole, Grimm, McHenry
Collins (GA), Guthrie, McIntyre
Collins (NY), Gutierrez, McKeon
Conaway, Hall, McKinley
Cook, Hanna, McMorris
Costa, Harper, Rodgers
Cotton, Harris, Meadows
Cramer, Hartzler, Meehan
Crawford, Hastings (WA), Messer
Crenshaw, Heck (NV), Mica
Culberson, Hensarling, Miller (FL)
Daines, Herrera Beutler, Miller (MI)

Mullin, Roe (TN), Stivers
Mulvaney, Rogers (AL), Stutzman
Murphy (PA), Rogers (KY), Terry
Neugebauer, Rogers (MI), Thompson (PA)
Noem, Rokita, Thornberry
Nugent, Rooney, Tiberi
Nunes, Ros-Lehtinen, Tipton
Nunnelee, Roskam, Turner
Olson, Ross, Upton
Owens, Rothfus, Valadao
Palazzo, Royce, Wagner
Paulsen, Runyan, Walberg
Pearce, Ruppertsberger, Walden
Perry, Ryan (WI), Walorski
Petri, Salmon, Weber (TX)
Pittenger, Scalise, Webster (FL)
Pitts, Schneider, Wenstrup
Poe (TX), Schock, Whitfield
Pompeo, Schweikert, Williams
Posey, Scott, Austin, Wilson (SC)
Price (GA), Sensenbrenner, Wittman
Radel, Sessions, Wolf
Reed, Shuster, Womack
Reichert, Simpson, Woodall
Renacci, Smith (NE), Yoder
Ribble, Smith (NJ), Yoho
Rice (SC), Smith (TX), Young (AK)
Rigell, Southerland, Young (FL)
Roby, Stewart, Young (IN)

NAYS—192

Andrews, Green, Al, O'Rourke
Barrow (GA), Green, Gene, Pallone
Bass, Grijalva, Pascrell
Beatty, Hahn, Pastor (AZ)
Becerra, Hanabusa, Payne
Bera (CA), Hastings (FL), Pelosi
Bishop (GA), Heck (WA), Perlmutter
Bishop (NY), Higgins, Peters (CA)
Blumenauer, Himes, Peters (MI)
Bonamici, Hinojosa, Peterson
Brady (PA), Holt, Pingree (ME)
Bralley (IA), Honda, Pocan
Brown (FL), Horsford, Polis
Brownley (CA), Hoyer, Price (NC)
Bustos, Huffman, Quigley
Butterfield, Israel, Rahall
Capps, Jackson Lee, Richmond
Capuano, Jeffries, Rohrabacher
Cárdenas, Johnson (GA), Roybal-Allard
Carney, Johnson, E. B., Ruiz
Darson (IN), Jones, Rush
Cartwright, Kaptur, Ryan (OH)
Castor (FL), Keating, Sánchez, Linda
Castro (TX), Kelly (IL), T.
Chu, Kildee, Sanchez, Loretta
Ciocline, Kilmer, Sarbanes
Clarke, Kind, Schakowsky
Clay, Kirkpatrick, Schiff
Cleaver, Kuster, Schrader
Clyburn, Langevin, Schwartz
Cohen, Larsen (WA), Scott (VA)
Connolly, Larson (CT), Scott, David
Conyers, Lee (CA), Serrano
Cooper, Levin, Sewell (AL)
Courtney, Flores, Lewis
Crowley, Lipinski, Shea-Porter
Cuellar, Loebsock, Sherman
Cummings, Lofgren, Sinema
Davis (CA), Lowenthal, Sires
Davis, Danny, Lowey, Slaughter
DeFazio, Lujan Grisham, Smith (WA)
DeGette, (NM), Speier
Delaney, Luján, Ben Ray, Stockman
DelBene, (NM), Swalwell (CA)
DeLauro, Maffei, Takano
DelBene, Long, Maffei
Deutch, Maloney, Thompson (CA)
Dingell, Carolyn, Thompson (MS)
Doggett, Maloney, Sean, Tierney
Doyle, Matsui, Titus
Duckworth, McCarthy (NY), Tonko
Edwards, McClintock, Tsongas
Ellison, McCollum, Van Hollen
Engel, McDermott, Vargas
Enyart, McGovern, Veasey
Eshoo, McHenry, Vela
Esty, Meeks, Velázquez
Farr, Meng, Visclosky
Fattah, Michaud, Walz
Foster, Miller, George, Wasserman
Frankel (FL), Moore, Schultz
Fudge, Moran, Waters
Gabbard, Murphy (FL), Watt
Gallo, Nadler, Waxman
Garamendi, Napolitano, Welch
Garcia, Negrete McLeod, Wilson (FL)
Grayson, Nolan, Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—13

Bachmann	Kennedy	Rangel
Blackburn	Lynch	Shimkus
Gohmert	Markey	Westmoreland
Holding	Miller, Gary	
Hurt	Neal	

□ 1418

Mr. RAHALL, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CÁRDENAS and Ms. WILSON of Florida changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. KING of New York, YOHO and AMASH changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO THE BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois). The Chair announces the Speaker’s appointment, pursuant to 14 U.S.C. 194, and the order of the House of January 3, 2013, of the following Members on the part of the House to the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy:

Mr. COBLE, North Carolina
Mr. COURTNEY, Connecticut

□ 1420

CYBER INTELLIGENCE SHARING AND PROTECTION ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill H.R. 624.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 164 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 624.

The Chair appoints the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1422

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 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, with Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank my ranking member and both the Republican and Democratic staffs and the Republican and Democratic members of the Intelligence Committee for 2 years of long hours in negotiated efforts to reach the point that we are.

I want to back up just a little bit and tell you how we got to where we are today. We sat down some 2 years ago when the ranking member and I assumed the leadership of the Intelligence Committee and we looked at the one threat that we knew existed but we were not prepared to handle as Americans, both the private sector and the government. And we knew that we had to do something about this new and growing and misunderstood cyber threat and what it was doing to our intellectual property across the country, what it was doing to the freedom and open Internet that we so enjoy and are increasingly dependent on and the commercial value of our growing economy. And it was at risk. The private sector was at risk because people were stealing their identities, their accounts, their intellectual property, and subsequent to that, their jobs, and people began to question the value of getting on the Internet and using it for commercial purposes. Their trust in the free and open Internet the way we’ve embraced it in the United States really was at risk.

How do we solve that problem? We knew that nation states were investing millions and billions of dollars to generate cyber warriors to go in and crack your computer network. I don’t care if you had intellectual property—those blueprints that made your business successful, or maybe it was your bank account, or your ability to have a transaction. If they could interrupt that, they could do great harm to our economy and to the United States.

We saw nation-states like Russia and China and now Iran and North Korea and others developing military-style attacks to actually do harm to the U.S. economy, to hurt the very men and women who get up every day and play by the rules and think that the Internet would be a safe place for them to interact when it comes to commerce. We want that to continue.

So we sat down and we talked to industry folks, people who are in the business, high-tech industry folks from Silicon Valley, financial services folks from New York City, manufacturers from across the Midwest, who were losing intellectual property due to theft from nation-states like China. We talked to privacy groups. We talked to the executive branch. And over the last 2 years, there were some 19 adjustments to this bill on privacy.

We believe this: this bill will not work if Americans don’t have confidence that it will protect your privacy and civil liberties while allowing one very simple thing to happen: cyber threat material, that malware that goes on your computer and does bad things, allows somebody else to take over your computer to attack a bank, allows them to go on your computer and steal your personally identifiable information and use it in a crime, allows them to go into your network at work and steal your most valuable company secrets that keep you alive and build great products here in the United States—could we allow the government to share what they know with the private sector and allow the private sector to share when it comes to just that cyber threat, those zeros and ones in a pattern that equates to malicious code traveling at hundreds of millions of times a second the speed of light, can we share that in a way to stop them from getting in and stealing your private information?

And the good news is the answer is, yes, we can do this. We can protect privacy and civil liberties, and we can allow this sharing arrangement, but not of your identity, not of your personally identifiable information. As a matter of fact, if that’s what’s happening, it won’t work. But at the speed of light, from machine to machine, from your Internet service provider before it ever gets into your network they bounce out the nastiest stuff that’s in there that’s going to take over your computer, steal your money, steal your personally identifiable information, steal your company secrets. And they can identify that by a pattern and kick it out. They’ll say, Something looks bad about that. Can the government take a look at that and say, you know what? This is a Chinese attack, it’s an Iranian attack, it’s a North Korean attack—let’s defend our networks. It’s really very simple.

Today, what you see is a collaborative effort. This isn’t a bill by DUTCH RUPPERSBERGER and MIKE ROGERS and this is the only way it has to be. We have taken suggestions from all the groups I just talked about, from privacy to the executive branch to industry to other trade associations. And this is the bill that mutually all of those people, representing tens of millions of employees around this country, said this is the way you do this and protect the free and open Internet and you protect civil liberties. And you finally raise that big red sign that tells people like China and Iran and Russia, stop. We’re going to prevent you from stealing America’s prosperity.

I heard a lot of debate earlier on the rule. I’ve heard a lot of misinformation. There are people who don’t like it for whatever reason, maybe it’s conviction, maybe it’s politics, maybe it’s political theater. And I have a feeling there’s a little bit of all of that when they talk about this bill.

This bill does none of the things I’ve heard talked about in the rule—that

it's an exchange of information that they've never seen with the government. This is not a surveillance bill. It does not allow the national security agencies or the Department of Defense or any of our military organizations to monitor our domestic networks. It does not allow that to happen. We would not allow that to happen.

□ 1430

So some notion that that's happening is just wrong, and some of the folks who are pretending otherwise know it's wrong. This is important.

You know, the Iranians, by public report, are laughing at our shores, looking for weaknesses in our financial institutions. They're not doing it for benevolence. They're doing it to try to create chaos in our markets here at home. This isn't 10 years or 20 years. This is today. It's happening today.

The average credit card in your purse, Madam Chair, will be hit 300,000 times today by bad actors trying to get in and steal your personal information—all those cardholders' information—and use it to commit a crime.

Today, hundreds of millions of times across this great country companies will be besieged by DDoS attacks trying to overwhelm their systems and shut them down and not allow commerce to happen, by people who are trying to get into their networks and steal something valuable.

This bill is that right balance between our privacy, civil liberties, and stopping bad guys in their tracks from ruining what is one-sixth of the U.S. economy. It's that important, and it's important that we get at it today.

We must do more to improve our cybersecurity, and this bill is that vital first step toward that bill. Our intelligence agencies collect important information overseas about advanced foreign cyber threats that could dramatically assist the private sector. That information is the intelligence community's unique value-added when it comes to our cybersecurity.

Unfortunately, we are not getting the full value of those intelligence insights. As I said, the intelligence community is not monitoring the Internet. They don't know what's happening on the domestic Internet. So when there is a nasty piece of source code or malicious source code attacking the private sector, the only way we're going to know that is if we—and these folks are victims of crime, by the way—if we allow them, in a classified environment, to share malicious source codes—zeros and ones in the right pattern—with the government and say, Hey, I am the victim of a crime. Here's what it looks like. Can you help? The government needs to be able to share this threat intelligence so that the private sector can protect its own networks.

The government is going to reciprocate. Our intelligence services go overseas. They find out what the bad guys are doing. They come back and

protect the government networks. The problem is, because of laws and policies and procedures, we can't share that with the private sector so they can protect their own networks. Wouldn't it be great if they know what's coming? If you know what you're looking for, you can stop it. That's really what we're talking about doing here, Madam Chair.

We must also modernize the law to give the private sector clear authority to share cyber threat information within the private sector, as well as the government, on a voluntary, anonymous basis.

Again, if you believe in the free and open Internet and you look at all the bills that have been introduced, there is a chomping at the bit in this town to go out and try to put their mitts on the Internet. They want to get in there and start regulating and standards and setting up procedures. They want to get in from business-to-business communication. They want the government to be at every corner of the Internet. I reject that wholly. It's the wrong approach. It will not work. It will bring the Internet to a halt. This is the only bill that doesn't have new mandates, new authorizations for any government involvement in the Internet.

It does something very simple. I'm going to repeat it a lot today, Madam Chair. It allows the government to share zeros and ones in the right pattern with the private sector. And zeros and ones from the private sector, when they know it's malicious and attacking their networks, they share it with the government and say, This is a problem. Can you help me? That's what this bill does. And we've got a long list of privacy protections and restrictions to make sure that that's all that this bill does. The bill achieves all of these important goals that I just walked through, and it will empower the private sector, which already does significant work to protect computer networks, to do even more.

The bill will allow the government to share cyber threat intelligence more widely with American companies in operationally usable form so they can help prevent state-sponsored cyber spies from stealing American trade secrets. It also provides clear, positive authority to allow companies to share cyber threat information with others in the private sector. It also provides authority to allow those companies to share threat information on a purely voluntary and anonymized basis with the government, meaning no personal identifying information.

This bill will not require additional Federal spending. It will not require the creation of a vast new government bureaucracy. It will not impose any Federal regulations or unfunded mandates on the private sector. To the contrary, it will be a critical, bipartisan first step toward enabling America's private sector to better defend itself from the advanced state-sponsored cyber threats in which we live in today.

I'm very proud of the open and transparent process that produced this bill. We've had a great conversation over the last 2 years with a broad range of private sector companies, trade groups, privacy and civil liberties advocates, and the executive branch. I appreciate all the constructive input we have received from the process. This bill has been revised every step of the way in this process, and all of that has been based on discussions with all the groups I just mentioned.

I just want to cover some of the privacy protections we've added along the way.

The bill prohibits the government from requiring private sector entities to provide information to the government. There is nothing in here that has any requirement that the private sector must share cyber threat information. If they don't think it's in their best interest to stop that cyber crime, they don't have to say a word. If they do, they're allowed to share just that cyber threat information with the right agencies in real time. Again, this is machine to machine so that they can deal with the international nature of that threat.

It encourages the private sector to anonymize or minimize the information it voluntarily shares with others, including the government.

In addition, the bill requires an annual independent inspector general audit and report to Congress of all voluntary information sharing with the government. That's another layer of oversight. We have built multiple layers of oversight into this bill so that we can gain the confidence of the public in its purpose, intent, and success.

The bill significantly limits the Federal Government's use of information voluntarily provided by the private sector, including a restriction on the government's ability to search that data—very important.

The bill also enforces the restrictions on the government by levying penalties against the government through Federal court lawsuits for any violations of those restrictions. Again, another layer of oversight.

In the markup, we've made some progress, as well, between the ranking member and the members on the committee negotiating and working out what changes we can make to, again, improve the confidence that people have in this bill. We have improved this bill every step of the way for the last 2 years, and the markup was no different. At our markup, which voted the bill out of committee on a strong 18-2 vote, we adopted five important amendments to further strengthen the bill's protections and safeguards.

We adopted an amendment by Mr. LANGEVIN that made it clear that the bill contained no new authority to allow companies to hack back into networks in other companies. It certainly wasn't intended in the legislation. I thought it was a well-intended amendment. The last thing we want to do is

unleash digital vigilantism across the country and what that might do to our ability to continue to rely on the Internet as an engine of commerce.

We've put in place the private sector use restriction that limits companies' use of information received to only cybersecurity purposes. Mr. HECK and Mr. HIMES worked diligently on this amendment to improve the bill and make it very clear that this is just about cybersecurity and cybersecurity purposes.

The bill previously gave the government authorization to create procedures to protect privacy and civil liberties and prevent the government's retention of personal information not necessary to understand a cyber threat. Last week's amendment makes those procedures mandatory. That was by Mr. HIMES. We agreed that was the right place to put the burden to make sure there was no personal identifiable information that was not necessary to determine the nature of the attack.

We also struck the bill's authorized government "national security" use of information received from the private sector. This would have provided the government flexibility in the future to address advanced cybersecurity threats. In conversations with government national security lawyers in recent months, they assured us that this flexibility wouldn't be required in the near future. In light of that, and given the widespread misunderstanding this language was generating, we thought it was prudent to take it out. Ms. SEWELL from Alabama offered that amendment and worked with the committee to make sure it was adopted.

We also added additional oversight in the already very strong oversight structure in the bill to monitor the government's receipt and use of cyber threat information voluntarily provided by the private sector. We added roles for the Privacy and Civil Liberties Board and the individual agency privacy officers to provide additional oversight of the government's use of information received from the private sector under this bill.

I'm also very proud to cosponsor an amendment today with Mr. MCCAUL and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER and myself that would put a civilian face on the privacy sector cyber information sharing with this government. It was a concern by many. It was something we had long debates and conversations on, and I think we came to an agreement that will at least end that debate. It puts the appropriate civilian face so that, again, people can have confidence in the intention of this bill and what it will do to protect cybersecurity on networks or allow the private sector to protect their own networks and protect civil liberties of Americans.

□ 1440

Other elements of the government, such as the intelligence community, will still receive the information they

need to play their important roles, but only after it has been minimized and screened by a civilian entity like the DHS or, in some rare cases, the FBI.

This bill already contains several levels of strong protections to ensure that it improves cybersecurity without compromising our important civil liberties, but this bill will add a significant new privacy protection to that existing structure.

Again, Madam Chair, you can see the level of effort that we are doing here to protect privacy and civil liberties and still have a workable bill that stops nation-states like China, Russia, Iran, and North Korea from getting into your networks and stealing your property.

We have yet to find a single U.S. company that opposes this bill. In fact, we have the enthusiastic support of nearly every sector of the economy, because they are under assault from foreign cyber attacks and they need our help. They need it now. Companies and industry groups from across the country, including Intel, the chip maker, IBM, the Internet Security Alliance, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the Business Roundtable, TechAmerica, TechNet, companies of Silicon Valley, the Financial Services Roundtable, U.S. Telecom, the Nuclear Energy Institute, and the National Association of Manufacturers, just to name a few, have sent the committee letters of support. And that list is growing by the day of people who are encouraged by the very light touch of the government; no new programs, no new authorizations, it's not a surveillance bill. This is the only appropriate way to try to deal with this problem.

By allowing the private sector to expand its own cyber defense efforts and to employ classified information to protect systems and networks, this bill will harness private-sector drive and innovation while also keeping the government out of the business of monitoring and guarding private-sector networks.

This important legislation would enable cyber threat sharing and provide clear authority for the private sector to defend its own networks while providing strong protections for privacy and civil liberties.

Madam Chair, with this great collaborative effort, with the effort facing this country, when you see this many Republicans and Democrats coming together, recognizing the threat and crafting a bill that meets that very important standard, this is the bill we should all stand up and enthusiastically support, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Madam Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ) for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request.

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

Mr. GUTIERREZ. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chair, as a member of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, I am very familiar with the types of threats that this country faces every day and the serious ramifications of cyber vulnerabilities. This is an issue to which the committee has devoted a great deal of time and energy during the last year.

In the cyber security realm these threats are growing in frequency and severity, so much so that the Director of National Intelligence, James Clapper, identified cyber security as a top threat facing this country earlier this year. Director Clapper stated in an open hearing just a month ago that the growing cyber capabilities of both state and non-state actors "put all sectors of our county at risk, from government and private networks to critical infrastructures." We have seen more and more brazen attacks, from financial institutions and banks to news outlets, credit card companies, telecommunications providers and even government entities.

I believe that we should make every effort to safeguard the privacy of Americans' personal information even as we take steps to prevent attacks to our electronic networks and attempts to steal trade secrets, facilitate critical information sharing, and protect our critical infrastructure.

To that end, the committee made a number of improvements to the bill with bipartisan support during our markup last week. Most notably, we voted to remove the authority for private information to be used for broad non-cyber "national security" purposes. We also expanded oversight responsibilities for the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board and restricted usage of information received by private entities to cyber security information. The bill also requires the government to minimize any personal information that is unrelated to a cyber threat. The bill has improved since the last time it was considered by the House of Representatives in 2012.

I understand that there remain areas of concern for some of my colleagues. I share your reservations and am disappointed that we were unable to adopt amendments to address some of the liability issues, require private sector entities to make "reasonable efforts" to remove irrelevant personally identifiable information, and establish the Department of Homeland Security as the primary receptor of cyber threat information. An amendment to place DHS as the primary agency was not made in order today and I hope that we can continue to work on an agreement to do that.

I am sensitive to these privacy concerns and hope that we can continue to improve the Cyber Intelligence Sharing and Protection Act through amendments today and ongoing dialogue. However, my underlying concerns about the national security implications of ever-present and even escalating cyber attacks compels me to support the bill today.

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

Chairman ROGERS and I are here today to discuss the Cyber Intelligence Sharing and Protection Act, known as CISP. The bill simply allows the government to give cyber threat intelligence to the private sector to protect its networks from cyber attacks.

I don't want to repeat a lot of what the chairman has said, but the first

thing I want to do is to acknowledge the leadership of the chairman. Three years ago, the chairman and I, when we took over the leadership of the House Select Intelligence Committee, realized how serious the threat of cyber attacks were to our country, to our businesses, to our health, safety, and welfare.

We decided to pull together a group of representatives from different parts of this issue—we had the administration involved, we had the privacy groups involved, including the ACLU, we brought in the industry—because we knew that we had to put together a bill that would pass the House, the Senate and be signed by the President.

So, what we attempted to do was get input, and then we put together a bill. And, by the way, the bill is only 27 pages—it's probably a record in this Congress—and we did read the bill.

Now, what we attempted to do in this bill is to address a situation where now, the government cannot really communicate with the private sector to try to help protect our citizens, our businesses from cyber attacks. The reason for that is in 1947, there is a law that says that the intelligence community cannot communicate or pass information to another entity that does not have clearances. So, basically what our bill does is to allow the sharing of information, which we can't do now, to the private sector.

Now, why is this important? This is something that is very important because most people don't understand this. In the United States of America we have 10 companies, called the providers, that control 80 percent of our network—80 percent of our network. So in order for us to protect the United States of America from cyber attacks, we need to make sure that the government has a partnership with the private sector and that they can pass the threat information so that the government can help protect.

As an example, if your house is being robbed, you call 911 and the police department comes. That's the same scenario that we're looking at here, only it's a lot more sophisticated. Again, as the chairman said, passing information, mostly zeroes and ones, to the government so that we can work together to protect our network.

Now, why is this so important? And I think it's important that we get into some of the issues of threats. Just recently, we understand, and we know, that The Washington Post, The New York Times, The Wall Street Journal, were cyber-attacked. And basically, our understanding is that they did this, especially China, to intimidate the paper sources within China. We had our U.S. banks. It is very serious for U.S. banks to be attacked and hacked. Most of what our banks have are records and information. And to be able to shut down a bank or to be able to manipulate or get privacy information could be very destructive to our banks, and yet this is being done, and it's been done for a period of time.

Media reports have said that Iran, a rogue country that we know exports terrorism—we know what Iran's beliefs are, and yet reports have said that Iran attacked Saudi Arabia's oil company, one of the largest in the world, Aramco, and wiped out 30,000 computers in a weekend. And let me say this: Iran is not a very sophisticated company as it comes to cyber, but they have the sophistication to be able to knock out 30,000 computers and really shut their businesses down for a period of time. This is what's happening in the United States.

Cyber Command, whose job it is to protect our military networks, estimated that in the last couple of years that we have had, the United States of America has had \$400 billion—not million, billion—worth of American trade secrets being stolen from U.S. companies every year, costing these companies market share and jobs. That's probably the biggest theft in the history of the world, and yet we still are not able to help government working with business.

You have Secretary Napolitano, the Director of the FBI, you have the Director of the NSA, Alexander, and all three have said one of the biggest fears they have now are these attacks, and that unless we have a sharing opportunity between government and between business, they feel that they cannot protect our country from these cyber attacks the way that they should. It's so important that we need to act now on this bill.

Now, we can pass bills in the House all day long, but if the Senate doesn't pass a bill and the President doesn't sign it, where are we? We were able to pass our bill last year in a bipartisan manner, and yet our bill went to the Senate and it stalled and the bill didn't go anywhere, so Chairman ROGERS and I started again.

But, what we said to each other and we discussed was that we need to address the issue of privacy. Even though we felt strongly that our bill does protect privacy, we knew there were groups out there, especially the privacy groups, that felt that there was not enough protection in our bill. So we rolled up our sleeves, we listened to the issues raised by the privacy groups, the administration had issues with respect to privacy, and we changed the bill.

Now, I don't want to repeat what the chairman said, but basically we made some significant changes to our bill to deal with the issue of privacy. We provided that first, there's a privacy and civil liberties oversight board, and now that board must review our program. That's one area of oversight.

In the intelligence community, we have privacy officers in each department, in each area. And these privacy people have to look at the threat information. They must also conduct a classified and unclassified review. That's the second oversight that was changed in the bill.

□ 1450

An annual report must be sent to Congress. We also have what we call the "inspector general," whose job it is to oversee the different agencies they represent. Those are four areas of oversight just in the bill.

Regarding the privacy agreements that we were concerned about, we only have five elements where this bill applies. That means if you're a tax cheat and we pick up some information, that can't be used against you. The privacy agreements were concerned about the issue of national security being one of those elements in this bill. They thought it was too broad. So Chairman ROGERS and I got together, and we were able to get the votes from both sides of the aisle, and we were able to take a position that the national security issue is not in the bill anymore. We feel national security is being covered by one of the elements in the bill that says it deals with the issue of protecting people's lives or liberty. So we feel that we have covered national security.

One of the most important issues was the issue of minimization. What is minimization? Most people don't know what it is. Basically, minimization is if private information is passed, there needs to be an entity out there that will take that private information out so that it is not used.

We've now added to the bill that any of the zeroes and ones that are passed—and that's what's happening—if there was some reason why somebody's personal information is passed when those zeroes and ones are coming back and forth, now we have what we call 100 percent minimization, and the government will make sure that every single entity and all the information that is passed will be 100 percent minimized. If there is any personal information in there at all, it will be knocked out. That's very significant, and that gives a lot of coverage.

This is also important: you don't have security if you don't have privacy. That was one of the themes Chairman ROGERS and I used in the beginning: if you don't have security, you don't have privacy. Even though we thought our first bill had it, we felt there was a certain perception, we heard what was said and we made these changes.

There is one other issue that is out there that's very important that I think is also extremely relevant. That's the issue of when the information is passed when we're attempting to protect our citizens and our businesses from these attacks and hopefully from a destructive attack like Iran did to Aramco in Saudi Arabia, there was a perception out there which, again, had to deal with perceptions. The perception was that if this information of zeroes and ones that are being passed back and forth, what is the point of entry. We did not want the perception to be that the military in any way would be in charge or would

be the entity that is overseeing this. We felt very strongly that it had to be civil.

So Chairman ROGERS and I, along with Chairman McCAUL of the Homeland Security Committee and Ranking Member THOMPSON, have an amendment here today which is very significant. I'm sure it will be very well received by the privacy groups in the White House. What the bill will now say is that when information is passed, it will be the Department of Homeland Security. That is very significant, and we would hope that that would truly deal with the majority of these privacy issues.

We know that we have to move and we have to move quickly. We're here today to debate this bill. And, again, Chairman ROGERS—he's not listening, but I'll say it anyhow—has shown tremendous leadership. I say this and I say it sometimes in jest, that I was a former investigative prosecutor and he was a former FBI agent and all good FBI agents must listen to their prosecutors, even if we're in the minority. That was a joke. Notwithstanding that, he has shown leadership. We threw partisanship out the window. We knew the stakes were high. We have been concerned that we have not been able to protect our country. I believe that Congress needs to act because we're standing in the way of protecting our country.

This reminds me of a situation. We know how serious Hurricane Sandy was. It's similar to if you are a meteorologist and Sandy is coming up the east coast and you can't warn your constituents that Sandy is coming. That's why we need to pass this bill tomorrow, and we need to do it for the benefit of our country.

And I do want to end with this: you do not have security if you don't have privacy. We feel that this bill, along with the amendments that will be introduced today, will effect that.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Madam Chair, I yield 3 minutes to a current military officer and great member of the Intelligence Committee, the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HECK).

Mr. HECK of Nevada. I want to begin by thanking both the chairman and the ranking member for their incredible leadership on this very difficult task. It was especially gratifying to work in such a bipartisan manner to come to the final product that we'll be voting on later tomorrow.

Madam Chair, our Nation is under attack every day, every hour, every minute. Cyber attacks on our Nation's networks threaten our economic and national security. That is why I rise in support of H.R. 624, the Cyber Intelligence Sharing and Protection Act.

Whether it is hacktivists attempting to disrupt services, criminals intent on stealing personal information, spies looking for intellectual property or trade secrets or nation-states search-

ing for military and security vulnerabilities, our networks are at risk.

Cyber looting puts U.S. businesses at a competitive disadvantage, threatening jobs and our private information. The same vulnerabilities used to steal intellectual and personality property are also exploited to target America's critical infrastructure, such as our electrical grids and our banking and financial institutions. These cyber weaknesses make the intelligence-sharing provisions within H.R. 624 vitally important. However, as we seek to secure and defend the U.S. economy and our country's critical infrastructure, we must be mindful of our Nation's founding principles. We must ensure that we protect our citizens' privacy and civil liberties.

The House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence has sought the input of and worked closely with privacy and civil liberties groups to strengthen the bill and provide necessary individual protections. These discussions resulted in a number of amendments that were adopted on a broad bipartisan basis during the committee markup.

My amendment, offered with my colleague from Connecticut (Mr. HIMES), specifically limits the private sector's use of cyber threat intelligence only to a cybersecurity purpose. This provision addresses the concerns and misperceptions that private sector companies could have used this information for marketing and other commercial purposes.

Another amendment requires the establishment of minimization procedures to limit the receipt, retention, and use of personally identifiable information, or PII. In the unlikely event that PII is inadvertently shared, this provision will prevent the government from receiving and/or maintaining that information while still ensuring rapid transmission of critical cyber threat intelligence necessary to protect our systems.

Yet another amendment narrows the authorized use of shared cyber threat intelligence by striking the provision providing the government broad authority to use this information for national security purposes.

All of these bipartisan amendments will provide the private sector the necessary tools to protect its own networks while at the same time providing critical protections for privacy and civil liberties.

This legislation represents an important first step toward securing our Nation's intellectual property and critical infrastructure from cyber attack, and I urge my colleagues to support its passage.

Again, I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their leadership.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Madam Chair, I now yield 2 minutes to a senior member of our committee who worked very hard on this bill, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON). He's been with us for the last 3 years at-

tempting to pass a bill that will help our country and protect us.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank both the ranking member and the chairman for their good work on this measure and for including all of us in trying to build a better product.

Clearly, the threat of a devastating cyber attack is real and, as has been mentioned by a number of previous speakers, can't be understated. Advanced cyber attacks from China and other nation-state actors are stealing hundreds of billions of dollars' worth of cutting-edge research and development from our U.S. companies and even from our Federal Government. That's why it's essential that the business community and the Federal Government work together to share cyber threat information for the purpose of protecting the American people from the fallout of cyber attacks and cyber hackers.

While it's important that we protect against the threat of cybersecurity, it's equally as important that we recognize the responsibility to protect the constitutional rights of law-abiding citizens. Though I support H.R. 624, both for the fact that it is important that we address these issues and because I believe it needs to be moved on and we can get it in conference committee with the Senate bill, I remain somewhat concerned that the bill as drafted could lead to the broad sharing of consumer information which in turn could be used in ways unrelated to combating cybersecurity threats.

□ 1500

I emphasize "could be used."

Already the chair and the ranking member have accepted and we've incorporated a series of provisions in this bill that I authored that would minimize the sharing of some personally identifiable information, that would limit permissible uses of information which would be shared under this bill, and that would insist on a number of reporting requirements that will ensure Congress' ability to provide the necessary oversight of this program.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of California. So, taken together, these provisions will improve the transparency and the accountability of this bill. However, notwithstanding these important changes, the bill is not perfect. Given the significance of this threat and the commitment of everyone to continue to work together, I strongly urge my colleagues to support this bill and to move it out of the House. Let's get the thing to conference. Let's get the best bill possible, get it signed into law, and work together to protect the American people.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Madam Chair, I am proud to yield 3 minutes to a leader on the Homeland Security

Committee and the chair of the House Admin Committee, the gentledady from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER).

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Madam Chair, let me just read for our colleagues the preamble of our Constitution:

We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

Madam Chair, this great statement that is the foundation for our Federal Government provides us the direction that we need to our primary responsibilities. I would suggest that this legislation helps us fulfill every one of the responsibilities mandated on us by our Constitution. Now let's just take them one by one.

"Establish justice"—it is just to protect American companies from the theft of their intellectual property by attackers and by competitors.

"Insure domestic tranquility"—can you even imagine the threat to domestic tranquility if our power grid is successfully attacked by a foreign state like North Korea and this Nation is left in the dark?

"Provide for the common defence"—what is more common than our power grid, our financial system and our economy? Are we not required to defend all of that?

"Promote the general welfare"—again, if our power grid is taken down, it is impossible to promote the general welfare.

"Secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and to our posterity"—our intellectual property, made with American ingenuity, our life savings in banks, under threat from foreign actors, our jobs, our economy. All of these blessings of liberty are currently at risk if we do nothing.

I've heard some suggest, Madam Chair, that they have constitutional concerns about passing this bill. I would just suggest to them that I believe strongly that you should have constitutional concerns about not passing this bill. I do not believe that our Constitution gives foreign state actors like China or Russia or North Korea or Iran uncontested access to the critical systems of private American companies. To the contrary, I believe that our Constitution requires us, the Federal Government, to defend them.

I certainly want to applaud the great work that has been done by the chairman of the House Intelligence Committee, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, and certainly applaud our ranking member, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

Gentlemen, you have worked so closely together on your committee and with other committees as well on this great piece of legislation.

I would urge all of my colleagues, Madam Chair, to join me in fulfilling our oath and in voting "yes."

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Madam Chairwoman, I yield 2 minutes to a great Member from the State of Illinois (Mr. ENYART).

Mr. ENYART. Madam Chair, I rise today in support of this important legislation.

The threat we face today from cyber attacks poses a clear and present danger that must be addressed. When I was sworn in to Congress to represent the people of southern Illinois, I took a vow to protect them from all enemies, both foreign and domestic. It was not the first time I had taken such an oath. By supporting CISPA, we move to fulfill our oath.

I know there are good Americans who oppose this legislation because they believe the protections for civil liberties and privacy don't go far enough, but we must not let the perfect be the enemy of the good. This bill prohibits the government from forcing private sector entities to provide information to the use of any data voluntarily shared. The bill provides for strong congressional oversight. These are tremendous victories to protect our civil liberties.

I support this bill because American jobs hang in the balance. Every day, our companies are subject to cyber attacks seeking to steal valuable trade secrets which deprive American citizens of high-paying high-tech jobs. Locally, my hometown grocery store in southern Illinois, Schnucks, was recently hacked, and customers' debit and credit card information was compromised, making many of my constituents vulnerable to theft.

I cannot stand by and let an opportunity to prevent such actions pass me by, which is why I stand in support of this legislation. To protect the jobs of those who work to build planes at Boeing in Belleville or workers at Afton Chemical in Sauget, I must support this legislation. To ensure that those who make weapons to defend our country at General Dynamics in Marion, Illinois, don't lose their jobs because some Chinese hacker has stolen proprietary information, I must support this legislation.

As the weapons of warfare change and adapt, we must make the necessary adjustments to protect our Nation while adhering to our founding principles. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this act.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland has 14½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Michigan has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to a former military officer, the distinguished gentleman from Kansas (Mr. POMPEO).

Mr. POMPEO. I want to thank Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member RUPPERSBERGER for all of their hard work over many months, now years, in bringing this to where we are today, and I want to thank all of the committee staff who worked so hard to bring it to this point as well.

I'd like to keep things pretty simple. If there were a sergeant from the Chinese People's Liberation Army inside one of our power plants or inside one of our banks and if they were trying to steal stuff and if they were looking around, trying to figure out how to get in and how to access our systems or to take property or to do damage to our power grid, the American people would demand that the government do whatever it could, and they would be thrilled to learn that that company was permitted and, indeed, protected if it decided to share with others that potential threat to its piece of the infrastructure. That's what we're doing today.

The world has changed just a little bit. In just this last month, the last M-1 tank left Europe. It's the first time we haven't had a tank in Europe since D-day when the great Kansan invaded on the great quest to free us from Nazi totalitarian domination. There are no tanks. We fight in a different world today. We use the word "cyber," and sometimes folks forget what we're really talking about. We're talking about nation-states trying to do terrible harm to American interests, to American property and, indeed, to American civil liberties.

Now, in the last minute I have here, I want to talk about a couple of myths that have arisen about this piece of legislation. When I first learned about it, I, too, shared some of the concerns about what might be happening, about what might take place here. I offered an amendment last year, which is now incorporated into the bill, along with dozens of such amendments, to make sure belt-and-suspenders that we protected civil liberties.

I've heard the myth propagated that this piece of legislation violates contract rights, that somehow through CISPA we're going to take away the ability of people to negotiate privately for contractual things that they want. I don't know how that could be. This bill is purely voluntary. It mandates that no one participate. It simply allows businesses to voluntarily participate and share information they have about attacks that have been foisted upon them.

I've heard a second myth that this will authorize warrantless searches across the United States of America.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. I yield an additional 60 seconds to the gentleman.

□ 1510

Mr. POMPEO. There's talk about warrantless searches all across America. The legislation does no such thing. It's a short bill. It's 26 pages. I would urge everyone to go read it for themselves.

It fairly clearly limits what government may do, what information government may receive. It limits what private companies can share with government and amongst themselves. It

limits what government can do with that information once it is received. It has greatly capped what is going on here.

Its design is simple: it is to make sure that all of the information about direct attacks on America are widely known, easily disseminated, and available for all to help in the protection of the American state. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN); and I do want to say that we've been working together for years on this issue of cybersecurity, and I consider him to be one of the experts and one of my closest friends working on this issue.

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I rise in strong support of H.R. 624, and I do thank Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member RUPPERSBERGER for their commitment to a bipartisan and inclusive process on a very, very challenging issue.

We know with certainty that cybersecurity threats that we face are real, and they are increasing both in number and sophistication every day. Congress may not have acted last year, but those who would use cyberspace for nefarious purposes certainly did, and they continue to steal intellectual property, identities, funds from bank accounts, and sensitive security information.

I know full well that this is not a perfect bill, such is the nature of the legislative process. But we need the authority that CISPA provides to allow the voluntary sharing of cybersecurity threat information.

Improvements, I should point out, have been made over last year's bill. Several amendments have already been adopted to alleviate many privacy concerns, and more may be adopted before we are done. I welcome such progress. This bill is an important step, but information-sharing is only one portion of the broader cybersecurity debate.

I have long maintained that we must also work to ensure the creation of minimum standards for critical infrastructure; the education of a strong and vibrant future cybersecurity workforce; and effective Federal and military cyber structure, including a Senate-confirmed cybersecurity director with real authority, including comprehensive budgetary authority; and the coordination of research and development on cybersecurity across the Nation.

Together with the President's recent executive order, I believe CISPA and the bills this House approved yesterday are a very promising beginning, but there is obviously much more to be done.

Again, I want to thank Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member RUP-

PERSBERGER for their efforts. I commend them on a collaborative approach to a very important issue, and I ask my colleagues to support this important measure.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. I don't have any further speakers, and so I will continue to reserve the balance of my time to close.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), who is a senior member of our committee and has worked very hard on this issue.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Chair, I sincerely want to thank the chair and ranking member of the Intelligence Committee and express my appreciation for all of their efforts to work in a bipartisan manner and to address the concerns raised by me, by civil liberties groups, and by the White House.

However, I rise today in opposition to the bill. While I strongly believe that we need to address the serious cybersecurity threat—there is no question about that—I think we can do it without compromising our civil liberties. Despite some positive changes, I feel this bill fails to adequately safeguard the privacy of Americans. Cybersecurity and privacy are not mutually exclusive, and this bill fails to achieve a balance between protecting our networks and safeguarding our liberties.

Yesterday, I offered an amendment that would have made critical advances toward protecting privacy. My amendment would have required that companies report cyber threat information directly to civilian agencies, maintaining the longstanding tradition that the military doesn't operate on U.S. soil or collect information of American citizens.

Another important amendment offered by Congressman SCHIFF would have required companies to make "reasonable efforts" to remove personal information before sharing cyber threat information. Unfortunately, those critical amendments were not made in order.

Yesterday, the Obama administration expressed ongoing concerns about this legislation, issuing a veto threat. I share the President's concern—despite positive changes, this bill falls short in several key ways. As written right now, and hopefully there still may be some changes, CISPA allows the military to directly collect personal information on American citizens. It fails to safeguard privacy of Americans and grants sweeping immunity to companies for decisions made based on cyber information, prohibiting consumers from holding companies accountable for reckless actions and negligence.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. I do urge my colleagues to oppose this bill. We can and should do better, and I'm hopeful that we still will do better.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Madam Chair, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I just want to make very, very clear—and I thank the gentlelady for working with us, she is a great member of the committee—nowhere in this bill does it allow the military to collect information on private citizens in the United States. This is not a surveillance bill. It does not allow it to happen. That needs to be very, very clear in this debate. It does not allow the military to surveil private networks in the United States. Period. End of story. That's the biggest part of our privacy protections. Again, I want to thank the gentlelady for working with us, but that's just an inaccurate statement, and I want to make that clear for the RECORD.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Madam Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), a very active member of our caucus.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the distinguished ranking member and the chairman, as well, for working to answer an enormous concern on the question of national and domestic security.

Since Robert Tappan Morris in 1988 released one of the first commuter worms, we realized, as the computer and the Internet now have grown, the proliferation of computer malware, or computer programs designed specifically to damage computers or their networks or to co-opt systems or steal data, has attracted public and media attention and that we needed to do something. Now more than ever, cybersecurity impacts every aspect of our lives.

As a member of the Homeland Security Committee, I can assure you that my concern about the electric grid utilities, the energy and financial industries, recognize that it is important to act, and to act with speed and understanding. Likewise, I am concerned about the rage in epidemic of hackers and the impact that it has on 85 to 87 percent of the infrastructure in this Nation.

For that reason, however, I believe that along with this effort, we should have a lead civilian agency to collect the data. I'm looking forward to the manager's amendment, which I hope will clarify that Homeland Security will be that.

In addition, I have offered an amendment. My amendment ensures that if a cloud service provider identifies or detects an attempt by someone to access, to gain unauthorized access to non-governmental information stored on the system, it would not be required or permitted to report that attempt to the government and it cannot share that information with the government. I think the Rules Committee for allowing that amendment to be in.

I do, however, want to raise the question on privacy. I believe that we could

fix this legislation with a small addition dealing with the privacy question as we hopefully address the question dealing with the lead civilian agency. I thank the chairman and the ranking member, and I look forward to further discussion on this legislation.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), a member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman.

This bill, unfortunately, hurts what it purports to help. It's detrimental to job growth, innovation, and privacy.

□ 1520

We talked a bit about the process whereby a number of amendments that would have improved it were not allowed to be discussed or voted on on the floor. And there are still enormous flaws with this bill which need to be addressed.

Look, to the extent that companies believe that information-sharing is important, it should be done in a way that's consistent with sanctity of contract. If there's something that gets in the way of information-sharing, we need to identify it. That hasn't been identified.

Clearly, the answer is not to say whatever a company agrees upon with a personal user, even if explicitly it says we're going to keep your information private, the minute after that's agreed to by a user, the company would be completely indemnified by turning all this information, personal information, credit card information, address, everything, over to the government.

Now, why not remove anything?

Why not just pass along the parts that are related to cybersecurity?

There's no incentive to do so. Had there been a requirement that reasonable efforts were taken to delete personal data, that would have been a step in the right direction. But, again, it's an extra cost with no benefit for the company to delete personal data because they're completely indemnified with regard to this matter without the consent of the user himself.

What happens to this information once it reaches the government?

It can be shared with any government agency. It can be shared with the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, the National Security Agency, the Food and Drug Administration. Again, the limitations are so open-ended that anything that relates even to a minor scratch or a cut, issues completely unrelated to cybersecurity, things that could be related to dog bites, essentially any information.

Part of the problem here, there are cyber attacks everywhere. I ran an e-commerce site. Tens of thousand every day. I mean, any e-commerce company experiences this every day, so it's a reality every day. Everything is a potential cybersecurity threat. There's people cracking passwords every day.

So all information is affected by this, under this bill, in its present form, turned over to the government, shared with every agency relating to any bodily injury or harm, and we haven't been offered an opportunity to amend that.

So I encourage my colleagues to vote "no" on this bill. We can and we must do better for our country.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL). Is it "Roll Tide"? She is an outstanding new member of the Intelligence Committee. She's smart. She works hard. She's very dynamic, and she is our closer today.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Madam Chair, today I rise to support the bill.

I can say, Madam Chair, that I actually voted against the bill last term. But today I am proud to say, because of the hard work of both the chairman and the ranking member and so many members of this committee, that today I stand before you in support of the bill.

I am now a new member of the Intelligence Committee and, as I've told my staff, the more you know, the better you can vote. And today, I want to rise to explain why I am voting for this bill.

I think that everybody agrees that there are cyber threats each and every day. And, in fact, Director Clapper, the Director of National Intelligence, he actually said his number one thing that keeps him up at night is cyber attacks.

And what this bill will do is simply to share information. It is not about releasing personal identifiable information. That is strictly prohibited by this bill. So it is strictly prohibited by this bill.

And this bill has been greatly enhanced by so many of my wonderful colleagues who have submitted amendments, many of which I am sure will pass tomorrow, as well as greatly enhanced by the amendments that were brought forth by committee members.

I shared some serious concerns about some privacy protections when I came on the committee, and I have to tell you that the committee was gracious enough to listen to the amendments that I offered, as well as other amendments that were offered by my colleagues on this side of the aisle.

I was surprised, given the partisan nature of politics here in this House, that the Intelligence Committee really tries, because of our national security, to work together. And in a true bipartisan manner, many of those privacy protections were unanimously agreed to by members of the committee.

Once again, I urge my colleagues to vote for this bill, and I urge the President to sign this bill into law.

Today, I rise in support of this bill. But Madam Chair, last year, I voted against the cybersecurity bill that was offered in this body. I am now and am honored to serve as a member of the Intelligence Committee and the more you know, the better you can vote. I want to commend the Chairman and the Ranking Member for their leadership to im-

prove this legislation. I also want to thank all of my colleagues who offered amendments to strengthen this bill by providing more privacy protections for our citizens and improving inter-agency coordination. While this is not a perfect bill, this is a step in the right direction and I am hopeful that the Senate will take up this measure and make it even stronger. It is also my hope that the White House will continue to work with us in this body's effort to be proactive instead of reactive. Madam Speaker, we simply cannot afford to wait—The threats against our national and economic security are real. Attacks against our financial, energy and communication sectors are happening every day. We have received dire warnings from our defense and intelligence officials that widespread attacks are the number one threat to our national security above all else. The Director of National Intelligence, James Clapper, has elevated cyber threats to the top of the list of national-security concerns. The National Intelligence Estimate provided evidence of widespread infiltrations of U.S. computer networks. Evidence has also emerged of spying inside the computer networks of major U.S. media, including the Wall Street Journal and New York Times. Defense and intelligence officials have grown increasingly alarmed over a relentless cyber attack campaign against U.S. banks, critical infrastructure and a host of other private entities.

We must continue to work together to find a balance between preserving privacy and protecting the security of this country from the danger of cyber attacks. Sharing cyber threat information, as provided for in this bill, is vital for combatting malicious hackers, criminals, and foreign agents. By removing the legal and regulatory barriers currently impeding the free flow of actionable information, the Cyber Intelligence Sharing and Protection Act (CISPA) will promote nimble, adaptive innovation—the best strategy for defending against a rapidly evolving threat landscape.

This growing number and complexity of cyber attacks on private and government computers has provided an opportunity for us to join together and pass bipartisan legislation to address the problem. I am committed to finding a workable solution with the Senate and White House, and I believe this bill provides a solid framework on a critical issue for national and economic security. I look forward to considering any amendments my colleagues put forth today to help improve the legislation of this bill. And though I realize this is not a perfect bill, I think the time to act is now to protect our national security. I urge members to vote for this legislation.

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

First thing, we've heard testimony today about how serious the cyber attacks are to our country. We know what has occurred already. We know that our banks have been attacked, our major banks. We know that our newspapers, New York Times, Washington Post, have been attacked.

We know that news reports have said that Iran attacked Aramco, Saudi Arabia's largest oil company. They took out 30,000 computers, which means we are subjected to those attacks also.

We also know that Cyber Command has said that we, in the United States,

have lost, from the attacks on our businesses, approximately \$200 billion. Just think what that equates to in jobs, stealing information about trade secrets, about competing globally with a country like China where they have all of our information, where they're able to shut down banks.

This is a very serious issue, and we need to do a better job to educate the public on how serious it is. And we just hope that we can pass this bill today in the House, a bill in the Senate, and the President signs the bill, so that we can protect our citizens, we can protect our businesses from these attacks.

If we knew that Iran was sending over an airplane with a bomb we would take it out. And yet we have to make sure that we deal with the issue in the United States of America to protect ourselves.

Now, there was a major issue raised, and that issue was privacy. And believe me, I want to say this over and over again. You don't have security if you don't have privacy. And we feel very strongly that this bill provides privacy.

But we also know, Chairman ROGERS and I know, that if we pass a bill here, we need to pass a bill in the Senate, and we need the President to sign it. So we got together, and even though we passed our bill in a bipartisan effort last year and it stalled in the Senate, we now have made the bill what we feel is a lot stronger as it deals with the perception of privacy.

And we've added oversight. We have four categories of oversight, privacy. We've made sure that minimization—taking out any privacy information that might pass—we made sure that that is 100 percent minimization so that no one's private information will pass.

But the most important thing is that we have to make sure that we pass a bill because of the fact that 80 percent of our network is controlled by 10 companies in the United States of America. And all of our experts in this area have said that if government and business can't share information about these attacks, zeros and ones, if they can't share information, they cannot protect our country from these ongoing attacks that are occurring as we speak right now.

So let's act. Let's not wait until we have another catastrophic attack like 9/11. Let's deal with this now. Let's pass the bill and make sure that we protect, again, our citizens. And I want to say it one more time. The issue that you can't have security if you don't have privacy.

I do want to also say, I want to thank all those individuals in our government, in the private sector. The privacy groups have all come together. This has been a good debate. It's been a debate about issues that the public needed to know.

And I also want to thank the chairman for his leadership, and the fact that he was willing, even though we had our bill passed a year ago, he was

willing to deal with the issue of perception and to make sure we made privacy an element that we could deal with, and that we could change our bill to deal with certain perceptions. I feel that we've done that.

I also want to thank Chairman MCCAUL from Homeland Security and Ranking Member BENNIE THOMPSON from Homeland Security, who've worked with us to get an amendment that was very important, as you heard from JAN SCHAKOWSKY.

That amendment basically says that the point of entry for any communication is on the civil side of our government, Homeland Security, and we hope to pass that amendment.

And I feel very strongly that if we do that, we will have addressed the majority of the issues that are so important to this bill and to our security and to our privacy.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Madam Chair, I yield myself the remaining time.

I just want to quickly, Madam Chair, address some of the moving targets on the bill. When we move to change something in the bill, the 19 privacy amendments, people who still decide they don't like it for, again, whatever reason, move their challenges of why they don't like it.

The newest, I think, straw man is that this somehow would violate contract law. Nothing in this bill allows you to avoid contract law. Nothing.

□ 1530

It's a red herring. It is not accurate. Nothing in this bill would allow this to happen. The fact that someone who was in the technical business would say this hurts job growth, that's interesting. The sheer number of companies who support this, from the Business Roundtable to the Financial Services Business Group to TechNet, who has companies like Intel Corporation, Symantec, Juniper, Oracle, EMC, social media, all stand up and say this is the right approach. It will allow us to protect our consumers of our product from foreign governments stealing their private information.

We need to understand what this bill is and what it is not. It is not a surveillance bill. Nothing in here authorizes surveillance. We're going to have an amendment to clarify that, to say it in the law so people can regain that confidence.

We argue, Read the bill. It's 27 pages. It is very clear. It is predominantly protections of your civil liberties, and it also allows companies to voluntarily share malicious source code—and that's source code that's committing a crime against their consumers and their company—with the Federal Government so they can go back overseas and find the Chinese or the Iranians or the Russians or the North Koreans who are perpetrating that crime. This bill is nothing more. It does do that.

Thanks to the ranking member and all who have gotten to this point. I

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

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Chair, this week, the House of Representatives is scheduled to take up the Cyber Intelligence Sharing and Protection Act (CISPA). Among other things, the legislation would authorize open-ended sharing of threat information between certain private companies and the federal government, and grant those companies unlimited legal immunity. I—along with more than 30 civil liberties and privacy groups ranging from the ACLU to the Competitive Enterprise Institute—believe the bill is badly flawed, and will harm the privacy and civil liberties of our citizens. While the Intelligence Committee amended CISPA last week, purporting to address privacy-related issues, the changes do not ameliorate the core concerns I have with the bill.

CISPA would create a "Wild West" of information-sharing, where any "certified" private-sector entity could share information with any federal government agency for various ill-defined purposes. By allowing for the direct sharing of information between the private sector and the National Security Agency, as well as other Defense Department agencies, the legislation hastily casts aside time-tested legal prohibitions against intelligence agencies and the military from operating on U.S. soil. The bill should be amended to prevent this direct sharing with non-civilian agencies.

CISPA would also create duplicative information-sharing processes with no central oversight or accountability. Successive administrations have expended enormous resources building proper information-sharing programs at the Department of Homeland Security and the FBI; these efforts should be enhanced, not clouded by permitting the proliferation of redundant programs across the federal government.

The legislation also removes current legal protections applicable to companies that facilitate and process our private communications and share them with the government and one another. Companies sharing information would be exempt from all privacy statutes and would be relieved of liability for recklessly sharing, or deciding not to share information. Without narrowly defining the information that may be shared, limiting to whom it may be shared and why, and preserving mechanisms to provide accountability for wrongdoing, the privacy of our citizens and confidence in the trustworthiness of our electronic communications networks would be weakened. For example, the bill would not prevent a company sharing cyber threat information from including data not necessary to understanding the threat, such as private emails between family members or personal information such as medical records, in a data dump to the government.

The bill should narrowly define the categories of information that may be shared, such as malicious code or methods of defeating cybersecurity controls, and require that companies sharing the data take reasonable steps to remove information identifying individuals not involved in the threat. It is not enough to require government recipients of the data to remove the private information because it should never be sent to the government in the first place. The bill therefore should be amended to require that companies sharing cyber threat information make reasonable efforts to

remove such personally identifiable information from the data they share with other companies and the government.

The bill's liability protection provisions are also unnecessarily broad and eliminate the ability of aggrieved citizens and companies to protect and secure their privacy, as well as their property and physical well-being. Regardless of whether a company acted recklessly or negligently, the bill would prevent civil or criminal actions for decisions made for cybersecurity purposes "based on" cyber threat information. In effect, the legislation removes critical incentives for industry to act reasonably concerning cyber threat information.

Consider a situation in which a telecommunications company through its operations becomes aware of a cyber threat directed toward a utility but fails to notify the critical infrastructure company of the threat, denying the utility the opportunity to engage in defensive measures and resulting in a catastrophic event producing substantial property damage and loss of life. Under the legislation, the telecommunications company characterizing its decision not to notify as one made for a cybersecurity purpose would be able to avoid legal liability. The bill's exemption from liability should therefore be narrowed to exclude protection for such decisions.

The cyber threats our nation faces are serious, and we need to take action. The president's recent executive order directing the enhanced sharing of cyber threat information by the government to industry is a significant step in the right direction. Legislation encouraging information-sharing by the private sector is also required, but it must be carefully crafted and limited to actual threats. The House version of CISPA is not the right solution to this real problem, and it must be fixed before it reaches the president's desk.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113-7. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

H. R. 624

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Cyber Intelligence Sharing and Protection Act".

SEC. 2. CYBER THREAT INTELLIGENCE AND INFORMATION SHARING.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Title XI of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 442 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"CYBER THREAT INTELLIGENCE AND INFORMATION SHARING

"SEC. 1104. (a) INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY SHARING OF CYBER THREAT INTELLIGENCE WITH PRIVATE SECTOR AND UTILITIES.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director of National Intelligence shall establish procedures to allow elements of the intelligence community to share cyber threat intelligence with private-sector entities and utilities and to encourage the sharing of such intelligence.

"(2) SHARING AND USE OF CLASSIFIED INTELLIGENCE.—The procedures established under paragraph (1) shall provide that classified cyber threat intelligence may only be—

"(A) shared by an element of the intelligence community with—

"(i) a certified entity; or

"(ii) a person with an appropriate security clearance to receive such cyber threat intelligence;

"(B) shared consistent with the need to protect the national security of the United States; and

"(C) used by a certified entity in a manner which protects such cyber threat intelligence from unauthorized disclosure.

"(3) SECURITY CLEARANCE APPROVALS.—The Director of National Intelligence shall issue guidelines providing that the head of an element of the intelligence community may, as the head of such element considers necessary to carry out this subsection—

"(A) grant a security clearance on a temporary or permanent basis to an employee or officer of a certified entity;

"(B) grant a security clearance on a temporary or permanent basis to a certified entity and approval to use appropriate facilities; and

"(C) expedite the security clearance process for a person or entity as the head of such element considers necessary, consistent with the need to protect the national security of the United States.

"(4) NO RIGHT OR BENEFIT.—The provision of information to a private-sector entity or a utility under this subsection shall not create a right or benefit to similar information by such entity or such utility or any other private-sector entity or utility.

"(5) RESTRICTION ON DISCLOSURE OF CYBER THREAT INTELLIGENCE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a certified entity receiving cyber threat intelligence pursuant to this subsection shall not further disclose such cyber threat intelligence to another entity, other than to a certified entity or other appropriate agency or department of the Federal Government authorized to receive such cyber threat intelligence.

"(b) USE OF CYBERSECURITY SYSTEMS AND SHARING OF CYBER THREAT INFORMATION.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—

"(A) CYBERSECURITY PROVIDERS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a cybersecurity provider, with the express consent of a protected entity for which such cybersecurity provider is providing goods or services for cybersecurity purposes, may, for cybersecurity purposes—

"(i) use cybersecurity systems to identify and obtain cyber threat information to protect the rights and property of such protected entity; and

"(ii) share such cyber threat information with any other entity designated by such protected entity, including, if specifically designated, the Federal Government.

"(B) SELF-PROTECTED ENTITIES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a self-protected entity may, for cybersecurity purposes—

"(i) use cybersecurity systems to identify and obtain cyber threat information to protect the rights and property of such self-protected entity; and

"(ii) share such cyber threat information with any other entity, including the Federal Government.

"(2) SHARING WITH THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.—

"(A) INFORMATION SHARED WITH THE NATIONAL CYBERSECURITY AND COMMUNICATIONS INTEGRATION CENTER OF THE DEPARTMENT OF

HOMELAND SECURITY.—Subject to the use and protection of information requirements under paragraph (3), the head of a department or agency of the Federal Government receiving cyber threat information in accordance with paragraph (1) shall provide such cyber threat information in as close to real time as possible to the National Cybersecurity and Communications Integration Center of the Department of Homeland Security.

"(B) REQUEST TO SHARE WITH ANOTHER DEPARTMENT OR AGENCY OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.—An entity sharing cyber threat information that is provided to the National Cybersecurity and Communications Integration Center of the Department of Homeland Security under subparagraph (A) or paragraph (1) may request the head of such Center to, and the head of such Center may, provide such information in as close to real time as possible to another department or agency of the Federal Government.

"(3) USE AND PROTECTION OF INFORMATION.—Cyber threat information shared in accordance with paragraph (1)—

"(A) shall only be shared in accordance with any restrictions placed on the sharing of such information by the protected entity or self-protected entity authorizing such sharing, including appropriate anonymization or minimization of such information and excluding limiting a department or agency of the Federal Government from sharing such information with another department or agency of the Federal Government in accordance with this section;

"(B) may not be used by an entity to gain an unfair competitive advantage to the detriment of the protected entity or the self-protected entity authorizing the sharing of information;

"(C) may only be used by a non-Federal recipient of such information for a cybersecurity purpose;

"(D) if shared with the Federal Government—

"(i) shall be exempt from disclosure under section 552 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the 'Freedom of Information Act');

"(ii) shall be considered proprietary information and shall not be disclosed to an entity outside of the Federal Government except as authorized by the entity sharing such information;

"(iii) shall not be used by the Federal Government for regulatory purposes;

"(iv) shall not be provided by the department or agency of the Federal Government receiving such cyber threat information to another department or agency of the Federal Government under paragraph (2)(A) if—

"(I) the entity providing such information determines that the provision of such information will undermine the purpose for which such information is shared; or

"(II) unless otherwise directed by the President, the head of the department or agency of the Federal Government receiving such cyber threat information determines that the provision of such information will undermine the purpose for which such information is shared; and

"(v) shall be handled by the Federal Government consistent with the need to protect sources and methods and the national security of the United States; and

"(E) shall be exempt from disclosure under a State, local, or tribal law or regulation that requires public disclosure of information by a public or quasi-public entity.

"(4) EXEMPTION FROM LIABILITY.—

"(A) EXEMPTION.—No civil or criminal cause of action shall lie or be maintained in Federal or State court against a protected entity, self-protected entity, cybersecurity provider, or an officer, employee, or agent of a protected entity, self-protected entity, or cybersecurity provider, acting in good faith—

"(i) for using cybersecurity systems to identify or obtain cyber threat information or for sharing such information in accordance with this section; or

"(ii) for decisions made for cybersecurity purposes and based on cyber threat information

identified, obtained, or shared under this section.

“(B) LACK OF GOOD FAITH.—For purposes of the exemption from liability under subparagraph (A), a lack of good faith includes any act or omission taken with intent to injure, defraud, or otherwise endanger any individual, government entity, private entity, or utility.

“(5) RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER LAWS REQUIRING THE DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION.—The submission of information under this subsection to the Federal Government shall not satisfy or affect—

“(A) any requirement under any other provision of law for a person or entity to provide information to the Federal Government; or

“(B) the applicability of other provisions of law, including section 552 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the ‘Freedom of Information Act’), with respect to information required to be provided to the Federal Government under such other provision of law.

“(6) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to provide new authority to—

“(A) a cybersecurity provider to use a cybersecurity system to identify or obtain cyber threat information from a system or network other than a system or network owned or operated by a protected entity for which such cybersecurity provider is providing goods or services for cybersecurity purposes; or

“(B) a self-protected entity to use a cybersecurity system to identify or obtain cyber threat information from a system or network other than a system or network owned or operated by such self-protected entity.

“(c) FEDERAL GOVERNMENT USE OF INFORMATION.—

“(1) LIMITATION.—The Federal Government may use cyber threat information shared with the Federal Government in accordance with subsection (b)—

“(A) for cybersecurity purposes;

“(B) for the investigation and prosecution of cybersecurity crimes;

“(C) for the protection of individuals from the danger of death or serious bodily harm and the investigation and prosecution of crimes involving such danger of death or serious bodily harm; or

“(D) for the protection of minors from child pornography, any risk of sexual exploitation, and serious threats to the physical safety of minors, including kidnapping and trafficking and the investigation and prosecution of crimes involving child pornography, any risk of sexual exploitation, and serious threats to the physical safety of minors, including kidnapping and trafficking, and any crime referred to in section 2258A(a)(2) of title 18, United States Code.

“(2) AFFIRMATIVE SEARCH RESTRICTION.—The Federal Government may not affirmatively search cyber threat information shared with the Federal Government under subsection (b) for a purpose other than a purpose referred to in paragraph (1).

“(3) ANTI-TASKING RESTRICTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to permit the Federal Government to—

“(A) require a private-sector entity or utility to share information with the Federal Government; or

“(B) condition the sharing of cyber threat intelligence with a private-sector entity or utility on the provision of cyber threat information to the Federal Government.

“(4) PROTECTION OF SENSITIVE PERSONAL DOCUMENTS.—The Federal Government may not use the following information, containing information that identifies a person, shared with the Federal Government in accordance with subsection (b) unless such information is used in accordance with the policies and procedures established under paragraph (7):

“(A) Library circulation records.

“(B) Library patron lists.

“(C) Book sales records.

“(D) Book customer lists.

“(E) Firearms sales records.

“(F) Tax return records.

“(G) Educational records.

“(H) Medical records.

“(5) NOTIFICATION OF NON-CYBER THREAT INFORMATION.—If a department or agency of the Federal Government receiving information pursuant to subsection (b)(1) determines that such information is not cyber threat information, such department or agency shall notify the entity or provider sharing such information pursuant to subsection (b)(1).

“(6) RETENTION AND USE OF CYBER THREAT INFORMATION.—No department or agency of the Federal Government shall retain or use information shared pursuant to subsection (b)(1) for any use other than a use permitted under subsection (c)(1).

“(7) PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES.—

“(A) POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.—The Director of National Intelligence, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Attorney General, shall establish and periodically review policies and procedures governing the receipt, retention, use, and disclosure of non-publicly available cyber threat information shared with the Federal Government in accordance with subsection (b)(1). Such policies and procedures shall, consistent with the need to protect systems and networks from cyber threats and mitigate cyber threats in a timely manner—

“(i) minimize the impact on privacy and civil liberties;

“(ii) reasonably limit the receipt, retention, use, and disclosure of cyber threat information associated with specific persons that is not necessary to protect systems or networks from cyber threats or mitigate cyber threats in a timely manner;

“(iii) include requirements to safeguard non-publicly available cyber threat information that may be used to identify specific persons from unauthorized access or acquisition;

“(iv) protect the confidentiality of cyber threat information associated with specific persons to the greatest extent practicable; and

“(v) not delay or impede the flow of cyber threat information necessary to defend against or mitigate a cyber threat.

“(B) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—The Director of National Intelligence shall, consistent with the need to protect sources and methods, submit to Congress the policies and procedures required under subparagraph (A) and any updates to such policies and procedures.

“(C) IMPLEMENTATION.—The head of each department or agency of the Federal Government receiving cyber threat information shared with the Federal Government under subsection (b)(1) shall—

“(i) implement the policies and procedures established under subparagraph (A); and

“(ii) promptly notify the Director of National Intelligence, the Attorney General, and the congressional intelligence committees of any significant violations of such policies and procedures.

“(D) OVERSIGHT.—The Director of National Intelligence, in consultation with the Attorney General, the Secretary of Homeland Security, and the Secretary of Defense, shall establish a program to monitor and oversee compliance with the policies and procedures established under subparagraph (A).

“(d) FEDERAL GOVERNMENT LIABILITY FOR VIOLATIONS OF RESTRICTIONS ON THE DISCLOSURE, USE, AND PROTECTION OF VOLUNTARILY SHARED INFORMATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—If a department or agency of the Federal Government intentionally or willfully violates subsection (b)(3)(D) or subsection (c) with respect to the disclosure, use, or protection of voluntarily shared cyber threat information shared under this section, the United States shall be liable to a person adversely affected by such violation in an amount equal to the sum of—

“(A) the actual damages sustained by the person as a result of the violation or \$1,000, whichever is greater; and

“(B) the costs of the action together with reasonable attorney fees as determined by the court.

“(2) VENUE.—An action to enforce liability created under this subsection may be brought in the district court of the United States in—

“(A) the district in which the complainant resides;

“(B) the district in which the principal place of business of the complainant is located;

“(C) the district in which the department or agency of the Federal Government that disclosed the information is located; or

“(D) the District of Columbia.

“(3) STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.—No action shall lie under this subsection unless such action is commenced not later than two years after the date of the violation of subsection (b)(3)(D) or subsection (c) that is the basis for the action.

“(4) EXCLUSIVE CAUSE OF ACTION.—A cause of action under this subsection shall be the exclusive means available to a complainant seeking a remedy for a violation of subsection (b)(3)(D) or subsection (c).

“(e) REPORTS ON INFORMATION SHARING.—

“(1) INSPECTOR GENERAL REPORT.—The Inspector General of the Intelligence Community, in consultation with the Inspector General of the Department of Justice, the Inspector General of the Department of Defense, and the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board, shall annually submit to the congressional intelligence committees a report containing a review of the use of information shared with the Federal Government under this section, including—

“(A) a review of the use by the Federal Government of such information for a purpose other than a cybersecurity purpose;

“(B) a review of the type of information shared with the Federal Government under this section;

“(C) a review of the actions taken by the Federal Government based on such information;

“(D) appropriate metrics to determine the impact of the sharing of such information with the Federal Government on privacy and civil liberties, if any;

“(E) a list of the departments or agencies receiving such information;

“(F) a review of the sharing of such information within the Federal Government to identify inappropriate stovepiping of shared information; and

“(G) any recommendations of the Inspector General for improvements or modifications to the authorities under this section.

“(2) PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES OFFICERS REPORT.—The Civil Liberties Protection Officer of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence and the Chief Privacy and Civil Liberties Officer of the Department of Justice, in consultation with the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board, the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community, and the senior privacy and civil liberties officer of each department or agency of the Federal Government that receives cyber threat information shared with the Federal Government under this section, shall annually and jointly submit to Congress a report assessing the privacy and civil liberties impact of the activities conducted by the Federal Government under this section. Such report shall include any recommendations the Civil Liberties Protection Officer and Chief Privacy and Civil Liberties Officer consider appropriate to minimize or mitigate the privacy and civil liberties impact of the sharing of cyber threat information under this section.

“(3) FORM.—Each report required under paragraph (1) or (2) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

“(f) FEDERAL PREEMPTION.—This section supersedes any statute of a State or political subdivision of a State that restricts or otherwise expressly regulates an activity authorized under subsection (b).

“(g) SAVINGS CLAUSES.—

“(1) EXISTING AUTHORITIES.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit any other authority to use a cybersecurity system or to identify, obtain, or share cyber threat intelligence or cyber threat information.

“(2) LIMITATION ON MILITARY AND INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT IN PRIVATE AND PUBLIC SECTOR CYBERSECURITY EFFORTS.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to provide additional authority to, or modify an existing authority of, the Department of Defense or the National Security Agency or any other element of the intelligence community to control, modify, require, or otherwise direct the cybersecurity efforts of a private-sector entity or a component of the Federal Government or a State, local, or tribal government.

“(3) INFORMATION SHARING RELATIONSHIPS.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to—

“(A) limit or modify an existing information sharing relationship;

“(B) prohibit a new information sharing relationship;

“(C) require a new information sharing relationship between the Federal Government and a private-sector entity or utility;

“(D) modify the authority of a department or agency of the Federal Government to protect sources and methods and the national security of the United States; or

“(E) preclude the Federal Government from requiring an entity to report significant cyber incidents if authorized or required to do so under another provision of law.

“(4) LIMITATION ON FEDERAL GOVERNMENT USE OF CYBERSECURITY SYSTEMS.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to provide additional authority to, or modify an existing authority of, any entity to use a cybersecurity system owned or controlled by the Federal Government on a private-sector system or network to protect such private-sector system or network.

“(5) NO LIABILITY FOR NON-PARTICIPATION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to subject a protected entity, self-protected entity, cyber security provider, or an officer, employee, or agent of a protected entity, self-protected entity, or cybersecurity provider, to liability for choosing not to engage in the voluntary activities authorized under this section.

“(6) USE AND RETENTION OF INFORMATION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize, or to modify any existing authority of, a department or agency of the Federal Government to retain or use information shared pursuant to subsection (b)(1) for any use other than a use permitted under subsection (c)(1).

“(h) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) AVAILABILITY.—The term ‘availability’ means ensuring timely and reliable access to and use of information.

“(2) CERTIFIED ENTITY.—The term ‘certified entity’ means a protected entity, self-protected entity, or cybersecurity provider that—

“(A) possesses or is eligible to obtain a security clearance, as determined by the Director of National Intelligence; and

“(B) is able to demonstrate to the Director of National Intelligence that such provider or such entity can appropriately protect classified cyber threat intelligence.

“(3) CONFIDENTIALITY.—The term ‘confidentiality’ means preserving authorized restrictions on access and disclosure, including means for protecting personal privacy and proprietary information.

“(4) CYBER THREAT INFORMATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘cyber threat information’ means information directly pertaining to—

“(i) a vulnerability of a system or network of a government or private entity or utility;

“(ii) a threat to the integrity, confidentiality, or availability of a system or network of a government or private entity or utility or any information stored on, processed on, or transiting such a system or network;

“(iii) efforts to deny access to or degrade, disrupt, or destroy a system or network of a government or private entity or utility; or

“(iv) efforts to gain unauthorized access to a system or network of a government or private entity or utility, including to gain such unauthorized access for the purpose of exfiltrating information stored on, processed on, or transiting a system or network of a government or private entity or utility.

“(B) EXCLUSION.—Such term does not include information pertaining to efforts to gain unauthorized access to a system or network of a government or private entity or utility that solely involve violations of consumer terms of service or consumer licensing agreements and do not otherwise constitute unauthorized access.

“(5) CYBER THREAT INTELLIGENCE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘cyber threat intelligence’ means intelligence in the possession of an element of the intelligence community directly pertaining to—

“(i) a vulnerability of a system or network of a government or private entity or utility;

“(ii) a threat to the integrity, confidentiality, or availability of a system or network of a government or private entity or utility or any information stored on, processed on, or transiting such a system or network;

“(iii) efforts to deny access to or degrade, disrupt, or destroy a system or network of a government or private entity or utility; or

“(iv) efforts to gain unauthorized access to a system or network of a government or private entity or utility, including to gain such unauthorized access for the purpose of exfiltrating information stored on, processed on, or transiting a system or network of a government or private entity or utility.

“(B) EXCLUSION.—Such term does not include intelligence pertaining to efforts to gain unauthorized access to a system or network of a government or private entity or utility that solely involve violations of consumer terms of service or consumer licensing agreements and do not otherwise constitute unauthorized access.

“(6) CYBERSECURITY CRIME.—The term ‘cybersecurity crime’ means—

“(A) a crime under a Federal or State law that involves—

“(i) efforts to deny access to or degrade, disrupt, or destroy a system or network;

“(ii) efforts to gain unauthorized access to a system or network; or

“(iii) efforts to exfiltrate information from a system or network without authorization; or

“(B) the violation of a provision of Federal law relating to computer crimes, including a violation of any provision of title 18, United States Code, created or amended by the Computer Fraud and Abuse Act of 1986 (Public Law 99–474).

“(7) CYBERSECURITY PROVIDER.—The term ‘cybersecurity provider’ means a non-Federal entity that provides goods or services intended to be used for cybersecurity purposes.

“(8) CYBERSECURITY PURPOSE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘cybersecurity purpose’ means the purpose of ensuring the integrity, confidentiality, or availability of, or safeguarding, a system or network, including protecting a system or network from—

“(i) a vulnerability of a system or network;

“(ii) a threat to the integrity, confidentiality, or availability of a system or network or any information stored on, processed on, or transiting such a system or network;

“(iii) efforts to deny access to or degrade, disrupt, or destroy a system or network; or

“(iv) efforts to gain unauthorized access to a system or network, including to gain such unauthorized access for the purpose of exfiltrating information stored on, processed on, or transiting a system or network.

“(B) EXCLUSION.—Such term does not include the purpose of protecting a system or network from efforts to gain unauthorized access to such system or network that solely involve violations of consumer terms of service or consumer licensing agreements and do not otherwise constitute unauthorized access.

“(9) CYBERSECURITY SYSTEM.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘cybersecurity system’ means a system designed or employed to ensure the integrity, confidentiality, or availability of, or safeguard, a system or network, including protecting a system or network from—

“(i) a vulnerability of a system or network;

“(ii) a threat to the integrity, confidentiality, or availability of a system or network or any information stored on, processed on, or transiting such a system or network;

“(iii) efforts to deny access to or degrade, disrupt, or destroy a system or network; or

“(iv) efforts to gain unauthorized access to a system or network, including to gain such unauthorized access for the purpose of exfiltrating information stored on, processed on, or transiting a system or network.

“(B) EXCLUSION.—Such term does not include a system designed or employed to protect a system or network from efforts to gain unauthorized access to such system or network that solely involve violations of consumer terms of service or consumer licensing agreements and do not otherwise constitute unauthorized access.

“(10) INTEGRITY.—The term ‘integrity’ means guarding against improper information modification or destruction, including ensuring information nonrepudiation and authenticity.

“(11) PROTECTED ENTITY.—The term ‘protected entity’ means an entity, other than an individual, that contracts with a cybersecurity provider for goods or services to be used for cybersecurity purposes.

“(12) SELF-PROTECTED ENTITY.—The term ‘self-protected entity’ means an entity, other than an individual, that provides goods or services for cybersecurity purposes to itself.

“(13) UTILITY.—The term ‘utility’ means an entity providing essential services (other than law enforcement or regulatory services), including electricity, natural gas, propane, telecommunications, transportation, water, or wastewater services.”

(b) PROCEDURES AND GUIDELINES.—The Director of National Intelligence shall—

(1) not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, establish procedures under paragraph (1) of section 1104(a) of the National Security Act of 1947, as added by subsection (a) of this section, and issue guidelines under paragraph (3) of such section 1104(a);

(2) in establishing such procedures and issuing such guidelines, consult with the Secretary of Homeland Security to ensure that such procedures and such guidelines permit the owners and operators of critical infrastructure to receive all appropriate cyber threat intelligence (as defined in section 1104(h)(5) of such Act, as added by subsection (a)) in the possession of the Federal Government; and

(3) following the establishment of such procedures and the issuance of such guidelines, expeditiously distribute such procedures and such guidelines to appropriate departments and agencies of the Federal Government, private-sector entities, and utilities (as defined in section 1104(h)(13) of such Act, as added by subsection (a)).

(c) PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Attorney General, shall establish the policies and procedures required under section 1104(c)(7)(A) of the National Security Act of 1947, as added by subsection (a) of this section.

(d) INITIAL REPORTS.—The first reports required to be submitted under paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (e) of section 1104 of the National Security Act of 1947, as added by subsection (a) of this section, shall be submitted not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(e) TABLE OF CONTENTS AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in the first section of the National Security Act of 1947 is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“Sec. 1104. Cyber threat intelligence and information sharing.”

SEC. 3. SUNSET.

Effective on the date that is 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act—

(1) section 1104 of the National Security Act of 1947, as added by section 2(a) of this Act, is repealed; and

(2) the table of contents in the first section of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended by section 2(d) of this Act, is amended by striking the item relating to section 1104, as added by such section 2(d).

The CHAIR. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in House Report 113-41. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF MICHIGAN

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 113-41.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 12, beginning line 15, strike “unless such information is used in accordance with the policies and procedures established under paragraph (7)”.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 164, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ROGERS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. I offer this amendment to ensure that library records, firearm sales records, medical records, and tax returns are not included in any information voluntarily shared with the government under CISPA. Though the underlying bill would not permit this information unless it was cyber threat information, I will support this amendment, as it is a clarification amendment that settles some Members’ concerns and reflects an amendment that was passed last year overwhelmingly.

With that, Madam Chair, I urge this body’s support of this clarification amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Madam Chair, I rise to claim the time in opposition, even though I am not opposed.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. I support Chairman ROGERS’ amendment to make a technical change to correct our personal records provision and retain the privacy protections that we had in our bill upon the introduction.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ROGERS).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 113-41.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Madam Chairwoman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 2, line 15, strike “and”.

Page 2, line 18, strike the period and insert “; and”.

Page 2, after line 18, insert the following:

“(D) used, retained, or further disclosed by a certified entity for cybersecurity purposes.”.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 164, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Madam Chairwoman, this amendment represents a commonsense improvement to H.R. 624, which I support, that simply narrows the scope of the authorization for the intelligence community to share classified—I stress, classified—cyber threat intelligence with private sector entities and utilities.

As my colleagues are aware, the administration and some leading voices from the civil liberties and privacy rights communities have raised serious concerns with CISPA as reported out of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. These concerns revolve around the fact that many provisions of CISPA are perhaps perceived as overly vague, or outright silent, with respect to limiting the scope of information sharing and mitigating the risk of unintended consequences.

For example, section 2 of CISPA, titled “Cyber Threat Intelligence and Information Sharing,” is silent on what specific purposes classified cyber threat intelligence may be used, retained, or further disclosed by a certified entity. As reported, section 2 only requires that the DNI’s procedures governing the sharing of classified cyber threat intelligence between the intelligence community and private sector entities be “consistent with the need to protect the national security of the United States” and used by certified entities “in a manner which protects cyber threat intelligence from unauthorized disclosure.”

In this particular instance, I believe the concerns raised over the potential unintentional consequences from vagueness are real, valid, and ought to be addressed. I also believe it’s a false choice that we must somehow choose between effective cybersecurity initiatives on the one hand and preserving the sacred civil liberties and privacy rights we hold so dear as a Nation on the other. In many cases, defining or limiting the scope of authority would go a long way toward addressing the privacy concerns that have been raised with respect to this legislation.

To be clear, I want to recognize that the sponsors of CISPA have already engaged in good faith efforts to incorporate and address outstanding concerns with respect to the legislation that were held by the administration and other stakeholders, and I think that needs to be recognized.

On that note, I am pleased that my amendment that was made in order represents a straightforward improvement, I hope, to CISPA that’s consistent with the sponsor’s stated commitment to enhancing cybersecurity, safeguarding privacy rights and civil liberties, and ensuring oversight of activity. The amendment simply establishes that, with respect to CISPA’s requirements, the DNI establish procedures to govern the sharing of classified cyber threat intelligence—that this classified cyber threat intelligence may only be used, retained, or further disclosed by a certified entity for cybersecurity purposes.

As noted by the ACLU in its statement of support for the amendment, it’s consistent with similar restrictions limiting the scope of other information sharing activities addressed in other parts of the bill. The straightforward enhancement will be one of many needed improvements to the bill that will ensure it is a targeted, well-defined bill that directly—and only—strengthens our national cybersecurity.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Madam Chair, while I do not oppose the amendment, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Madam Chair, I do not oppose this amendment, which clarifies that classified intelligence shared by the government with a certified cybersecurity entity may only be used, retained, or further disclosed for cybersecurity purposes. The amendment is consistent with language that is already in the bill requiring the DNI, the Director of National Intelligence, to ensure that such classified information is carefully protected.

I appreciate the gentleman’s working with us and the ACLU to find an amendment that we could all agree on. I do not oppose this further clarification and would urge support by this body of the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I would inquire of the Chair how much time is remaining.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Madam Chairwoman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished ranking member of the committee, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RUPPERSBERGER).

□ 1540

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

This amendment increases the privacy and civil liberties protections in our bill; therefore, I urge a “yes” on Congressman CONNOLLY’s amendment.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Madam Chairwoman, I yield 1 minute to my distinguished colleague and our friend from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Madam Chair, I rise in support of this amendment.

I would also argue that, in addition to it being vague, it’s also overbroad in that it includes investigations for child pornography and child abductions and computer crimes. This means that under CISPA, the NSA could share data with law enforcement to investigate computer crimes, which is so broad and includes even lying about your age on your Facebook page. Are these really cyber threats that this bill claims to fix? We must defend against cyber attacks while protecting the liberties and privacy of Americans.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume to clarify that this doesn’t call for investigations of those crimes based on this material, but only protection of the individuals that may—and I want to stress “may,” because, again, the PII, the personal identifying information, is stripped clean. But in some rare, rare cases, you might find that you have located the child who has been subjugated to child pornography. In those cases, you don’t want to throw that away. There are parents out there begging for us to find this child. It’s very rare, it’s exceptional, doesn’t happen often, but in that very rare case—and, remember, there’s no personally identifiable information. It would allow for the protection, not investigation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Madam Chairwoman, I just want to thank the distinguished chairman and the distinguished ranking member of the committee for their leadership and for their cooperation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. SCHNEIDER

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 113-41.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, beginning on line 2, strike “employee or officer” and insert “employee, independent contractor, or officer”.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 164, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Every day, U.S. Web sites, databases, and operating networks are threatened by foreign governments, criminal organizations, and other groups trying to hack into our systems and wreak havoc.

Daily we read about infiltrations of the networks of our banks, newspapers, and even Federal agencies putting sensitive information at risk. These cyber attacks are real, and they can have devastating consequences: billions of dollars a year in stolen intellectual property and the potential to shut down our power grids and financial systems. The Cyber Intelligence Sharing and Protection Act gives the private sector the necessary tools to protect itself and its customers against these cyber attacks.

Currently, the intelligence community has the ability to detect cyber threats, but Federal law prohibits the sharing of this information with the very companies whose firewalls are under attack. By sharing this information, private companies can actually prevent these attacks.

The amendment I’m offering makes a small, clarifying change to the underlying bill, simply allowing independent contractors to be eligible for security clearances to perform the critical work of handling cyber threat intelligence. This clarification will allow companies—in particular, small and medium-sized businesses without the resources to employ full-time experts—to hire the most capable individuals and organizations to analyze network information, coordinate with the Federal Government, and protect ordinary Americans.

We cannot allow ourselves to be in a situation where the Federal Government has available the information to prevent or mitigate a cyber attack, but companies remain defenseless because there was no legal framework to share that critical information.

The networks at risk power our homes, our small businesses, and are what allow our banking systems to

function. They facilitate nearly every aspect of our daily lives. These networks must be protected as best and responsibly as possible.

I urge my colleagues to support both my amendment and final passage of this critically important bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Madam Chairman, while I do not oppose the amendment, I ask unanimous consent to control the time in opposition.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Madam Chairman, I will support the clarification in this amendment.

The amendment clarifies that independent contractors are eligible to receive security clearances to handle cyber threat intelligence and cyber threat information shared under the bill, an important clarification amendment.

I appreciate the gentleman’s work and effort in offering this amendment; And because the bill was not intended to exclude independent contractors, I will support this important clarification and would reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

Mr. SCHIFF. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise in opposition to the overall measure.

There are three concerns that have been raised by the administration about this bill that I share.

The first is that it does not include a provision requiring the private sector to make reasonable efforts to remove personal information before they share it with each other or before they share it with the government. This is a bedrock necessity for those who are concerned about the privacy of Americans who may be implicated in this cyber sharing.

Second, it’s very important that a civilian agency, like the Department of Homeland Security, be the main intake—really, the sole intake—for this domestic data.

There was one form of amendment offered in Rules to try to address this problem yesterday, yet another form of that amendment that was ultimately adopted by Rules, and yet a third form of that amendment that was adopted here this morning. None of us know exactly what it does because it has been a moving object. But it is very unclear whether this amendment would make a civilian agency, such as DHS, the sole intake for this domestic data. It should not be a military agency. We shouldn’t have the private sector interacting directly with a military agency when it comes to domestic data that may involve the privacy of the American people.

Finally, the immunity provisions are very broad and need to be reined in so as to encourage the private sector to take reasonable steps to make sure it

does not compromise privacy interests when it is not necessary to do so to protect cybersecurity.

Those three issues still must be addressed.

I want to compliment the chairman and the ranking member for the work they have done. They have made a very good-faith effort to make progress on many of these issues and in fact have made progress, but the bill still falls short and I must urge a “no” vote.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Madam Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. I yield such time as he may consume to the ranking member.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Madam Chair, our bill now enables companies and the government to have the option to hire independent contractors to handle cyber threat information. It helps bring talented people into our cybersecurity workforce; it provides jobs; it is good for our economy; and it is good for our national security. Therefore, I urge a “yes” vote on this amendment.

I also want to acknowledge Congressman SCHNEIDER for his involvement in this issue.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just want to address my friend from California, who is a thoughtful member of the intelligence community.

This is a position that much has been debated about: Should the government regulate into the private sector their use of the Internet? I argue that is a dangerous place to go. They will have to promulgate rules; they will have to set what reasonable standards are; they will have to determine what the private sector does on the Internet. That’s government in the Internet. One of the things that we decided to avoid in this bill was not to make that mandate, the burden to make sure that no PII, personal identifying information, is mandated in this bill; and it’s stripped out at the place where the burden should be: on the government. To make sure it happens, we have four different layers of oversight built in just to make sure what we say that they’re supposed to do according to the law, they follow the law—four levels of review.

□ 1550

We shouldn’t put the burden on the victims. We don’t do it if somebody sticks a gun in your face on the street or robs the bank or robs your home. What’s the difference if they’re robbing your Internet or stealing your blueprints that steals American jobs? The difference? There is none. Theft is theft.

Let us not move to get the government into regulating. Aspects of the Internet between private to private has been the explosion of growth in one-

sixth of our economy. Keep the government out of it.

That’s what we decided to do. We came to a very sensible place that protects that PII, that personal identifying information, and allows the government to stay out of regulating the Internet.

I think that’s the right prudent course. I think most Americans are with us. Certainly the broad specter of industries who have joined this, from the high-tech industry to the financial services to manufacturing, have said, This is the right way to go. You stay out of our business. We’ll share with you when we’re victims of a crime.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Madam Chairman, I just want to thank the ranking member and the chairman for the way you have approached this in a bipartisan effort, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. LANGEVIN

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 113–41.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Chair, I rise to offer an amendment, No. 35, listed as No. 4 in the rule.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 8, line 16, strike “a State, local, or tribal law or regulation” and insert “a law or regulation of a State, political subdivision of a State, or a tribe”.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 164, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island.

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

My amendment ensures that utility districts are not unnecessarily and unintentionally limited from protecting their own information and ultimately will lead to a broader and more effective information sharing structure, leading to better cybersecurity across all critical infrastructure. Specifically, the amendment replaces the word “local,” which is typically interpreted to mean city, town, and county by the courts.

Such a definition, I believe, could potentially leave out special districts that provide utility services, like the Salt River Project, the Central Arizona Project, the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, and other smaller special districts.

My amendment, Madam Chair, which is supported by the American Public Power Association, changes the bill to read, “political subdivision,” allowing

more utilities to receive the protections built into our bill. In doing so, it also makes the language consistent with the preemption provision in the bill.

If not amended, this legislation could subject utility districts to additional requirements if they share threat information, effectively creating a deterrent to participation—precisely what we want to avoid. We know that myriad threats are arrayed against the networks that run our critical infrastructure, and we must ensure that the utilities, which are the front lines in the cybersecurity fight, are properly protected.

I have long advocated for minimum standards for utilities, but absent such standards, I believe that we have to make sure that as many utilities as possible have access to the best possible information to defend their networks and are able to share information about the attacks that they experience.

This is an important bill overall. I really do want to applaud, again, Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member RUPPERSBERGER for their outstanding work on the underlying bill.

Obviously, the challenges of the threats that we face in cyberspace are growing exponentially every day. It seems like there’s not a week that goes by that you don’t hear of a new major attack on the critical infrastructure or, in particular, our banking system or major corporations with intellectual property theft, and obviously we have got to take action and do so now. Failure to do so would be a great abdication of our responsibility.

I’m disappointed the bill didn’t pass last year. I know how hard the chairman and ranking member worked on this legislation, but clearly our adversaries, or enemies, have not taken a hiatus. They are actively engaged in cyber attacks or threats of intellectual property or identity theft, and the list goes on and on.

The underlying bill is a major step forward in protecting our cyber networks, allowing classified information to be shared with the private sector, allowing threat information to be shared back with the government to give broader situation awareness, as well as information sharing between both in the private sector among companies.

So, again, the underlying bill is a major step forward. I believe this amendment that I’m offering makes the bill even better for making sure that broader utilities are included in allowing for information sharing.

I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment and the underlying legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Madam Chair, while I do not oppose the amendment, I ask unanimous consent to control the time in opposition.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN), who has been a tremendous leader on cybersecurity efforts on the Intelligence Committee. Much of our work there is classified and it goes unnoticed, and rightly so. I think it would be wrong for us not to commend in public your great leadership and efforts and work with us to try to make sure that this bill does what we say we want it to do. It has been a great privilege and pleasure to work with you throughout that process, and without that leadership, we wouldn't be standing on the floor today. I want to thank the gentleman for that.

I will support the amendment, which clarifies that entities located across multiple localities are intended to be covered by provisions in the bill exempting information shared under the bill from certain disclosures otherwise required of public or quasi-public entities. The amendment replaces the term "local" with "political subdivision." Because there is no intention to exclude such entities, this is intended as a clarification, an important clarification, and I will gladly support the amendment, and again thank the gentleman for his work on the totality of both national security issues and cybersecurity.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the ranking member of the Intelligence Committee, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RUPPERSBERGER).

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chair, first, I want to agree with our chairman, and I said it before, that you have been one of the key players in developing legislation to protect our country. From the beginning, when those of us started working on this issue, probably 2006, you were there. You have a tremendous amount of expertise. You have been a great adviser to all of us, and also not only the Intelligence Committee, but the Armed Services Committee, and I appreciate all your work.

I also support your amendment to include political subdivisions within the information, use, and protection requirements in our bill. Your amendment ensures that utility districts are not unnecessarily and unintentionally limited from protecting their own information.

Therefore, I urge a "yes" vote on your amendment.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Chair, before I close, I just wanted to thank, again, the chairman and the ranking member for their comments, but, more importantly, their extraordinary collaborative work in trying to protect our Nation's cybersecurity. The work that they did in putting this legislation together, it is a real service to the country what you have done, and I am grateful to have played a part in it with you, and thank you for your friendship.

With that, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island will be postponed.

□ 1600

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Madam Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MARCHANT) having assumed the chair, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 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, had come to no resolution thereon.

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 4 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1630

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS) at 4 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

CYBER INTELLIGENCE SHARING AND PROTECTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 164 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 624.

Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MARCHANT) kindly take the chair.

□ 1631

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 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, with Mr. MARCHANT (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 113-41 offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) had been postponed.

Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 113-41 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. LANGEVIN of Rhode Island.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF MICHIGAN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ROGERS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 418, noes 0, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 110]

AYES—418

Aderholt	Bucshon	Cook
Alexander	Burgess	Cooper
Amash	Bustos	Costa
Amodei	Butterfield	Cotton
Andrews	Calvert	Courtney
Bachus	Camp	Cramer
Barber	Campbell	Crawford
Barletta	Cantor	Crenshaw
Barr	Capito	Crowley
Barrow (GA)	Capps	Cuellar
Barton	Capuano	Culberson
Bass	Cárdenas	Cummings
Beatty	Carney	Daines
Becerra	Carson (IN)	Davis (CA)
Benishek	Carter	Davis, Danny
Bentivolio	Cartwright	Davis, Rodney
Bera (CA)	Cassidy	DeFazio
Bilirakis	Castor (FL)	DeGette
Bishop (GA)	Castro (TX)	Delaney
Bishop (NY)	Chabot	DeLauro
Bishop (UT)	Chaffetz	DeBene
Black	Chu	Denham
Blumenauer	Cicilline	Dent
Bonamici	Clarke	DeSantis
Bonner	Clay	DesJarlais
Boustany	Cleaver	Deutch
Brady (PA)	Clyburn	Diaz-Balart
Brady (TX)	Coble	Dingell
Braley (IA)	Coffman	Doggett
Bridenstine	Cohen	Doyle
Brooks (AL)	Cole	Duckworth
Brooks (IN)	Collins (GA)	Duffy
Brown (GA)	Collins (NY)	Duncan (SC)
Brown (FL)	Conaway	Duncan (TN)
Brownley (CA)	Connolly	Edwards
Buchanan	Conyers	Ellison

Ellmers	LaMalfa	Price (NC)	Weber (TX)	Wilson (FL)	Yoder	Forbes	LoBiondo	Roby
Engel	Lamborn	Quigley	Webster (FL)	Wilson (SC)	Yoho	Fortenberry	Loebsock	Roe (TN)
Enyart	Lance	Radel	Welch	Wittman	Young (AK)	Foster	Lofgren	Rogers (AL)
Eshoo	Langevin	Rahall	Wenstrup	Wolf	Young (FL)	Fox	Long	Rogers (KY)
Esty	Lankford	Rangel	Westmoreland	Womack	Young (IN)	Frankel (FL)	Lowenthal	Rogers (MI)
Farenthold	Larsen (WA)	Reed	Whitfield	Woodall		Franks (AZ)	Lowe	Rohrabacher
Farr	Larson (CT)	Reichert	Williams	Yarmuth		Frelinghuysen	Lucas	Rokita
Fattah	Latham	Renacci				Fudge	Luetkemeyer	Rooney
Fincher	Latta	Ribble				Gabbard	Lujan Grisham	Ros-Lehtinen
Fitzpatrick	Lee (CA)	Rice (SC)	Bachmann	Kennedy	Nugent	Gallego	(NM)	Roskam
Fleischmann	Levin	Richmond	Blackburn	Lynch	Rush	Garamendi	Luján, Ben Ray	Ross
Fleming	Lewis	Rigell	Green, Gene	Markey	Shimkus	Garcia	(NM)	Rothfus
Flores	Lipinski	Roby	Holding	Miller, Gary	Tsongas	Gardner	Lummis	Roybal-Allard
Forbes	LoBiondo	Roe (TN)	Jackson Lee	Moore		Garrett	Maffei	Royce
Fortenberry	Loebsock	Rogers (AL)				Gerlach	Maloney,	Ruiz
Foster	Lofgren	Rogers (KY)				Gibbs	Carolyn	Runyan
Fox	Long	Rogers (MI)				Gibson	Maloney, Sean	Ruppersberger
Frankel (FL)	Lowenthal	Rohrabacher				Gingrey (GA)	Marchant	Ryan (OH)
Franks (AZ)	Lowe	Rokita				Gohmert	Marino	Ryan (WI)
Frelinghuysen	Lucas	Rooney				Goodlatte	Massie	Salmon
Fudge	Luetkemeyer	Ros-Lehtinen				Gosar	Matheson	Sánchez, Linda
Gabbard	Lujan Grisham	Roskam				Gowdy	Matsui	T.
Gallego	(NM)	Ross				Granger	McCarthy (CA)	Sanchez, Loretta
Garamendi	Luján, Ben Ray	Rothfus				Graves (MO)	McCarthy (NY)	Sarbanes
Garcia	(NM)	Roybal-Allard				Grayson	McCauley	Scalise
Gardner	Lummis	Royce				Green, Al	McClintock	Schakowsky
Garrett	Maffei	Ruiz				Green, Gene	McCollum	Schiff
Gerlach	Maloney,	Runyan				Griffin (AR)	McDermott	Schneider
Gibbs	Carolyn	Ruppersberger				Griffith (VA)	McGovern	Schock
Gibson	Maloney, Sean	Ryan (OH)				Grijalva	McHenry	Schrader
Gingrey (GA)	Marchant	Ryan (WI)				Grimm	McIntyre	Schwartz
Gohmert	Marino	Salmon				Guthrie	McKeon	Schweikert
Goodlatte	Massie	Sánchez, Linda				Gutierrez	McKinley	Scott (VA)
Gosar	Matheson	T.				Hahn	McMorris	Scott, Austin
Gowdy	Matsui	Sanchez, Loretta				Hall	Rodgers	Scott, David
Granger	McCarthy (CA)	Sarbanes				Hanabusa	McNerney	Sensenbrenner
Graves (GA)	McCarthy (NY)	Scalise				Hanna	Meadows	Serrano
Graves (MO)	McCauley	Schakowsky				Harper	Meehan	Sessions
Grayson	McClintock	Schiff				Harris	Meeks	Sewell (AL)
Green, Al	McCollum	Schneider				Hartzler	Meng	Shea-Porter
Griffin (AR)	McDermott	Schock				Hastings (FL)	Messer	Sherman
Griffith (VA)	McGovern	Schrader				Hastings (WA)	Mica	Shuster
Grijalva	McHenry	Schwartz				Heck (NV)	Michaud	Simpson
Grimm	McIntyre	Schweikert				Heck (WA)	Miller (FL)	Sinema
Guthrie	McKeon	Scott (VA)				Hensarling	Miller (MI)	Sires
Gutierrez	McKinley	Scott, Austin				Herrera Beutler	Miller, George	Slaughter
Hahn	McMorris	Scott, David				Higgins	Moore	Smith (NE)
Hall	Rodgers	Sensenbrenner				Himes	Moran	Smith (NJ)
Hanabusa	McNerney	Serrano				Hinojosa	Mullin	Smith (TX)
Hanna	Meadows	Sessions				Holt	Mulvaney	Smith (WA)
Harper	Meehan	Sewell (AL)				Honda	Murphy (FL)	Southernland
Harris	Meeks	Shea-Porter				Horsford	Murphy (PA)	Speier
Hartzler	Meng	Sherman				Hoyer	Nadler	Stewart
Hastings (FL)	Messer	Shuster				Hudson	Napolitano	Stivers
Hastings (WA)	Mica	Simpson				Huelskamp	Neal	Stockman
Heck (NV)	Michaud	Sinema				Huffman	Negrete McLeod	Stutzman
Heck (WA)	Miller (FL)	Sires				Huizenga (MI)	Neugebauer	Swalwell (CA)
Hensarling	Miller (MI)	Slaughter				Hultgren	Noem	Takano
Herrera Beutler	Miller, George	Smith (NE)				Hunter	Nolan	Terry
Higgins	Moran	Smith (NJ)				Hurt	Nunes	Thompson (CA)
Himes	Mullin	Smith (TX)				Israel	Nunnelee	Thompson (MS)
Hinojosa	Mulvaney	Smith (WA)				Issa	O'Rourke	Thompson (PA)
Holt	Murphy (FL)	Southernland				Jeffries	Olson	Thornberry
Honda	Murphy (PA)	Speier				Jenkins	Owens	Tiberi
Horsford	Nadler	Stewart				Johnson (GA)	Palazzo	Tierney
Hoyer	Napolitano	Stivers				Johnson (OH)	Pallone	Tipton
Hudson	Neal	Stockman				Johnson, E. B.	Pascrell	Titus
Huelskamp	Negrete McLeod	Stutzman				Johnson, Sam	Pastor (AZ)	Tonko
Huffman	Neugebauer	Swalwell (CA)				Jones	Paulsen	Turner
Huizenga (MI)	Noem	Takano				Jordan	Payne	Upton
Hultgren	Nolan	Terry				Joyce	Pearce	Valadao
Hunter	Nunes	Thompson (CA)				Kaptur	Pelosi	Van Hollen
Hurt	Nunnelee	Thompson (MS)				Keating	Perlmutter	Vargas
Israel	O'Rourke	Thompson (PA)				Keating	Perry	Veasey
Issa	Olson	Thornberry				Kelly (IL)	Peters (CA)	Vela
Jeffries	Owens	Tiberi				Kelly (PA)	Peters (MI)	Velázquez
Jenkins	Palazzo	Tierney				Kildee	Peterson	Visclosky
Johnson (GA)	Pallone	Tipton				Kilmer	Petri	Wagner
Johnson (OH)	Pascrell	Titus				Kind	Pingree (ME)	Walberg
Johnson, E. B.	Pastor (AZ)	Tonko				King (IA)	Pittenger	Walden
Johnson, Sam	Paulsen	Turner				King (NY)	Pitts	Walorski
Jones	Payne	Upton				Kingston	Pocan	Walz
Jordan	Pearce	Valadao				Kinzinger (IL)	Poe (TX)	Wasserman
Joyce	Pelosi	Van Hollen				Kirkpatrick	Polis	Schultz
Kaptur	Perlmutter	Vargas				Kline	Pompeo	Waters
Keating	Perry	Veasey				Kuster	Posey	Watt
Kelly (IL)	Peters (CA)	Vela				Labrador	Price (GA)	Waxman
Kelly (PA)	Peters (MI)	Velázquez					Price (NC)	Weber (TX)
Kildee	Peterson	Visclosky					Quigley	Webster (FL)
Kilmer	Petri	Wagner					Lance	Welch
Kind	Pingree (ME)	Walberg					Langevin	Wenstrup
King (IA)	Pittenger	Walden					Lankford	Westmoreland
King (NY)	Pitts	Walorski					Larsen (WA)	Whitfield
Kingston	Pocan	Walz					Larson (CT)	Williams
Kinzinger (IL)	Poe (TX)	Wasserman					Latham	Wilson (FL)
Kirkpatrick	Polis	Schultz					Lee (CA)	Wilson (SC)
Kline	Pompeo	Waters					Levin	Wittman
Kuster	Posey	Watt					Lewis	Wolf
Labrador	Price (GA)	Waxman					Lipinski	Womack

NOT VOTING—14

□ 1656

Mrs. LOWEY and Mr. RANGEL changed their vote from “no” to “aye.” So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 110, had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 418, noes 0, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 111]

AYES—418

Aderholt	Camp	Cuellar
Alexander	Campbell	Culberson
Amash	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
Bentivolio	Chaffetz	DesJarlais
Bera (CA)	Chu	Deutch
Bilirakis	Cicilline	Diaz-Balart
Bishop (GA)	Clarke	Dingell
Bishop (NY)	Clay	Doggett
Black	Cleaver	Doyle
Blumenauer	Clyburn	Duckworth
Bonamici	Coble	Duffy
Bonner	Coffman	Duncan (SC)
Boustany	Cohen	Duncan (TN)
Brady (PA)	Cole	Edwards
Brady (TX)	Collins (GA)	Ellison
Brady (IA)	Collins (NY)	Ellmers
Bridenstine	Conaway	Engel
Brooks (AL)	Connolly	Enyart
Brooks (IN)	Conyers	Eshoo
Brown (GA)	Cook	Esty
Brown (FL)	Cooper	Farenthold
Brownley (CA)	Costa	Farr
Buchanan	Cotton	Fattah
Bucshon	Courtney	Fincher
Burgess	Cramer	Fitzpatrick
Bustos	Crawford	Fleischmann
Butterfield	Crenshaw	Fleming
Calvert	Crowley	Flores

Woodall Yoho Young (IN)
 Yarmuth Young (AK)
 Yoder Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—14

Bachmann Jackson Lee Nugent
 Bishop (UT) Kennedy Rush
 Blackburn Lynch Shimkus
 Graves (GA) Markey Tsongas
 Holding Miller, Gary

□ 1701

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

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. LANGEVIN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 411, noes 3, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 112]

AYES—411

Aderholt Castor (FL) Duncan (TN)
 Alexander Castro (TX) Edwards
 Amodei Chabot Ellison
 Andrews Chaffetz Ellmers
 Bachus Chu Engel
 Barber Cicilline Enyart
 Barletta Clarke Eshoo
 Barr Clay Esty
 Barron (GA) Cleaver Farenthold
 Barton Clyburn Farr
 Bass Coble Fincher
 Beatty Coffman Fitzpatrick
 Becerra Cohen Fleischmann
 Benishek Cole Fleming
 Bentivolio Collins (GA) Flores
 Bera Collins (NY) Forbes
 Billirakis Conaway Fortenberry
 Bishop (GA) Connolly Foster
 Bishop (NY) Conyers Foxx
 Bishop (UT) Cook Frankel (FL)
 Black Cooper Franks (AZ)
 Blumenauer Costa Frelinghuysen
 Bonamici Cotton Fudge
 Bonner Gabbard Gabbard
 Boustany Cramer Gallego
 Brady (PA) Crawford Garamendi
 Brady (TX) Crenshaw Garcia
 Braley (IA) Crowley Gardner
 Bridenstine Cuellar Garrett
 Brooks (AL) Culberson Gerlach
 Brooks (IN) Cummings Gibbs
 Broun (GA) Daines Gibson
 Brown (FL) Davis (CA) Gingrey (GA)
 Brownley (CA) Davis, Danny Goodlatte
 Buchanan Davis, Rodney Gosar
 Bucshon DeFazio Gowdy
 Burgess DeGette Granger
 Bustos Delaney Graves (GA)
 Butterfield DeLauro Graves (MO)
 Calvert DelBene Grayson
 Camp Denham Green, Al
 Campbell Dent Green, Gene
 Cantor DeSantis Griffin (AR)
 Capito DesJarlais Griffith (VA)
 Capps Deutch Grijalva
 Capuano Diaz-Balart Grimm
 Cárdenas Dingell Guthrie
 Carney Doggett Gutierrez
 Carson (IN) Doyle Hahn
 Carter Duckworth Hall
 Cartwright Duffy Hanabusa
 Cassidy Duncan (SC) Hanna

Harper McGovern
 Harris McHenry
 Hartzler McIntyre
 Hastings (FL) McKeon
 Hastings (WA) McKinley
 Heck (NV) McMorris
 Heck (WA) Rodgers
 Hensarling McNeerney
 Herrera Beutler Meadows
 Higgins Meehan
 Himes Meeks
 Hinojosa Meng
 Holt Messer
 Honda Mica
 Horsford Michaud
 Hoyer Miller (FL)
 Hudson Miller (MI)
 Huelskamp Miller, George
 Huffman Moore
 Huizenga (MI) Moran
 Hultgren Mulvaney
 Hunter Murphy (FL)
 Hurt Murphy (PA)
 Israel Nadler
 Issa Napolitano
 Jeffries Neal
 Jenkins Negrete McLeod
 Johnson (GA) Neugebauer
 Johnson (OH) Noem
 Johnson, E. B. Nolan
 Johnson, Sam Nunes
 Jones Nunnelee
 Jordan O'Rourke
 Joyce Olson
 Kaptur Owens
 Keating Palazzo
 Kelly (IL) Pallone
 Kelly (PA) Pascrell
 Kildee Pastor (AZ)
 Kilmer Paulsen
 Kind Payne
 King (IA) Pearce
 King (NY) Pelosi
 Kingston Perlmutter
 Kinzinger (IL) Perry
 Kirkpatrick Peters (CA)
 Kline Peters (MI)
 Kuster Peterson
 Labrador Petri
 LaMalfa Pingree (ME)
 Lamborn Pittenger
 Lance Pitts
 Langevin Pocan
 Lanford Poe (TX)
 Larsen (WA) Polis
 Larson (CT) Pompeo
 Latham Posey
 Latta Price (GA)
 Lee (CA) Price (NC)
 Levin Quigley
 Lipinski Radel
 LoBiondo Rahall
 Loeb sack Rangel
 Lofgren Reed
 Long Reichert
 Lowenthal Renacci
 Lowey Ribble
 Luetkemeyer Rice (SC)
 Lujan Grisham Richmond
 (NM) Rigell
 Luján, Ben Ray Roby
 (NM) Roe (TN)
 Lummis Rogers (AL)
 Maffei Rogers (KY)
 Maloney, Carolyn Rogers (MI)
 Carolyn Rohrabacher
 Maloney, Sean Rokita
 Marchant Rooney
 Marino Ros-Lehtinen
 Massie Roskam
 Matheson Ross
 Matsui Rothfus
 McCarthy (CA) Roybal-Allard
 McCarthy (NY) Royce
 McCaul Ruiz
 McCollum Runyan
 McDermott Ruppensberger

NOES—3

Amash Gohmert McClintock

NOT VOTING—18

Bachmann Lewis
 Blackburn Lucas
 Fattah Lynch
 Holding Markey
 Jackson Lee Miller, Gary
 Kennedy Mullin

Ryan (OH) Ryan (WI)
 Ryan (WI) Salmon
 Sánchez, Linda T.
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sarbanes
 Scalise
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schneider
 Schock
 Schrader
 Schwartz
 Schweikert
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, Austin
 Sensenbrenner
 Serrano
 Sessions
 Sewell (AL)
 Shea-Porter
 Sherman
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Sinema
 Sires
 Slaughter
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Smith (WA)
 Southerland
 Olson
 Stewart
 Stockman
 Stutzman
 Swalwell (CA)
 Takano
 Terry
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tiberi
 Tierney
 Tipton
 Titus
 Tonko
 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
 Westmoreland
 Whitfield
 Williams
 Wilson (FL)
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Wolf
 Womack
 Woodall
 Yarmuth
 Yoder
 Yoho
 Young (AK)
 Young (FL)
 Young (IN)

□ 1707

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

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Chair, on April 17, 2013, I was not able to vote on rollcall votes 110, 111 and 112. At the time, I was performing my duties as a designee of the U.S. House of Representatives attending the funeral of Baroness Margaret Thatcher in London. Had I been present for the vote, I would have voted “aye” on all three votes.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.
 Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. WAGNER) having assumed the chair, Mr. MARCHANT, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 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, had come to no resolution thereon.

□ 1710

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER TO WORLD WAR I CENTENNIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker’s appointment, pursuant to section 4(b) of the World War I Centennial Commission Act (Public Law 112-272), and the order of the House of January 3, 2013, of the following individual on the part of the House to the World War I Centennial Commission:

Colonel Thomas N. Moe, Retired, Lancaster, Ohio

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably detained with meetings in my office. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye” on the Rogers amendment, “aye” on the Connolly amendment, and “aye” on the Langevin amendment to the underlying legislation, H.R. 624.

COMMEMORATING 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE

(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. Madam Speaker, 100 years ago, Congress passed the 1914 Legislative, Executive, and Judicial Appropriations Act, which established a separate department within the Library of Congress to serve the legislative and resource needs of the United States Congress.

The legislation authorized the Library of Congress to “employ competent persons to prepare such indexes, digests, and compilations of laws as may be required for Congress and other official use.”

In 1946, the Department was renamed the Legislative Reference Service, which is today known as the Congressional Research Service, or CRS. Over the years, CRS has served the Congress by providing comprehensive and reliable legislative research and analyses that are timely, objective, and authoritative.

This year is the 100th anniversary of the Congressional Research Service, and today I want to thank these research professionals for the work they do and the contributions they make to the United States Congress and our Federal legislative process.

SAFE CLIMATE CAUCUS

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

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, last week, members of the Safe Climate Caucus challenged the Republicans who are on the Energy and Commerce Committee to come to the floor and debate with us and talk about the problems of climate change. We wrote them a letter, and we haven't even gotten a reply. There seems to be a conspiracy of silence in the House of Representatives about the dangers of climate change, and it's time for real debate on the House floor.

Every day, members of the Safe Climate Caucus have come to this floor to give speeches on topics relating to climate change, including the importance of preparing communities to mitigate the impacts of extreme weather events, potential for clean energy technologies, and the threats of rising temperatures across the country.

In contrast, we're not aware of any Republican Member who has spoken on the House floor about the dangers of climate change, and the committee of jurisdiction is not even willing to hold a hearing to hear what the scientists and experts have to say about the issue.

I have a message to House Republicans: You can't make climate change go away by ignoring the problem.

THE BOSTON TRAGEDY

(Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Madam Speaker, today our hearts remain

heavy. Our hearts are heavy for those who lost their lives in Monday's unspeakable act of violence, for those who remain in critical condition, for the parents who lost their 8-year-old son, and for the families whose loved ones never came home from the Boston Marathon.

While our sorrow is great, so, too, is our resolve. We're committed to working with law enforcement officers to ensure that those responsible are held accountable, and we are committed to stopping acts of terror on U.S. soil and abroad.

We will remain vigilant, demand answers, and seek justice, for there is nothing we take more seriously than the protection of American life. And in our sorrow, we will find gratitude for the firefighters, paramedics, police officers, and first responders who put their lives at risk to help save others.

In the words of Ronald Reagan:

I know in my heart that man is good, that what is right will always eventually triumph. And there's purpose and worth to each and every life.

So today let us come together as Americans—as moms and dads, brothers and sisters, husbands and wives—and continue to pray for those whose lives were forever changed.

SAFE CLIMATE CAUCUS

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Speaker, earlier today, the Energy and Commerce Committee passed, for the third time in 2 years, a bill to force approval of the Keystone XL pipeline.

I voted against the bill for many reasons, but chief among them is the fact that it doubles down on a dead-end oil-based energy policy that is hurting our economy, hurting our environment and our health.

Burning fossil fuels is a primary cause of climate change, and we simply can't afford to continue down this destructive path. It makes far more sense to focus on developing the clean, renewable energy technologies that we all know we're going to need down the road. Developing these technologies will create quality long-term jobs that can't be shipped overseas. It's good for business; it's good for our planet; and it's good for our national security.

There's no reason we can't put aside our differences and take action to promote a clean energy future. It's what our constituents sent us here to do.

Our window of opportunity is rapidly closing. The time to act is now.

□ 1720

CYBERSECURITY AND THE CONSTITUTION

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

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, the House has been considering H.R. 624, the so-called CISPA bill.

Although its sponsors assure us that a person's Internet data would be stripped of personal identification, this bill then allows this data to be used to prosecute certain Federal crimes. Well, how could they do it? It turns out the Federal Government, having stumbled upon this evidence, can then seek a warrant to obtain that personally identifying information.

That makes it the functional equivalent of the “writs of assistance” used by the English Crown in colonial times. It is antithetical to the Fourth Amendment, which requires that, before the government can invade your privacy, it must first present a court with reasonable cause to believe you have committed a crime. This bill effectively allows the government to search through your personal records indiscriminantly and then use that information to form the basis of a prosecution.

Cybersecurity is an important national security issue, but it does not trump the Bill of Rights or the American freedoms that our Constitution protects.

SAFE CLIMATE CAUCUS

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Today, I rise to cite the fact that the American people and Democrats and scientists agree that climate change is a danger to us all, but where are the Republicans? A week ago, I joined my colleagues in the Safe Climate Caucus to challenge the Republican members of the Energy and Commerce Committee to debate the Nation's response to climate change on the House floor. We received no response.

It is time for a real debate on the House floor about the dangers of climate change. We are already seeing the powerful forces and effects of nature. We are witnessing the predictions of our premier scientists come true, and they are alarming. We've seen catastrophic storms, record heat waves, droughts, and wildfires. Top scientists in the U.S. and around the world tell us that impacts like these will get even worse as climate change continues. There is no debate about the science of climate change.

Madam Speaker, it's time for a debate on how to solve climate change.

THE “GOLD STAR” FOR DAWSON COUNTY HIGH SCHOOL JUNIOR ROTC

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to report that the Dawson County High School Junior ROTC recently earned “gold star” status. This honor places the Dawson County High School Junior ROTC in

the top 10 percent of the Nation. This status is a reflection of each cadet's hard work and the investment of the parents, the instructors, and the community in the Junior ROTC program.

As a member of the Air Force Reserve, I have great admiration for the young people involved in Junior ROTC in Georgia and throughout the United States. This important program instills the values of citizenship, service, and personal responsibility in the next generation of leaders.

I anticipate great things from these young men and women in the future, and I wish the Dawson County High School Junior ROTC program continued success.

THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF FEDEX

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

Mr. COHEN. I rise today to recognize the 40th anniversary of the founding of FedEx, one of the world's great companies.

According to business lore, CEO Fred Smith originally introduced his idea for FedEx in a Yale economics paper that got him a C grade. Today, 40 years later, we can all appreciate the merit of that C paper after the company originally set up shop in 1973 near the Memphis airport with 14 aircraft and 186 packages set for delivery. That first day, FedEx flew to 25 U.S. cities from its home base in Memphis, which remains its world headquarters. Today, FedEx has grown to ship more than 9 million parcels daily across the globe.

FedEx and Fred Smith have also shown great generosity to the country, and Memphis is lucky and proud that it's our home company. Fred Smith, a combat marine, who served two tours of duty in Vietnam, served as the co-chair of the World War II Memorial Committee to build a memorial here in Washington.

It used to be said that what's good for General Motors is good for the Nation, but now I think what's good for FedEx is good for the Nation—absolutely, positively.

I congratulate Fred Smith and FedEx on 40 years of great service, and I look forward to another 40 years of innovation and service.

SAFE CLIMATE CAUCUS

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

Mr. TONKO. It is time for a real debate on climate change—right here on the House floor. The members of the Safe Climate Caucus come to the floor to talk about this critical issue every day that the House is in session, but where are our Republican colleagues?

Last week, we challenged the Republican members of the Energy and Commerce Committee to a debate, a debate

about the appropriate policy response to the threat of climate change, but we've heard nothing from the Republicans. The House Republican leadership should schedule that debate right away. This problem is not going away. The longer we delay, the greater the risks.

The Energy and Commerce Committee has refused to act or to even hear the latest science. Congressman WAXMAN and Congressman RUSH have sent over 20 letters requesting hearings with scientists and other experts about important developments in climate science, but the Republicans have refused to hold any hearings on climate change. The American public is entitled to an explanation for this disappointing record of inaction.

Madam Speaker, we need to get serious about tackling climate change. That means having a debate about what actions should be taken. That debate is long overdue, and my friends, time is running out.

JOHN GRANVILLE

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to talk about a remarkable man from Buffalo, New York—John Granville.

John was a diplomat with the United States Agency for International Development, who was facilitating free elections in the Sudan when, 5 years ago, he was assassinated in Khartoum. Four of his killers were captured and convicted, but they escaped from prison. Two remain at large, and the State Department has issued a \$5 million reward for information leading to their capture. Meanwhile, in February, the Sudanese Government pardoned the man who helped John Granville's killers escape.

Madam Speaker, John deserves better. He was a selfless and courageous man who dedicated his life to representing the United States and in helping those who needed it most. Tomorrow, I will introduce a resolution calling for the Sudan to remain on the State Sponsors of Terrorism list until the pardon is repealed and the escapees are captured. I will also send a letter demanding that President al-Bashir rescind the pardon immediately.

John Granville made western New York and our Nation proud. I will keep fighting to see that justice is served and that his memory is honored.

CLIMATE CHANGE NEEDS A GLOBAL SOLUTION

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

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. Ladies and gentlemen, I join you today to share an amusing note that one of my constituents posted on Facebook recently. He said:

I carved my pumpkin, and it was snowing outside. Today, I dyed Easter eggs, and it's snowing outside. Congratulations, Mr. President. You've solved global warming.

Now, that's amusing. Climate change is a serious issue, but we must recognize that we do not have this planet all to ourselves and that, when the Chinese are increasing elevenfold their profits on the production of coal, when they, in fact, have become the number one coal producer, when their equipment is about 30 to 50 percent less efficient than ours, we cannot solve this problem without a global solution, and we must have the Chinese act.

We've done our part in going down this road to solve problems. We need the Chinese to act as well.

COMMONSENSE BACKGROUND CHECKS ON GUN OWNERS

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

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. I rise to commend JOE MANCHIN and PAT TOOMEY for coming up with a rational approach that 92 percent of Americans all agree with in the need for universal background checks as they relate to our gun laws.

The bill was taken up today in the Senate, and the vote was 54-46. Every fifth grader in America is astounded that that bill was defeated. Only in the United States Senate, the other body, could that take place—that a vote of 54-46 would not pass.

So, disheartening as it is and in reeling from the events that have taken place in Boston on Patriots' Day, children all across America cannot be reassured by their parents tonight that they are safe, but the NRA will sleep well this evening. Mission accomplished.

But there is another Chamber and an opportunity for the House of Representatives to speak its will on the violence that has been perpetrated across this country: in the commonsense background checks that are needed here in this country.

□ 1730

WAR ON COAL

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BARR. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the topic of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BARR. Madam Speaker, this Nation was founded on a simple, but majestic, idea; and that idea is that we are endowed by our Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Think about these words from Jefferson in the Declaration of Independence for just a minute: the pursuit of happiness—the idea that every human being has a fundamental, natural right to follow his or her dreams, to reach for the stars, to work hard to achieve their God-given potential, all without undue interference from the government.

What is the key to happiness? I believe it to be hard work—a relentless and unyielding desire on the part of the individual to apply effort and improve their lot in life. Hard work, after all, has been an American tradition from our very founding. Benjamin Franklin once said:

It is the working man who is the happy man. It is the idle man who is the miserable man.

And so this story is the story of America. The work ethic defines who we are as a nation. It is in our DNA; unconstrained by excessive government, the industry and creativity of the American people have fueled the most prosperous and productive nation in the history of the world.

So what gives Americans—or anyone else for that matter—the character to pursue happiness? What animates our capacity to do work? In a word: energy.

Quite literally, the classic, scientific definition of energy is the ability to do work. And Americans' ability to perform work, to work hard and to pursue happiness over the years has been supported by an abundant and affordable supply of domestic American-produced energy. Energy has been the indispensable ingredient in Americans' ability to pursue happiness.

Think about it: the story of this country has been the story of American energy—coal, oil, natural gas. Abundant, reliable, affordable energy has always been essential to a growing national economy. It built the railroads and conquered the West. It spawned the industrial revolution and won two world wars. It revolutionized communications and fostered innovation from Henry Ford to the Wright brothers, Apollo and Neil Armstrong. It propelled us into the Information Age and the knowledge-based economy. Energy always has been and always will be the key to Americans' ability to work hard and pursue happiness.

It is no surprise then that the countries with the best human health and the most material wealth on this planet are the countries with the highest levels of energy consumption. The most salient difference between nations in the developed world and nations in the lesser-developed world is that nations in the developed world produce and consume the most energy, whereas nations in the lesser-developed parts of the world produce and consume the least.

And so before us we have a choice, and it's a choice between two futures. The first is a future of energy freedom and independence in which we continue to embrace the ideals of our Founding Fathers, of Jefferson and Franklin, where men follow their dreams, can work hard and pursue happiness unconstrained by central planners in Washington, D.C., where we can pursue an open energy system and a diversity of energy sources to create jobs and opportunity and power a future of unlimited growth and potential.

The second is a future of energy scarcity, a future of energy dependency in which we abandon the traditions of the Founding Fathers, reject the American work ethic, and deprive Americans of their ability to pursue their dreams, by limiting the diversity of their energy choices to only those that Washington politicians and not the American people decide are worthwhile and sustainable.

In short, in the words of Benjamin Franklin, we can be the happy man. We can pursue happiness, or we can be the idle man. The choice is ours, and here's why this is relevant today. We are on the path toward a future of energy scarcity rather than energy freedom. We are on a path that replaces Americans' right to work hard and pursue happiness with a government-directed society in which politicians and bureaucrats restrict Americans' freedom and limit their choices. And the best example of this is the Obama administration's war on coal.

What is the impact of this great, abundant natural resource? In 2012, coal was responsible for 37 percent of electricity generated in the United States, more than any other source of electricity. Given current consumption rates, the United States has more than 230 years remaining in coal reserves. Coal is mined in 25 U.S. States and is responsible for over 760,000 U.S. jobs.

My home State, Kentucky, has produced energy for centuries. And most importantly, we have produced coal. And our coal industry that has been built by the hard work of my fellow Kentuckians powers America. Kentucky was the third largest coal producer in the United States during 2011, and coal mining was by far the greatest source of energy production in the Commonwealth. In 2011, coal mines employed more than 19,000 individuals through the year, and mining directly contributed approximately \$4 billion to the Commonwealth's economy.

What has the war on coal brought to our country and to Kentucky? Domestic coal decreased by 4.6 percent just last year. In 2012, U.S. coal consumption for electric power declined by 11.5 percent. Within the past year, 226 coal electricity-generating units have been shut down. In 2012, Kentucky's overall coal production decreased by 16.3 percent, reaching its lowest level of production since 1965.

And this has an impact on real people. U.S. coal-mining jobs dropped by

7,700 in 2012, and new and pending EPA regulations will cost 1.65 million jobs. With 205 coal-fired generators shutting down in the coming year due to stricter environmental regulations, the United States is expected to lose up to 17,000 jobs.

In my home State of Kentucky, this war on coal has been devastating to my fellow Kentuckians. In 2012, direct employment in Kentucky's coal industry decreased by over 4,000 workers.

Mr. Speaker, this has a real impact on real lives. It's easy to sit in Washington and issue regulations when you don't have to confront the human cost.

I want to yield time to some of my fellow colleagues in the House; but before I do, I want to tell a brief story that I think tells the story of the war on coal and why it matters to people all around this country. It's a story of a young coal miner that I met in my home State of Kentucky. His name is Chris Woods, and Chris commutes over an hour each way, both ways, to work and back home every day. He took me in the coal mine, and he wanted to show me his work. And it's heroic work what these coal miners do. And he took me underground and he showed me what he did. As we were coming out of the mine, and as I recognized that what he was doing was providing low-cost, reliable electricity to the American people, he looked at me and he said: You know, ANDY, I don't really know much about politics. And, frankly, I don't care much about politics; but if you can save my job, I'm for you.

And the thing about Chris Woods was he wasn't thinking about himself. His one paycheck takes care of his wife, two children, and both sets of parents.

□ 1740

This matters to people. And for every one coal mining job lost, there are 3½ additional jobs that are dependent on the coal industry.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I look forward to having a discussion tonight about the future of coal in America, about the choices we have as a country to pursue our happiness, to work hard, to fulfill and embrace the Founding Fathers' vision that we should shoot for the stars, that we should have energy diversity and energy freedom, and we should reject the path we're on, a path of energy scarcity and dependence.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to yield to the gentlelady from Missouri, ANN WAGNER.

Mrs. WAGNER. I thank the gentleman from Kentucky for yielding and for hosting this Special Order on the importance of America's coal industry.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to discuss the importance of coal in Missouri. There is no denying that coal has played a vital role in providing an abundant source of power to plants that generate electricity for families and for businesses across this country.

In Missouri, coal-fired electricity is responsible for 81 percent of the State's electric supply, and largely contributed

to Missouri's low electricity rate of 7 cents per kilowatt hour in 2011, compared with the national average of 10 cents per kilowatt hour for that very same year.

Additionally, Missouri was sixth in the country in coal consumption, with 46 million tons of coal used for electricity in 2011, of which Ameren Missouri's Meramec plant in the Second Congressional District consumed 3½ million tons.

Ameren Missouri, based out of St. Louis, is the State's largest electric utility and provides electric service to approximately 1.2 million customers across central and eastern Missouri, including the Greater St. Louis area.

In addition to the consumption of coal, the Greater St. Louis area is also a critical player in the procurement of coal for our Nation's energy needs, with companies like Arch Coal, Peabody Coal and Patriot Coal headquartered in St. Louis and drawing employees from Missouri's Second Congressional District. These companies are among some of the country's and the world's largest coal providers.

All of this helps in keeping energy costs low for families and for businesses. More than half of American households devote more than 20 percent of their family budget to energy costs and, in this economy, we must do everything we can in order to keep the costs of electricity down.

Despite the reliance on coal in providing for this country's energy needs and contributing to low electricity prices, this administration has continually made it more difficult for these longstanding plants to operate, which ultimately threatens the industry for the future.

Existing power plants are already in the middle of meeting compliance with an EPA regulation aimed at reducing uncontrolled greenhouse gas emissions by 90 percent over 3 years. Now EPA is also proposing to regulate greenhouse gases for new power plants that will require them to meet a natural gas standard for air emissions by relying on unproven technology utilizing carbon capture and storage.

This standard was originally designed for a completely different energy source and relies on technology that has not yet been commercially tested, with the EPA itself estimating that this New Source Performance Standards rule will add around 80 percent to the cost of electricity for a new coal plant.

The EPA has already missed their April 13 deadline to finalize the rule, citing that they are still reviewing the close to 2 million comments that have been offered on the proposal. Among these comments are submissions from 221 Members of Congress, including 14 Democrats, who all have concerns with the devastating impact that this rule will have on jobs and the economy.

As a new Member of Congress, I would like to join my colleagues in opposition of this rule. The New Source

Performance Standards rule will deny economic and environmental benefits of new low-emissions coal power plants in favor of plants that rely on commercially unproven technology in order to chase unrealistic and marginal environmental standards.

On top of all of this, President Obama's nominee to head the EPA during his second term only promises to bring the same kind of policies that have shut down factories and bogged down companies with increased regulatory red tape during his first term.

Gina McCarthy has headed the EPA's Office on Air Quality since 2009, and was instrumental in the creation of these regulations that have attacked the coal industry.

I applaud Senator ROY BLUNT's leadership in placing a hold on her nomination, and hope that my other Senate colleagues will also take a hard look at her previous agenda when considering her legitimacy for the position, with such an important part of our domestic energy production and economic activity at stake. The coal industry just simply cannot handle four more years of the same regulatory overburden by the EPA.

What this all comes down to is continuing to provide reliable and affordable energy for the people of Missouri and the United States of America. Increasing costs of doing business subsequently increases the price of energy for households at a time when families are spending more and more of their budget on powering their homes.

The amount that American households devote from their family budget to energy cost is more than double from 10 years ago, and these regulations on coal have all played a significant role in that.

Mr. BARR. I thank the gentlelady, and appreciate her comments on the fact that certainly affordable electricity is part of this discussion. And it's particularly important to recognize that the war on coal affects everybody, not just coal miners, not just people in the power industry, but seniors on fixed income.

Over half of American households devote more than 20 percent of their family budget to energy costs, more than double 10 years ago, and so this matters to every middle class family in America.

At this time I'd like to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky, the chair of the Energy Subcommittee.

Mr. WHITFIELD. I want to thank the gentleman from Kentucky for hosting this discussion about the importance of coal, and for all those who are going to participate in this discussion this evening.

When President Obama was seeking the office he now holds, he visited San Francisco and he attended a meeting in San Francisco. And at that meeting he made the comment that if he was elected President, you could still build a coal plant in America, but he would bankrupt the industry.

And guess what?

He and his administration have made it very clear, despite their comments that they support all of the above in energy policy to produce electricity, they've made it very clear that they do not support the use of coal.

The gentleman from Kentucky mentioned earlier that over 205 coal-burning plants have closed in this country in recent years. And this President's EPA recently came out with a rule proposal relating to greenhouse gas emissions, and that when they finalize that rule—they were supposed to have finalized it on April 13 and they did not do it—but when they finalize it, it will be impossible to build a new coal-powered plant in America because the technology is not available to meet the emissions standards required by EPA.

Now, let's think about that for a moment. We would be the only country in the world in which you would not be able to build a coal-powered plant to produce electricity. And we know that in China, they're building more and more every day, every week, every month. The same thing in India. And even in Germany, where they closed down their nuclear power plants, they're building more coal-powered plants.

Now, what does that mean to America if we can not build a new coal-powered plant?

My friend from Virginia was talking about, in Virginia, just about a year ago, they built one of the cleanest burning coal-powered plants in America.

I was in Texarkana, Arkansas, in December. They opened up another clean-burning plant in Arkansas. But under these new regulations, you would not be able to build any plant, regardless of how clean it is.

□ 1750

Now the sad thing about this is that we're losing jobs because of these regulations. But just as important, America is becoming less competitive in the global marketplace because it's increasing the cost of electricity, making it much more difficult for us to compete in the global marketplace. And the sad thing about it is that this is being done by regulators without any public debate.

It's hard to believe that a regulation administered by EPA will prohibit the building of any coal-powered plant in America, once it's final, from that day forward, unless the technology is dramatically improved. And yet there's no public debate about it. This is a decision that should be made on the floor of the House of Representatives and on the floor of the United States Senate, not by a group of regulators who determine that they want to put coal out of business.

Now a few of our friends were talking earlier in the 1-minutes about climate change. America does not have to take a backseat to anyone on a clean environment. In fact, our CO₂ emissions in

America today are lower than they have been in 20 years, and our other emissions are lower than they have been in many, many years because our Clean Air Act and our Clean Water Act are working. But let's not use these pieces of legislation to penalize the American people and lose jobs and be less competitive in the global marketplace.

So I want to thank the gentleman for sponsoring this event. Let's be mindful of the importance of coal and producing electricity in America.

Mr. BARR. I thank the gentleman. And I think his final point was a good one; that, ironically, the EPA's overly restrictive policies are actually contributing to a negative global environment. The crackdown on domestic energy production is producing exports to countries with inferior electrical generation capabilities. We need to unleash the American free enterprise system. The American free enterprise system is what will solve problems in utility generation and energy production.

So I thank the gentleman, and I look forward to continuing to work with him on this important topic.

I now would like to recognize the gentledady from West Virginia.

Mrs. CAPITO. I would like to thank the gentleman from Kentucky for hosting us today to talk about coal. As he mentioned, I am from the great State of West Virginia, one of the largest coal-producing States in our Nation, and, historically, some of the largest coal-producing areas of our Nation.

As we know, coal is a huge part of the economy in West Virginia. But we also know that energy is a jobs economy. When you're generating energy in any capacity, you're generating jobs. We have over 7.6 percent unemployment across the country, and yet we have a President who wants to pick winners and losers on the energy front. Coal has been one of the President's favorite losers, as we have seen and heard from our colleagues.

But there are three reasons I'm standing here today. The first reason I'm here is to stand up for the jobs of tens of thousands of West Virginians, whether that's a coal miner, as you mentioned, transportation, shop owner, electrician, fuel supplier, and all the different jobs that are connected with getting to and burning our Nation's most abundant resource. And I'm very concerned about it. We lost 1,200 jobs in the last quarter of 2012 in West Virginia alone.

Secondly, I'm here to stand up to the families and those who are on fixed incomes. As the gentleman from Kentucky brought up, when you think about the largest part for a senior who lives on a fixed income, the most difficult thing for them is the fluctuation in their power bill, whether it's heating or air conditioning. And when you start chipping away at \$50 or \$100 a month, you're going to find our seniors and those who live on fixed incomes really suffering.

Finally, I'm here to talk about the reliability of our electrical grid. If we disadvantage ourselves as a Nation, as we have been, and say no more coal generation, no more coal-fired power plants, we're going to disadvantage ourselves as an energy economy and the manufacturing jobs that come with that.

We've heard a lot about the different regulations that are out there that we've tried to battle back in the House and say, Unacceptable; you can't regulate; you have to legislate, you have to let this body, the representatives of the people, decide who are going to make these decisions. We've already had 266 coal-fired power plants close.

I know we have the gentleman from Kentucky. We've got Virginia, West Virginia. Permitting has been very, very difficult. We've got regulators who are coming in and have yanked back one major permit retroactively. After the 10 years of going through all the permitting, all of the reissuing, all of the capital investment, the EPA comes in and grabs back on that permit. The court said, No, you can't do that. And so we have an overreaching EPA that is willing to overreach into the legal area until the courts say, No more.

Now we've worked in the House to try to stop this war on coal. We've passed a lot of things. We did pass the Stop the War on Coal Act last September. Unfortunately, the Senate did not act on this. It's sort of a bit of a repeating theme for us in the House.

But the administration is seeking to turn us away from coal and keep the war on coal and drive up energy prices. People around the world are buying West Virginia coal. Our exports in the Nation almost doubled since 2006, and in West Virginia we exported more than \$5 billion of West Virginia coal. Now we all know it's going to China because they have an insatiable demand, right? Guess where else it's going? Europe, the Netherlands, Italy, Germany. These are countries that are going to use our cheaper resource to power themselves into a burgeoning economy, and we're going to disadvantage ourselves here with our own natural resources.

So the rest of the world wants American coal.

Myself and my colleagues here today can't for the life of us see why we don't have a President and an administration that believes that coal has a great future in our energy mix. He always says he's for all of the above, but we all know standing here it's "all of the above, except."

I always try to end everything on a bit of a positive note. And there's some great technological advances with coal. This is why I think we've got to keep coal active and in the mix and viable as our energy resource because the future for coal is very good. One of the discoveries was at Ohio State University, where they were able to do a laboratory experiment. We don't know if it'll

go full-scale, but the technique would release the heat from the coal without actually burning it. So there's no carbon emission. That has great potential.

Also, in another use of coal, the carbon could be used commercially for enhanced oil recovery. We hear about all of the oil sands and the oil shale in the northern part of our country and even in West Virginia. There are technologies that enable the use of carbon to enhance that recovery so that we get more from the recovery. And I think that's something that has a tremendous future for us.

We stand here today on a united front. I look at my colleagues and I see folks from States all across this country. We formed a Coal Caucus, of which I'm the chair, to talk to our other Members of Congress who don't have this passion and realistic view of the place that coal can play in our energy future.

I want to thank all of my colleagues here for fighting the good fight. We have a lot of miners and their families, other business folks, jobs, manufacturers, and elderly folks who understand what it means to try to have availability of cheaper energy resources. We've got a whole lot of America behind us. This is the reason the opportunity to talk about these things tonight, I think, sends a powerful message across the Congress, across to the Senate, across to the President that really an all-of-the-above energy plan does include coal, must include coal, and we're going to fight like heck to make sure it does.

Mr. BARR. I thank the gentledady.

I would like to recognize another Member from the great State of West Virginia and yield some time to the gentleman. This is not a partisan issue. It is an American issue. And I am appreciative of the gentleman's attending this session tonight.

Mr. RAHALL. Thank you, Mr. BARR. I appreciate very much your giving this Special Order for a discussion of America's most plentiful, most economic, efficient domestic energy resource we have, that being coal.

□ 1800

I also come from the great State of West Virginia, a State that is proud of its heritage of mining coal—proud of its coal miners, number one, those individuals who go beneath the bowels of the Earth to extract the energy that has fueled the industrial revolution in this country. They are brave, courageous individuals. Every one of us is concerned every day about their safety, number one, their health, and their retirement benefits for themselves and their families. Yes, coal is a valuable natural resource, but our number one natural resource is the coal miner, himself or herself. So we thank them for what they do. They are courageous individuals.

My district is both surface and deep mined. We can do both in a very environmentally sane manner, a manner

which produces jobs for our people, produces energy for our country, and at the same time does restore our environment and make it a beautiful place in which to work. That's why we in West Virginia pride ourselves on our clean environment, our productive workforce, and our high worker morale because we can do all-of-the-above at the same time. And we are for all-of-the-above as far as our energy resources as long as all-of-the-above means our domestic production of resources for energy in this country.

Coal literally keeps the lights on. Many a county commission in my district, during the downturns in the coal market, has had to lay off law enforcement personnel, has had to really trim the lighting of their public streets when coal resources are down, when revenues and our coal severance taxes are down to our local county units of government.

So coal is important. It has been, it is, and it always will be a mainstay of our economy in West Virginia. Our quality of life—indeed, the quality of life in America—and our economic vitality have long been fueled by coal, and it's something that the American people cannot turn their backs on. Yet too many, I'm afraid, fail to recognize the contributions that coal has made to our past, and certainly they underestimate the role that coal can and should play in our future.

Through decades of investment, coal has changed for the better. It is not our grandfathers' coal. It is a cleaner, more efficient fuel than ever before. And with the right kind of investments and know-how and the technologies that are coming online—some of which have already been talked about this afternoon—its use continues to improve and modernize.

Our Nation must embrace an energy strategy that encompasses a broad range of fuel choices, including domestic coal, if we are ever to have any hope of completely freeing ourselves from our overdependence on foreign fuels. This means that this Nation must acknowledge the simple fact that coal has been and for the foreseeable future it must be part of a comprehensive national energy strategy that will enable us to grow our economy, remain strong militarily, and help to influence environmental and economic challenges around the globe.

So coal is a critical element for ensuring affordable, abundant, and reliable energy that fuels the opportunities and the way of life that we cherish here in the United States of America.

So as a Representative of coal mining communities and generations of coal mining families, I will continue the good fight in the Congress for the future of coal and for the health and safety of America's coal miners. And as the gentleman from Kentucky has said, it is a bipartisan issue. I wish there were more from my side of the aisle here this evening, but perhaps they will submit comments for the RECORD. I do

hope that many more of my colleagues that may not be with us on the floor this evening will come forth and express their support for coal as a valuable domestic source of energy.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BARR. I thank the gentleman from West Virginia. I thank him for his comments. I thank him for, in particular, his sentiments about the heroic work of these men and women who go to work every day in our coal mines. I just cannot thank them enough for their contributions to our society every day for providing us with affordable and reliable electricity.

With that, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mrs. HARTZLER. I thank the gentleman. I really appreciate you holding this special time, where we can show our support for the coal industry, as well as condemn the Obama administration's current war on coal, because that's what it is.

In Missouri, coal is our preferred source of energy for electrical generation due to its abundance and its low cost. Coal provides over 81 percent of Missouri's electric-power generation, and Missouri ranks 11th in the Nation in energy affordability. So that means the people of Missouri have more money that they can spend on other things for their family.

It also attracts businesses to our State. We want to keep it that way. We love coal in Missouri, and we appreciate the role that it plays in having affordable, safe energy in our country.

I wanted to show this picture to you and my colleagues here because a lot of people think in Missouri that we don't have coal mines. But I want to tell you, in the Fourth District of Missouri, we have a coal mine. This is a picture. My husband and I had the opportunity to go there and I snapped a few pictures, and let me tell you we are so proud of it. These hardworking people here are doing a great job in getting coal out of the ground and taking it to our local power plants.

This coal mine is providing great jobs in my district. These are high-paying, skilled jobs. I know some of the people that work here, and they appreciate this opportunity. This mine is also bringing in property taxes to our local schools, and it's helping the economy of the entire county, this region of the district. Plus, it is powering two of our local power plants nearby. So this is very exciting for us. We want to see this continue rather than having the current administration, through the EPA, try to rein us in and to force us to rely on more expensive, untested energy sources in our country.

You know, President Obama and the EPA are pushing this over-prescriptive, regulatory agenda without adequate cost-benefit analysis, workable timelines, and input from the industry. Both of the proposed and current regulations being promoted by the EPA are having sweeping negative impacts on coal-fueled electricity generation in this country.

Now, according to the National Economic Research Associates, it is estimated that compliance costs for these EPA regulations on the electric sector will average \$15 billion to \$16 billion per year. Who pays for that? Who's going to pay for the extra cost to our electric industry, \$15 billion to \$16 billion? I'll tell you who: it's the families in my district who are living from paycheck to paycheck and who are struggling to put food on the table. When they see their electric bill go up every month because of the EPA coming here from Washington, D.C., imposing these regulations on our electric industry, that's who ends up paying, and it's wrong.

It also is costing jobs. The same group estimated that these regulations are going to cost half a million jobs just next year. Now, we have too much unemployment in this country already. Why would the government administration from this President be pushing regulations that's going to kick out half a million more people from being able to work? Just in Missouri alone, the cost is expected to be \$500 per household in higher electricity bills. It's wrong.

I want to just point out two of these regulations that are driving this cost and impacting them—and several of my colleagues have mentioned several of them already. But these two I wanted to bring to your attention.

The New Source Performance Standards for new coal units are establishing new guidelines that control carbon dioxide emissions from any newly constructed coal and natural gas power plants. This proposal requires new coal units to meet a standard so low that it effectively is going to ban new coal plants. My friend and colleague from Kentucky did a very good job of illustrating this. I wanted to reiterate, though, the quote from our President about this administration. He admitted in 2008 that his goal was to bankrupt new coal-fired power plants. Now, that is wrong. Here's what he said:

If somebody wants to build a coal-powered plant, they can. It's just that it will bankrupt them because they're going to be charged a huge sum for all that greenhouse gas that's being emitted.

Now, it's frustrating to me that the Obama administration, our President, would target an industry that is providing clean, affordable energy for our country, providing jobs in my district and all across this country, and keeping that electricity bill at home low for our families, but he is.

The second regulation that he is talking about is going to impact what's called coal ash and try to make it a hazardous waste. Now, this is something that is not hazardous. It is going to increase the cost of cement. Now, we need cement. We're building new highways. We need it in building new homes. We need it for our businesses that are building. Why would we do this? It's going to increase the cost for that.

□ 1810

We have in Missouri five cement plants that provide 12,000 jobs. Yet if this continues to go through we're going to see an increase in cement cost.

So here, gentleman, we have two examples of regulations coming out of Washington here that are increasing the cost for our families at home and that are killing jobs and increasing our electricity costs. It's wrong, and I will continue to stand against it. And I appreciate all my colleagues as we stand together tonight against this and we make a stand for low-cost, reliable energy, and that is coal. I commend you for having this, and I encourage all my colleagues to join us in this very important effort.

Mr. BARR. I appreciate the gentleman, and I appreciate her stand for the coal industry. Just one of those rules that she was referring to, the Utility MACT rule, the EPA estimates it to cost \$10 billion per year, but other independent annual cost estimates range from \$70 billion to \$200 billion, well above the EPA estimate. It is no wonder that within the past year, 226 coal electricity-generating units have shut down.

With that, I would like to recognize the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman, and thank you for holding this this evening, because it's really important that we understand exactly what's going on with coal.

When America was looking for energy, they went to coal. Coal has always been there for us. It is abundant, it is accessible, it is affordable, and it is truly American. And this is the part I don't get. You just heard Mrs. HARTZLER talk about the President's statement, and also Mr. WHITFIELD. That's one campaign promise he kept. He said, If you want to produce electricity using coal, you can do it, but we'll bankrupt you. Now, this makes absolutely no sense to anybody who understands what America needs right now, and it's jobs.

In Pennsylvania, 40 percent of Pennsylvania's electricity is produced using coal. In addition to keeping electricity affordable, the coal industry contributes more than \$7 billion annually to the Commonwealth's economy. It's about jobs, jobs, jobs.

This is a President who just doesn't get it. He talks about all the above when it comes to energy, but he forgets all that's below. He turns his back on coal and looks to renewables that are very expensive and make no sense to the average American. And the hardworking American people who produce this coal are miners. We've not only shut down their mines, we've shut down their power plants, and we're ruining their communities. We're absolutely ruining communities right now.

Now, I couldn't understand what was so horrible about this product, because I heard the President describe it many times, and I grew up in a coal pro-

ducing community. The Sauls were in the coal mining business, they had Eagle Coal. My friend John Stilley has Amerikohl. I have friends over in the Kittanning area, Rosebud.

But I went to CONSOL, and I went down to the Bailey Mine. I went down 700 feet underground to see this horrible, horrible product that the President absolutely hates and wants to eliminate. And while I was there, I was trying to figure out: Where is it so bad?

I watched as they did the longwall mining, how it shaved the coal off the wall. It's being drenched all the time with a fine mist, and then there's vacuums taking all the coal dust out.

I sat as far away from the machine as you having a conversation with somebody. And the guy who I was talking to said: You know, Mike, I've done this for 40 years. When I first started, I had to do it on my hands and knees. I laid on my back and I used a pick. And the reason I did that was because I was married and my wife and I had some dreams. We wanted to buy a house, we wanted to raise a family, wanted to educate those kids, and we wanted to live our life. And I did it through coal mining.

But, you know, the way it is now, this is incredible. And I stood in a room that was at least 10 to 12 feet high and about 30 feet wide and watched the coal miner, a machine, shave the face of the coal off the wall and then extract it.

Now, it doesn't make sense to me or to anybody else as a commonsense person. What in the world are you trying to do, Mr. President? In Erie, Pennsylvania—that's where GE Transportation is, they build locomotives. Now, the locomotives haul trains and those trains haul coal. And there's been a 20 percent reduction in coal.

So do you know what that did to GE? They don't have to build as many locomotives. We have 3,000 locomotives sitting idle. Why? In a country that's looking for jobs, why is this President eliminating jobs?

Now, look, it doesn't make any sense, it just doesn't make any sense. And as we go forward, I would like this President to look at energy, all the above. What would make us great as a country? Energy independence. That's what we need—low cost energy. And we have it right here, right now.

When coal wins, America wins, and when America wins, we all win. This isn't a Republican initiative or a Democrat initiative. As you said earlier, this is about America and America's strategy and America's answer to energy independence. Coal is a big part of it and has to continue to be a big part of that.

So I thank you for what you're doing. We'll keep fighting for coal, we're not going to give up, we're not going home. Mr. RAHALL spoke very eloquently about it. But all these folks from all these coal-producing areas—you know, Pennsylvania is the fourth-leading coal-producing State in the country,

the third-largest State in terms of coal produced by the underground mining method, and first in terms of total coal extracted by longwall mining technology. We win with coal, we put people to work with coal, we lower our energy costs with coal, we win the battle in the world economy because our cost of energy is lower, which allows us to pay higher wages to all those folks out there right now who are struggling, hardworking American taxpayers.

Why in the world would we take from them right now low-cost energy and condemn it because it doesn't meet this President's standards?

It's time for us to fight back and fight back hard, not as Republicans, not as Democrats, but as Americans. So, Mr. BARR, I thank you so much for what you're doing.

Mr. BARR. I thank the gentleman. I think his comments about the railroads reminds me of a quick story about my district in Estill County, Kentucky, a little town called Ravenna. This community was built on the railroads, and those railroads carried the coal out of Perry County and Harlan County and Bell County and all those counties in southeast Kentucky. This community in my congressional district was built on the railroads.

Today, furloughed railroaders, their families are without jobs, without a paycheck, and this is because of the war on coal. One of the furloughed railroaders told me that just a few years ago 120 trains would come through their community full of coal. Now barely 50 come through every month.

So this has a real impact for real people, middle class Americans losing their jobs. The war on coal is hurting the American people. Unemployment is higher than the national average in Estill County, Kentucky, because of this President's war on coal. So I thank the gentleman.

I would now like to recognize the gentleman from Indiana to talk about coal in Indiana.

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of our coal industry and the men and women who work in the industry.

I grew up in a small town in Illinois, 1,400 people, Kincaid, Illinois, where my dad was a United Mine worker for 36 years. All of my friends' parents worked in the coal mine. Coal created good, middle class jobs for those who lived in my hometown.

I've been down in these mines in my hometown when I was a kid, and recently in my district now in southwestern Indiana. I've met the proud, hardworking coal miners, and I've seen the impact their hard work has on the local economy.

In 2010, Indiana mined around 36 million tons of coal and consumed nearly 65 million tons. Currently, Indiana has more energy underground in the form of coal reserves than the entire United States does in oil and gas reserves.

Indiana's demonstrated coal reserve base of over 17 billion short tons is

enough to maintain the current level of production in Indiana for 500 years. The reserve base for the entire Illinois Basin, which includes Indiana coal, is over 130 billion tons, enough to meet the entire U.S. coal demands for the next 100 years. Eighty-eight percent of all electricity generated in Indiana is from coal. And I'm proud to say that all of that coal production is in my district.

This natural resource is vital to our State's energy industry and supports over 3,300 direct mining jobs and approximately 12,000 indirect mining jobs. Twenty-seven percent of Indiana's GDP is from manufacturing dependent on coal-fired electrical generation.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot deny that coal is vitally important to Indiana's economy, as well as our Nation's. Despite the immense impact coal has on our economy, onerous Federal regulations can often be an obstacle for this industry.

I'm pleased to say that the administration actually recently responded to a request by myself and our two Indiana Senators to give a permit to a company creating 100 jobs in my area, but this is unusual. The coal industry under this administration should not have to navigate the overaggressive and ideological regulatory climate coming out of the EPA.

□ 1820

The Mine Safety and Health Administration, or MSHA, recently proposed outlandish rules that are nearly impossible to follow. As has been previously stated, they can't be followed. There's no technology that will meet these standards. These proposed rules are oftentimes, as I just stated, impossible to meet, and they fail to examine the science.

I was a heart surgeon in my previous career, and I can tell you I didn't practice medicine based on ideology or anecdote. I practiced based on scientific fact. Many of the regulations do not have the backing of science.

Madam Speaker, we need a sound energy policy that supports our Nation's coal industry to lower the cost of electricity, create jobs, and make our businesses more competitive internationally.

I'm proud to stand here today to support coal in Indiana and across America, and I thank the gentleman from Kentucky for holding this Special Order.

Mr. BARR. I thank the gentleman.

I would now recognize the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. DAINES. I want to thank the gentleman from Kentucky this evening for this opportunity to talk about coal.

I stand with my colleagues to show support for an all-of-the-above energy strategy. Montana possesses an abundance of hydropower, oil, sun, wind, natural gas, and coal. And coal is a very important piece of that equation.

Coal provides the fuel for roughly 40 percent of the electricity used in the

United States. You know, I see the electric cars going down the street; and I'm not opposed to electric cars, but they ought to say "powered by coal" on them in terms of understanding where the source of the power is to power these electric cars.

Coal keeps energy costs low. It helps keep American businesses competitive, and it allows middle Americans to keep more of their hard-earned dollars during these challenging economic times.

In Montana, we are seeing firsthand the critical role that coal plays in the energy sector. In my home State, it is creating hundreds of jobs, fostering important relationships with our Indian reservations, being a leader in coal production for our country and leading the way for coal exports.

I support this industry because it enables more young Montanans to put their training and education to work and to stay at home with their job instead of exporting our talent to other places so Grandma and Grandpa have to fly to see the grandkids versus visiting them next door.

You see, in my home State of Montana, we boast the largest coal reserve in the Nation. The Powder River Basin, which spans across southern Montana and northern Wyoming, contains nearly 3.4 billion tons of coal reserves.

I recently met with representatives from Arch Coal, a company that is ready to invest millions of dollars into developing the Otter Creek mine in southeastern Montana.

Developing these resources creates jobs, injects millions of dollars into the economy. It helps lower energy costs, and, importantly, it creates tax revenues for our schools.

Cloud Peak Energy recently signed an agreement with the Crow Tribe to open up access to more than 1.4 billion tons of coal on the northern Powder River Basin, which would help inject millions of dollars into the Crow reservation's economy. I met with Chairman Old Coyote of the Crow Tribe. He said they have a vision of becoming financially independent on the reservation because of these coal opportunities.

These are exciting opportunities, but the industry is under attack. Fringe environmental groups continue to pressure the administration and others to slow production and slow economic development. This must change.

As Montana's Congressman, I'm committed to working for commonsense reforms that ensure that our natural resources like coal can be developed responsibly.

With that, I thank the rest of my colleagues here tonight for helping do the same.

Mr. BARR. I thank the gentleman.

I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. I'd like to thank the gentleman from Kentucky for doing this Special Order tonight, and it's an honor for me to also follow my colleague from Indiana (Mr.

BUCSHON), who talked about his hometown of Kincaid, Illinois, and talked about the importance growing up of coal mining in that community.

I represent Kincaid, Illinois, right now in the 13th Congressional District of Illinois, and just over 20 years ago, these miners lost their jobs because of deliberations and the eventual stroke of a pen here in Washington, D.C. It became cheaper to import coal from the western United States to burn at the power plant across the street from this coal mine where these miners worked than it was to dig it out from underground, ship it on an electronic conveyor belt across the street, and burn it. Over 1,200 miners that day lost their job.

Those were Congressman BUCSHON's friends. Those were my friends' parents. It hit our local economy harder than anything we had seen. Our local economy has since recovered, but we cannot forget that these deliberations in this great body have an impact on all of America's families. And these coal miners of 20 years ago are no different than the coal mining families of today, and we need to make sure we think of them every single time we see this war on coal, that we stand together, Mr. BARR, and fight.

Thank you.

Mr. BARR. I thank the gentleman.

I would now like to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. ROTHFUS. I thank the gentleman from Kentucky, and I rise today in solidarity with the middle class workers and families who call western Pennsylvania home.

President Obama's war on coal is a threat to their livelihood and to our communities. From the mine and power plant workers who have received pink slips because of misguided regulations, to the middle class moms who are trying to pay monthly utility bills, to the restaurants and barbershops and other small businesses concerned about costs, President Obama's onerous regulations will negatively impact our communities.

Coal is an essential part of our economy and infrastructure. It is an abundant, affordable, and reliable source of energy that powers our streetlights, schools, and factories. Coal-fired power plants generate 40 percent of electricity in Pennsylvania and 37 percent around the country. Electricity derived from coal is more affordable for families and businesses.

The coal industry employs more than 41,000 hardworking women and men across our commonwealth. Unfortunately, these workers, their families, and their communities are the ones who will suffer as a result of the EPA's unreasonable regulations and President Obama's war on coal.

These burdensome regulations have forced the electric generating industry to shutter coal-fired power plants and lay off workers. Six of these coal-fired power plants in our commonwealth—including several in Western Pennsylvania—have been marked for closure since

the beginning of last year. The power company placed part of the blame on the burdensome cost of federal environmental regulation.

The resulting slowdown in demand and surge in costly regulation have forced coal mines to shut down or reduce production. Last summer, the head of a Western PA coal company attributed the idling of some of its mines to the escalating costs and uncertainty caused by EPA regulations.

Layoffs caused by shuttering of power plants and idling of coal mines—and job losses in related industries—devastate middle-class workers, their families, and their communities.

It is too easy for unelected federal elites in Washington to write regulations without an understanding of the human costs of their actions.

That is why I am working with my colleagues to pass the REINS Act. The REINS Act will provide a check and balance on the Obama Administration by requiring that any regulation with an annual economic impact of \$100 million or more be subject to the approval of the House and Senate. Last week, I voted in favor of the REINS Act in the House Judiciary Committee. The Act was approved and now moves to the full House for consideration.

Middle-class moms and dads, coal miners, seniors, and those on fixed incomes deserve the support of all of my colleagues in the House and Senate on a pro-growth agenda. I call on both chambers to pass the REINS Act as a good first step towards sensible regulation that helps grow all parts of our economy.

There is a war on coal in this country, and it needs to stop. It's time to keep the lights on in America. It's time to relight America, and we need to do that here in this House and stop this war on coal.

With that, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. BARR. I thank the gentleman.

I would now like to yield to the gentlelady from Wyoming.

Mrs. LUMMIS. I thank the gentleman for yielding and hosting this Special Order.

Wyoming is the largest coal-producing State in the Nation. It has been since 1986. The 10 largest coal mines in the United States are in the State of Wyoming. And we're having trouble exporting our coal. Even if Americans don't want to use it and would disadvantage themselves in comparison to other countries, we'd like to send it overseas to people who want it.

Who wants it? I'll show you.

China, India, and even Turkey wants our coal. Yet here's the United States, this little dot. This is all the United States wants. It's silly, given this tremendous resource the United States has that produces jobs and revenue and electricity that keeps our manufacturing competitive, to have to send it to those other countries. They want it because they want what we have. They want inexpensive, affordable, abundant energy so their people can manufacture.

We need to protect these jobs in manufacturing. We need to protect the affordability and the reliability by keep-

ing these resources working at home for Americans with American energy.

Mr. BARR. I thank the gentlelady.

I appreciate all of my colleagues here this evening talking about and highlighting the importance of the future of energy freedom in this country and independence.

I would like to yield the balance of our time to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LAMALFA I appreciate my colleague from Kentucky having this conversation tonight and allowing me to speak on it.

Being from California, we don't have a lot of coal in California, and we don't really use a lot of it either. But what I would like to point out is we have a very similar plight in that many of our industries have been devastated by out-of-control regulations by Federal Government: our timber industry, mining, our ability to trap more water for our water supply. Agriculture is also being affected by overreaching regulations.

Also, coal is very important for our entire Nation, and it does have an effect on California, too. What I'm saying here is that, with 42 percent of our Nation's grid being powered by coal and a mandate coming down from the EPA and the President's very aggressive remarks saying that coal is a thing of the past, we're going to put our country in great peril by devastating this industry for our electricity grid. For all the many jobs that are all over the eastern part of this country and part of the West, we're really going to hurt ourselves in this country with this type of policy.

□ 1830

In California, we've seen the effects, for example, in that we have a self-inflicted mandate that makes it where California can no longer use coal, and we've devolved down to only 8 percent as part of our grid—and getting lower. So we're going to be seeing higher and higher energy costs in our State. Why would we want to do this to the rest of our Nation here? California's energy costs are 14 cents per kilowatt while the Nation's average is about 10 cents.

That's why we see an exodus of business from the State of California and their moving to other States. If we do this type of thing in this country, this mandate, we're going to see a bigger exodus to places like China, where they don't have near our environmental regulations. Indeed, China's smoke plume comes over in the jet stream and affects California. We're going backwards with this type of mandate, with this type of policy.

So, for many reasons, I think it's key that we support the coal industry in America—for our economy and for our electricity grid. For those who want to be agitators against coal, then they should be the first ones to sit in the dark, in the cold, from not having electricity on the grid.

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

IMMIGRATION REFORM

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

Mr. VARGAS. Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I appreciate it.

I would first like to say and take a moment to remember the victims of the Boston attack. Certainly, my prayers and the prayers of all of us here go to the families and everyone affected.

I had the great opportunity to go to Harvard Law School and to graduate from that school and spend 3 years there. I ran the marathon once. Usually, when you finish the marathon, it's a great celebration. It's an incredible time. The people there are so friendly, so nice, and everyone is excited. So what this horrible tragedy has done is unbelievable, and our prayers go out to each and every one affected.

I also rise today in recognition of the need for our great Nation to address immigration reform. Tomorrow, many evangelical churches are scheduled to come to the Capitol to pray for just and merciful immigration reform. I want to welcome them here. I think it is about time that we listened to some of the voices of these pastors, to some of the voices of their congregations. I welcome them here, and I'm very, very excited about their presence here at the Capitol tomorrow. I know that they will be praying for us. I know that they will be here to open up our hearts and to listen to what immigration reform can do for us, which is to set us on a path of not only more justice but a more merciful path, so I am very excited about tomorrow.

I want to put this in the context of what has been happening in the United States because of our immigration laws, and I'd like read an excerpt from *The New York Times*. This is entitled, "Immigration Status of Army Spouses Often Leads to Snags":

Lieutenant Kenneth Tenebro enlisted in the Armed Forces after the September 11 terrorist attacks, signing up even before he became an American citizen. He served one tour of duty in Iraq, dodging roadside bombs . . . but throughout that . . . mission, he harbored a fear he did not share with anyone in the military. Lieutenant Tenebro worried that his wife, Wilma, back home in New York with their infant daughter, would be deported. Wilma, who like her husband was born in the Philippines, is an undocumented immigrant.

"That was our fear all the time," he said. When he called home, "She often cried about it," he said. "Like, hey, what's going to happen? Where will I leave my daughter?"

It goes on and explains:

Like Lieutenant Tenebro, many soldiers, anticipating rebuke and possibly damage to their careers, do not reveal to others in the military their family ties to immigrants here illegally.

Mrs. Tenebro is snagged on a statute, notorious among immigration lawyers, that makes it virtually impossible for her to become a legal resident without first leaving

the United States and staying away for 10 years.

So our current law requires that the wife of this brave American soldier leave the country for 10 years before her status can be legalized. There are very few things that I can think of that are less just than that law, and that law must be changed.

I want to thank the Senators, the Group of Eight—I don't like the word "gang" because I'm from California, and there it has a very negative connotation. I don't think of the Senators as gangs or as anything other than good guys over there, so I want to thank the Group of Eight that has come forward with these proposals, because I think these proposals are very, very important.

You might think that Wilma and Lieutenant Tenebro are unique, but they're not. In fact, we've heard testimony here, interestingly. A brave marine said something in such stark terms that I'll never forget it. He came and told his story, and he said this:

I've been through two tours of duty in Iraq, and I'm going back to Afghanistan. I'm not afraid of dying, "because that's what soldiers do."

I thought that was really stark. He's not afraid of dying in fighting for our country, but what he said he was afraid of was that his wife might be deported. It was the exact same thing as Lieutenant Tenebro. His fear was not that he would be killed in action. His fear was that his wife would be deported. He said, What will I do then with my two children? What will happen with my two children if they deport my wife?

He told the story that he met his wife at church. I understand from him she's a beautiful young lady. They fell in love, they got married, and they began to have children. The next thing he thinks about is—well, he gets deployed to fight for his country, and he's proud to do it, but his fear is that his wife and his kids will be separated, that the family will be broken.

He did a very interesting thing that I've heard a couple of soldiers do now. He has covered his wife's car with "Go, Marines. My husband is a marine in Iraq." He says he has blanketed his car with that, suspecting that they won't pull her over for a minor traffic issue because, if they do pull her over, the police will find out that she does not have a driver's license because she's not a citizen. So his fear is that they're going to deport her. What will become then of their kids?

Again, he's not unique. We also met here—and he testified over in the Senate—a gentleman who was an Army soldier. He was in the Army. He went to Iraq, and unfortunately, he was injured. He then came home, and thank God for his loving wife, who has taken care of him, and his children. He has the opportunity then to live with them, but they live in fear. He says:

I'm captured here. I am a prisoner of my country. I'm afraid to go anywhere because I can't drive. My wife drives, but my wife's un-

documented. I am afraid that they're going to pull us over and they're going to deport her. Then what am I supposed to do? How am I going to take care of myself and my kids?

This is a very unjust law. This law has to be changed. How can it be that we can allow this? One of our brave soldiers is called by his Nation to fight. He fights and he's injured. He comes home, and his loving wife takes care of him, and his fear is that his wife is going to be deported. We have to change this law. We have to change this law because it's unjust.

I would like to take a moment to review what our immigration law is, because a lot of people say, Well, you know, these people broke the law. They broke the law. Maybe they should be deported. Maybe the soldier's wife should be deported. She broke the law. I would say this: let's take a look at the law because the law is very interesting. I'm an attorney, and I can tell you this, that the law usually is divided in a very special way, and that is: malum in se and malum prohibitum.

□ 1840

So what is malum in se? Malum in se is this. Malum in se means the thing is wrong or bad in itself. It's malum in itself. Malum in se. So, for example, murder, murder is illegal because it's malum in se. It's always wrong. It's bad. It's wrong to murder and it's illegal to murder, so that's malum in se.

So what is malum prohibitum? Malum prohibitum is it's bad or wrong or illegal because it's prohibited, not because it's wrong or immoral in itself. So the act itself is not wrong; it's simply illegal because we make it illegal. A good example is the speed limit. You could be traveling 56 miles an hour in a 55-mile-an-hour zone. Now you've broken the law, but have you done something immoral? Have you done something wrong? Well, you broke the law, but you know what? You didn't endanger anybody. And, in fact, your car is built to go safely at 56 miles an hour. The road, we call them in California freeways, the freeway was built to do 70, so you're actually obeying common sense. So it's illegal only because it's malum prohibitum, because we created the law, not because it's wrong in itself. And, in fact, we often change the law because we say that's a silly law. It doesn't make sense to travel 55 miles an hour on a freeway, so we change the law to 70. Although I drove through Texas, and I see that they have 75. They think it's safe at 75, which is great. I'm sure it is. And so they changed the law. Why they'd change the law, because there's nothing wrong or immoral about it. It's simply malum prohibitum, so they changed the law. That's what we have to do with our immigration laws.

When a person comes here to work, when a wife like Wilma lives here with her husband, she's not violating any type of moral law. She's violating malum prohibitum, a law that we made that we can change.

So let's review, then, a little bit of the immigration laws in our Nation.

The Naturalization Act of 1790 stated that Congress adopted the uniform rule so that any free white person could apply for citizenship after 2 years of residency. So if you were here, if you lived here for 2 years, you could become a resident.

Then there were minor changes, and in 1882, we had the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882. It was the first Federal immigration law that suspended Chinese immigration for 10 years and barred Chinese in the U.S. from becoming citizens. A terrible law that, of course, we changed. Why? Because it was malum prohibitum. It was a dumb law. It was an immoral law. We changed it, and we should've changed it. Thank God we changed it.

Then in 1892 we opened up Ellis Island. No one ever talks about California, by the way. We had Angel Island located in San Francisco. Not as many people went through Angel Island. In fact, between 1892 and 1953, in Ellis Island we had over 12 million immigrants that were processed in that facility. Angel Island had nowhere near that.

What was the law then? The law said this: first- and second-class passengers, those on ships, were not required to undergo inspections at Ellis Island unless they were sick or had legal problems. So, in other words, you showed up; come on in. That's the law. That was the law. You showed up; come on in. You're in first-class, second-class on a ship, yup, come on through. No problem.

Third-class passengers had to undergo a medical and legal inspection. If in good health and papers in order, the process took 3 to 5 hours, and then they were citizens. That was the law. That was the law. So it's very interesting when people say, Well, we did it the right way. My ancestors did it the right way.

They came here. There was basically no law. All you had to do was walk in. It was very interesting.

Then there were minor changes. But in 1986, we had a major change—the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986. It is also known as the Simpson-Mazzoli Act. And what this law did, it set a ceiling of 540,000 immigrants a year. It also required employers to attest to their employees' immigration status, that they were here legally, and made it illegal to knowingly hire or recruit unauthorized immigrants. It legalized certain seasonal agricultural immigrants, and it legalized illegal immigrants who entered the United States before January 1, 1982, and had resided here in the United States continuously.

And who signed the law? Ronald Reagan. Ronald Reagan signed the law. It's very interesting because I'm a Californian. Ronald Reagan, even though he is from Illinois originally, we claim him as one of our own. We're very proud of Ronald Reagan in California,

and even as a Democrat, I'm very proud of Ronald Reagan. I've always liked Ronald Reagan. I thought he was a good man, and I think he set a great example. He certainly set a great example when it came to immigration. He looked at the humanity of the immigrants here, and I'll read a couple of quotes from him a little later on, but he signed it, and it was something he never regretted. He never regretted. Just the opposite. He said, I regretted raising taxes in California and a bunch of other bills that he signed when he was still a fairly young Governor, but he never regretted this. Just the opposite; it was something that he was proud of.

So what now? Where do we go from here? I think what we should do is we should remember the people that are coming tomorrow, the evangelical pastors and churches, and thank them for coming and opening our hearts. I want to read a few letters from both Catholic priests, pastors and a rabbi, and see what they think about immigration because it has been very interesting. I do watch here some of the speeches that are given, and I have to say that they're very negative about immigrants. You hear about all the terrible things, the parade of horrors that some people come up here and talk about day after day after day, and you'd think that most immigrants are terrible. It would be as if I came up here and talked about some of the terrible things that some mothers do, and say, Well, mothers are terrible. We should get rid of mothers. That's ridiculous.

The reality is most immigrants are very hardworking people. They come here for a better life. They work hard. I want to read a few letters from pastors and priests and a rabbi that talks to this and puts it into the context of Scriptures because I think it is very important. Obviously they are here tomorrow because they read the Scriptures, they believe in the Scriptures, and that's why they're here tomorrow; and I want to put this debate within that context because I think that we are a very fair and merciful people. I think we are a God-fearing people. I think we need to put this immigration debate within the context of our faith communities, and so I'm going to read this letter.

The first letter is from Father Scott Santarosa. He's the pastor at Dolores Mission Catholic Church in Los Angeles, California. He's a Jesuit. He addresses this letter to me and it reads like this:

Dear Congressman Vargas,

I applaud your enthusiastic support of comprehensive immigration reform that includes a pathway to citizenship. I believe you are correct in stating, as you did before the House of Representatives last week, that immigration reform is one of the most pressing moral issues of our time.

He says it's "one of our most pressing moral issues of our time."

He goes on and says:

The truth is there are numerous biblical reasons for advocating for immigration reform. Indeed, our Judeo-Christian history as people is built on immigration, and Jesus, who himself is the new covenant with us, calls us to be compassionate to all.

He goes on and says:

Early in Genesis, we find God's exhortation to Abraham: "Leave your country, your people, and your father's household and go to the land I will show you."

That's from Genesis 12:1.

He goes on and says:

God makes a promise to Abraham to make him a great nation. It is a promise of a better life, a better future.

Again, a quote from the Bible:

"I will make of you a great nation, and I will bless you; I will make your name great, so that you will be a blessing."

Genesis 12:2-3.

This is God's calling his people to immigration as their pathway to greatness, and we of Christian and Jewish faith cannot deny that our roots are built on immigration, on God's call to us to be migrants.

And once we arrive at our destination, we cannot rest there, but we must remember what it was to be immigrants, to be aliens. God instructs us, His people, "to love those who are aliens for you, yourselves, were aliens in Egypt" (Deuteronomy 10:19) and to treat strangers by providing a place of rest, food, and hospitality: "Let some water be brought that you may bathe your feet and then rest yourselves under the tree. Now that you have come close to your servant, let me bring you a little food that you may refresh yourselves." (Genesis 18:4-5)

□ 1850

Scripture is clear on the treatment of the immigrant. We read this time and again in passages like the following:

"When an alien lives with you in your land, do not mistreat him. The alien living with you must be treated as one of your native-born."

I'm going to read that again:

"When an alien lives with you in your land, do not mistreat him. The alien living with you must be treated as one of your native-born. Love him as yourself, for you were aliens in Egypt. I am the Lord your God." (Leviticus 19:33-34)

Then Father goes on and quotes from Deuteronomy:

"Cursed is the man who withholds justice from the alien, the fatherless or the widow."

He then quotes Exodus 23:9:

"Do not mistreat the alien or oppress him, for you were aliens in Egypt. Do not oppress an alien; you yourselves know what it feels to be aliens, because you were aliens in Egypt."

Father Santarosa goes on and says:

Jesus himself is an immigrant, as very early in His life He and His parents, Mary and Joseph, are forced to flee to Egypt for His safety. We must understand that His heritage as a Jewish person and as an immigrant informed His teachings on how we are called to treat the other, in particular the most vulnerable among us. Jesus goes so far as to say that how we treat the least among us, namely, the immigrant, is how we treat him: "For I was hungry and you gave me something to eat. I was thirsty and you gave me something to drink. I was a stranger, and you invited me in. I needed clothes and you clothed me. I was sick and you looked after me. I was in prison and you came to visit

me." (Matthew 25:35-36). Jesus clearly mandates that we are to treat the immigrant and the alien as we would treat Jesus himself.

Other New Testament readings after Jesus continue to emphasize the just and humane treatment of our immigrant brothers and sisters. First, we read that we, though perhaps not actual immigrants, are called to see ourselves as people who have no home here on Earth, that our destination is beyond this world: "But our citizenship is in heaven, and from it we also await a Savior" (Phillipians 3:20) and "Beloved, I urge you as aliens and sojourners to keep away from worldly desires that wage war against the soul." (1 Peter 2:11).

And second, we are called to be just and fair in our treatment of immigrants. "Contribute to the needs of the holy ones. Exercise hospitality." (Romans 12:13). "Let mutual love continue. Do not neglect hospitality, for through it some have unknowingly entertained angels." (Hebrews 13:1-2).

He goes on and says:

In sum, as people of Judeo-Christian heritage, and as people of faith, we cannot escape or get around Jesus' call to exercise hospitality towards our immigrant brothers and sisters. Jesus' call to love one another as He loves us requires that we not simply do the least or the minimum just to get by, for that is not how He has loved us. Jesus has loved us to the maximum. So, also, we are called to go above and beyond what could be expected in order to love others. In this country, this would imply granting full citizenship to our undocumented brothers and sisters. Less than this would be creating a level of society that is devalued as persons, and this would be in direct violation of everything that Jesus teaches. To be a person of value in this democratic country is to be a person with a voice, a person with a vote. This is the democratic foundation of our country.

He goes on and ends like this:

Thank you for reading this letter to fellow leaders in Congress. I, together with my parishioners of Dolores Mission, and with 26 other multi-faith congregations of Los Angeles, and 1 million families in 150 cities of this country which make up PICO, am praying for your good discernment as you propose to enact an immigration reform which is just and humane, rooted in our faith and biblical values.

Gratefully and faithfully yours,

Father Reverend Scott Santarosa, S.J., Society of Jesus, Pastor.

I want to thank Father Santarosa. I want to let him know that tomorrow he will have help here. He will have plenty of help from the evangelical ministers and pastors that will be here tomorrow on hand to open up the hearts and the minds of those that are not yet convinced that we have to have a humane, a just, and a merciful immigration reform package. And I thank him.

The second letter that I'd like to read is from Father Sean Carroll. Father Sean Carroll is the executive director at the Kino Border Initiative for Nogales, Arizona, and Nogales, Sonora, Mexico. He also addresses the letter to me and says this:

Dear Congressman Vargas:

Since 2009 I have been working with deported migrant men, women and children along the U.S./Mexico border. These past 4 years I have witnessed firsthand their brokenness in body and spirit when they are deported due to days and weeks in detention

and forced separation from their spouses and children. I have held the hand of the mother separated from her children in Chicago, and listened to the father deported away from his two children in North Dakota. I have been present with the mother so far apart from her children in New York and with the son seeking to be reunited with his mother in Central California.

He goes on and says:

I know God calls us not to oppress the widow, the orphan and the stranger (Exodus 22:21-22 and Deuteronomy 27:19) and yet I have been a witness to how we essentially make widows out of women migrants when we deport them away from their husbands in the United States. I am also keenly aware of how we turn U.S. citizen children into orphans by repatriating their migrant parents to Mexico and placing their sons and daughters in foster care. And I see the ways we reject the stranger in our midst, the person seeking a better life for themselves and their families, the one who in the Gospel of Matthew (25:35-40) reflects the presence of Jesus himself.

What would happen if we accepted God's invitation to remember the moments that we were in exile (Exodus 22:21), the times when we felt like strangers, and to recall how God has led us through those experiences to new life? My memory of God's action in my own struggles and challenges compels me in gratitude to put this Word of God into practice in the here and now, to support a path to citizenship for our undocumented sisters and brothers, to reunify family members separated due to mixed immigration status, and to provide some ways for people that come to work in the United States with dignity and with their human rights respected.

Jesus quotes the book of Isaiah (61:1-2) when He opens the scroll and says, "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because He has anointed me to bring good news to the poor. He has sent me to proclaim release to the captives and recovery of sight to the blind, to let the oppressed go free, to proclaim the year of the Lord's favor. Today, this scripture has been fulfilled in your hearing." (Luke 4:16-19; 21). I firmly believe that God has given us the gift of His Spirit, the same Spirit that Jesus breathed on His friends when he rose from the dead (John 20:19-22). It is a spirit that empowers us to make the promise and command of the word, God's word, a reality, by working for comprehensive immigration reform.

□ 1900

He concludes by saying this:

Please count on my prayers for you and the other Members of Congress, as you follow God's word on this issue of great importance for us as a country and as a people of faith.

Sincerely yours in Christ,
Reverend Sean Carroll, Society of Jesus
Executive Director
Kino Border Initiative
Nogales, Arizona, and Nogales, Sonora,
Mexico.

Thank you, Father Carroll. I appreciate that very much.

Father Carroll very poignantly says that our policy today makes orphans out of children of migrants.

Recently, I had the opportunity in San Diego to listen to a young lady who is very accomplished in her short life. I believe she's 17 years old. She's very excited about going to college next year. She attends the Preuss School. It's a magnet school at UCSD. She has very, very good grades and is

excited about college. We're very excited for her. She started off with a great tempo and we thought wow, this is going to be a great story. She's a lovely young person. She was telling her story and we were all excited to listen and hear what was going on in her life. And then she stopped for a moment, sort of an awkward cadence, and started crying. She said, Of course, my parents have just been deported. She said she didn't know what to do because her parents had been deported.

It really was a shocking moment to me to listen to her because she's an American citizen, she was born here, but her parents are undocumented immigrants. Right at the moment of great accomplishment, the moment of great pride for her, and I'm certain for her parents, her parents are pulled away, not because they're terrible, not because they have done anything wrong other than try to provide a better life for themselves and for their daughter, but because they're undocumented.

The good thing is that we have a chance to do something about this. We have a chance to pass immigration reform that's merciful, that lives up to the values that we hold dearly in this country. And so I'm very excited about this reform. I'm very excited about tomorrow, frankly. I have to be honest and say I've always been in favor of immigration reform. I thought that President Reagan got it right, that we should have a humane policy towards immigrants. I think he was following certainly the Good Book. I appreciate Ronald Reagan, and I appreciate all those that felt like him previously.

I've always thought that we should have immigration reform that makes sense. But not everyone was always convinced of this. In fact, a few years ago, I had a conversation with a pastor in San Diego who was pretty sour on the notion that we should give an opportunity for the people that came here without documents to stay. We got into a heated but loving discussion. I do love the pastor. He's a great guy. But we got into somewhat a heated discussion. I said, I don't see how this tracks the Bible. I know the Bible pretty well. I studied to be a priest myself for 5 years. So I certainly read the Good Book and am humbled by what's in there. I said, I challenge you to go through there and find a place that criticizes the immigrant, that criticizes the stranger. Because it's just the opposite.

Anyway, we got into a theological discussion. And we remain friends. I met him again recently and he told me that he was praying for me and for the rest of us in Congress to pass a very comprehensive, just, merciful reform package. And I said, Pastor, I remember our conversation. He says, Yes, so do I. He said, I was wrong. I said, What happened? He said, I want to say it was simply the Bible. I read it. But the reality is my congregation has changed. We evangelize. That's our mission. I'm

an evangelizing preacher here, and in my evangelization I have brought in people who are undocumented. And they're wonderful. They come, they pray. They make my church a better place. Some of them have married, he mentioned two people, in fact, who were in the Navy, the people in his congregation. He says, I've changed. I was wrong about them.

So I thank the evangelical churches, most of whom now are ardent supporters of immigration reform, a comprehensive immigration reform that's just, that's merciful, that leads to citizenship so people are not second-class citizens. I want to thank them.

Tomorrow, I know that they're going to have an opportunity to mix among us Congress Members and senators. And I hope that we have an open heart to receive them and to receive their words because I think they're here on a good mission.

I would like to read a letter from Mark Potter. He is the Provincial Assistant for the Social Ministries at the California Province, Society of Jesus, the Jesuits. And it reads like this:

In the Hebrew scriptures the story of Israel is a story of a people on the move, called by God to migrate and to become strangers in strange lands, motivated by God's promise of something better—a better life, a better future: "The Lord said to Abram: 'Go forth from your land, your relatives, and from your father's house to a land that I will show you.'" This is how the people of Abraham wound up in Egypt, where they were forced into captivity. The Egypt experience of being enslaved because they were immigrants became for Israel the touchstone of God's command to treat aliens with hospitality.

And they certainly have. And I thank the Jewish community. I know a number of rabbis in San Diego, and they are the first people to defend immigrants in such a strong way. And I thank the Jewish community. That faith community is one that has always had the immigrant at heart. I thank you from the bottom of my heart.

It goes on with a quote from Deuteronomy:

"So you, too, should love the resident alien, for that is what you were in the land of Egypt." Care and hospitality for the stranger became a hallmark of Jewish ethics, law, and culture, famously invoked dozens of times throughout the Hebrew scripture as the particular concern for the "widow, the orphan, and stranger in your midst." Living according to these values became for Israel a sign of fidelity to God's laws. Violating this concern for the widow, the orphan, and the alien became reasons for God's judgment against his people.

Exodus 22:20-22:

"You shall not oppress or afflict a resident alien, for you were once aliens residing in the land of Egypt. You shall not wrong any widow or orphan. If ever you wrong them and they cry out to me, I will surely listen to their cry."

Leviticus 19:33-34:

"When an alien resides with you in your land, do not mistreat such a one. You shall treat the alien who resides with you no differently than the natives born among you; you shall love the alien as yourself; for you too were once aliens in the land of Egypt. I, the Lord, am your God."

Deuteronomy 27:19:

"Cursed be anyone who deprives the resident alien, the orphan, or the widow of justice! And all the people shall answer, 'Amen.'"

He goes on and quotes a number of passages from the Bible. And then he concludes his letter by stating this:

The most literal reference to care for the stranger is found in the famous story of the Final Judgment in Matthew 25, where Jesus instructs His followers about how they will ultimately be judged by how they treated the most vulnerable: "The King shall say to those on His right, 'Come, you who are blessed by my Father. Inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world. For I was hungry and you gave me food, I was thirsty and you gave me drink, a stranger and you welcomed me, naked and you clothed me, ill and you cared for me, in prison and you visited me.'" (Matthew 25: 34-37)

Tomorrow we will have, again, the opportunity, and I hope that we all take the opportunity to meet with the pastors that are going to be here, the evangelical churches.

□ 1910

I would like to quote a pastor who wrote very eloquently. He is a doctor, Pastor Dr. Richard Land, outgoing president of the Southern Baptist Convention's Ethics and Religious Liberty Commission and executive editor of *The Christian Post*. He writes:

Southern Baptists have gotten to know immigrants as brothers and sisters in Christ. It has put a human face on this.

He also pointed out that Southern Baptist churches now include several hundred thousand Hispanics as a result of their evangelization efforts. An Hispanic pastor told Reverend Land that he estimates that as many as 40 percent of those Southern Baptist Hispanics probably do not have legal status in this country.

So I am very excited about tomorrow. I know that Dr. Pastor Richard Land and others are praying for us. They're very excited about coming and speaking to us and opening up our hearts and our minds and making sure that we do the right thing, which I'm sure we will do—I'm hoping we will do.

The last letter that I'm going to read is a letter that was actually written by Rabbi Laurie Coskey, executive director of the Interfaith Committee for Worker Justice, and Pedro Rios, chairperson of the San Diego Immigrant Rights Consortium and director of the American Friends Service Committee. The letter is addressed to the San Diego Council, which just last week unanimously approved a resolution in support of comprehensive immigration reform.

I would note that the San Diego City Council is made up pretty equally of Democrats and Republicans, and here they put aside partisanship and they strongly passed a resolution in support of comprehensive immigration reform. So this is the letter that Rabbi Laurie Coskey and Mr. Pedro Rios wrote:

Dear San Diego City Council, we are writing to you today representing ourselves and

the myriad of organizations that have worked within our city to support immigrants and refugees over many decades. Over the years, in the spirit of good faith, we have urged our City Council members to take a stand with immigrant and refugee communities who live and work in the city of San Diego.

As the conundrum of our broken immigration system has affected all of us in profound ways, many times over the years the City Council of San Diego has been at the forefront of human rights issues that affect the people living and working here. We come to you now, recognizing the importance of your voice.

Today, we stand at a unique moment in history, where the Federal Government has recognized that the immigration laws and policies are no longer of benefit, and that they are stretching to craft a new comprehensive immigration policy that we pray will be generous, humane, and transformational for those who live and work here.

As the leaders of the largest border city in the United States, we passionately urge you to take a leadership stand by passing a bipartisan resolution in support of reasonable immigration policy reform.

In parenthesis, they did, they did exactly that. They did it unanimously. And I thank the San Diego City Council—every member, the Democrats and the Republicans. Thank you. Thank you deeply for that.

They go on and say:

Because of the prominence of San Diego, your bipartisan resolution can serve as an example and as a model to the Federal legislators that the benefit of such policy change demands bipartisan collaboration and agreement in order to pass sweeping immigration policy reform. To put it simply, by working together quickly, you may teach the Congress what bipartisan collaboration can actually accomplish.

They did exactly that. They acted together; they acted swiftly; they acted unanimously; they acted compassionately. I hope we do the same.

They go on and say:

Additionally, your action will encourage immigrant and refugee community members and their supporters by demonstrating that their city representatives understand and support the call for reforming immigration laws.

We all recognize that in recent years the failure of Congress to reform immigration laws has led to great hardships for too many people who live in fear. In San Diego, we have witnessed the devastating impact of the broken immigration system. Families have been torn apart in immigration raids; immigrant workers are silent in the face of abusive labor practices; distrust has generated fear for immigrants, who otherwise contribute to the social fabric of our communities; and the current immigration laws have led to an unbalanced focus on enforcement.

To be sure, the city of San Diego would not be America's finest city without numerous ways that immigrant and refugee communities contribute economically, culturally, and socially, from the agriculture fields in northern San Diego County to the tech industries, and adding to the cultural vibrancy that make San Diego an attraction to people around the world.

As a border city, San Diego is uniquely positioned to address immigration issues and to offer insight into what reasonable immigration reform might look like. A resolution

might address the need to improve the port's infrastructure. It can address human and civil rights implications and enforcement mechanisms. It can advocate for a broad and inclusive pathway to citizenship without burdensome obstacles.

As representative organizations and coalitions, we urge you to adopt a resolution that supports a reasonable and comprehensive approach to immigration reform.

It's signed, Sincerely Rabbi Laurie Coskey, Educational Doctorate, Executive Director, Interfaith Committee for Worker Justice; Pedro Rios, Chairperson, Director of the San Diego Immigrant Rights Consortium and the American Friends Service Committee.

I want to thank Rabbi Laurie Coskey for this letter. I also want to thank Pedro Rios for coauthoring this letter.

I have to say that one of the reasons that I'm up here reading these letters is that there are a lot of people that want to be heard out in the Nation about this issue of immigration. From this podium, day after day after day, they've only been hearing the negative voices, the parade of horrors, the instances when immigrants have failed or have even committed horrible crimes, and some have. But unfortunately, it has been somewhat of a less than veiled attack on all immigrants, especially those that came to this country for no other reason but to better their lives and to work very hard so their children could have a better life. That's the American Dream. That's the American Dream for all of us, for our children, that we can have a better life.

I want to read now from President Ronald Reagan. Again, many of us are very proud of Ronald Reagan. I will give Illinois their due, he was from there originally, but the reality is he's a Californian. If you look at the statue here in Statuary Hall, he's here as a Californian. So I'm very proud of him. As a Democrat, I've always been very proud of him. I say that, and some of my Democrat friends, they get a little nervous about that. The reality is I'm very proud of him. I didn't agree with everything, obviously, but I agreed with his humanity.

I think we will see that in some of these quotes. I think what made Reagan a great person and a great President was that he didn't stick to some of the tired dogma of others. Instead, he led us forward as a great President. I quote him:

Unless the United States makes a more sensible and efficient system for admitting legal migrants who come to take advantage of work opportunities, no reasonable level of enforcement is likely to be enough to resolve this illegal immigration problem.

How true he was. How true he is still.

I also agree with former President Reagan when he said the following, referring to the Immigration Reform and Control Act, again, the Simpson-Mazoli Act of 1986:

We have consistently supported a legalization program which is both generous to the alien and fair to the countless thousands of people throughout the world who seek legally to come to America.

You know what? Ronald Reagan was generous. I hope that each and every one of us can have that spirit of generosity, that magnanimous spirit that he had.

I'm going to quote him again and continue with his quote:

The legalization provisions in this act will go far to improve the lives of a class of individuals who now must hide in the shadows without access to many of the benefits of a free and open society. Very soon many of these men and women will be able to step into the sunlight, and ultimately, if they choose, they may become Americans.

□ 1920

I thank Ronald Reagan because I think he was very generous. It's very interesting how many Republicans are running away from his legacy on this, his legacy of generosity. You shouldn't be running away from it; you should be running towards it; you should be running to it. You will be like him if you have that spirit that he had, the spirit of a generous soul.

I know I have a few minutes left here, and I thank the Speaker very much for the opportunity that they've given me here. Normally I don't speak this long, but I thought it was important to come and hear another voice, not just the voice that condemns the immigrant, a voice that says there's millions and millions and millions of Americans out there, in fact, a great majority now, that want comprehensive immigration reform that's just, that matches up with our values of a generous people.

This is a statement of citizenship from the evangelical churches. This is the evangelical statement of principles for immigration reform.

Our national immigration laws have created a moral, economic, and political crisis in America. Initiatives to remedy this crisis have led to polarization and name calling, in which opponents have misrepresented each other's position as open borders and amnesty versus deportations of millions. This false choice has led to an unacceptable political stalemate at the Federal level at a tragic cost of human life, at tragic human cost.

As evangelical Christian leaders, they say:

We call for a bipartisan solution on immigration that respects the God-given dignity of every person, protects the unity of the immediate family, respects the rule of law, guarantees secure national borders, ensures fairness to taxpayers, establishes a path toward legal status and/or citizenship for those who qualify and those who wish to become permanent residents. We urge our Nation's leaders to work together with the American people to pass immigration reform that embodies these key principles and that will make our Nation proud.

There's heads of the evangelical immigration table, and it's very, very lengthy. In fact, I'm not going to go through and read it. I was tempted to do that because day after day I heard a few people come in here and you'd think that everyone in the United States was against immigration reform. In fact, just the opposite.

I could read that Leith Anderson, President of the National Association

of Evangelicals; Stephan Bauman, President and CEO of the World Relief; David Beckmann, President of Bread for the World; Noel Castellanos, CEO of Christian Community Development Association—I could go on and on and on because this thing goes on for pages. My trustee staff gave me pages and pages and pages of leaders in the evangelical churches that have signed on to this, so I won't go on and read all the names.

But I will say this. I believe we will come to an agreement on immigration. I do believe that. I honestly believe that. I do believe that the prayers that the faith communities are directing towards us, and especially towards the immigrants, are going to be heard. I believe that. I believe it deeply that this time we won't fail, that this time will be different, that this time, in fact, we will pass a law that is just, a law that treats immigrants as we're supposed to treat them, as it says in this Good Book. As our values as Americans, I think that we will have a just, a merciful immigration law, and I'm very excited about it.

I wanted to end with a story of a young woman that came and testified in California last year. I spoke about it in California and I want to speak about it here, because it's one of those incredible tragedies in life, and I called it, "Two Days in Mexicali." And, unfortunately, for many of us Californians, when we think about 2 days in Mexicali or 2 days in Tijuana, it's normally not the 2 days that I'm going to speak about here.

Instead, this was a young lady. This was a young lady who was born in Mexicali. Her mother was a prostitute and a drug addict. They lived in Los Angeles. The mother had been born and raised there. She went to Mexicali and then had a child in Mexicali.

She abandoned the child there, and this child's grandmother went and found her, brought her back to Los Angeles. And the grandmother was, I suspect, a very Christian, devout woman, and raised this child in a beautiful way, because for 13 years she developed into a very successful student and a very nice person.

We got to meet her because she was, I guess, 19 years old. She had turned 19, and she had not known that she was an undocumented person because that never came up. So, instead, she lived her life thinking she was an American citizen. Then she applied for college. And at that point, we hadn't changed the law yet as they had in Texas to allow an undocumented person to get in-State tuition or to get any kind of financial aid; so even though her mother was a prostitute and a drug addict who abandoned this little girl, this little girl grew up to be a wonderful person, and then the law oppressed her by not allowing her to continue.

We have a chance to change that for her and for so many other people. And I hope we listen to the pastors tomorrow, our evangelical brothers and sis-

ters that are going to come tomorrow to pray for us, to pray that we open our hearts, pray that we will see the immigrant as the stranger in Matthew 25, that we will treat them in a way that is humane and that cherishes our values as Americans.

Madam Speaker, I thank you very much for the opportunity today to speak. I think this is a very important issue, an issue that I have great faith in God that will be resolved according to our best values; and our best values are those of mercy.

I thank you very much, and I yield back the balance of my time.

CURRENT EVENTS IN REVIEW

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. WALORSKI). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, we know that there is so much going on after the tragedy in Boston where not just Boston was attacked, but the United States was attacked by acts of sheer evil, perpetrators who did not care about innocent people and innocent lives. They thought it better to try to kill, maim, and destroy. What sick, twisted, evil human being or human beings would do that?

But we saw 9/11/2001 vividly clear. There actually are people who are so radical, so mean, so evil, so twisted that they actually believe they could make for themselves a way to paradise by killing innocent people, killing children not even old enough to have really done anything wrong, and that is what they obviously felt would make their great mark in the world. I can't help but strongly believe with all my heart that, unless they repent and find grace, they are in for a very rude awakening in the next life.

It is my hope, as well, that the individual or individuals who are responsible will be held to account with the death penalty that will be implemented behind closed doors, without cameras present, without an opportunity for them to yet insult or hurt anyone else. They've done enough.

□ 1930

We'll await to see who it is that ends up being responsible. Perhaps there's an announcement tonight, perhaps not.

I am glad that even though there was a person of interest, that the investigators did not rush to judgment on that, that they continue to explore every possible clue, every possible video and photograph, thoroughly doing a good job it certainly appears in law enforcement so that when the evil culprits are apprehended and they go to trial and their attorneys are trying to raise a reasonable doubt with a jury, that the investigation will have been so thorough and there will not have been an inappropriate rush to judgment such that a fair trial is had, due process is had, and then making sure that it is,

indeed, the perpetrator or perpetrators and then carry out a death penalty. I hope that is the justice that ends up being carried out.

In the meantime, we had a gun bill that was voted down, as I understand, 54–46 in the Senate. It did not pass. It did not have enough votes. But with all of our hearts having poured out and continuing to have prayers and sympathy and empathy for the people in Sandy Hook, in Newtown, we still had a bill that was being brought to the Senate floor that all of the people who supported the bill, as I heard, had basically admitted that bill would not have saved a single one of the precious, dear little children that were so violently gunned down in their schoolroom. It would not have saved the heroic administrator, a teacher, those who were trying to protect the children.

It just seems that if people in Washington or other parts of the world, New York City or wherever, are going to manipulate and use such a tragic situation, such sympathetic victims, they ought to at least, for goodness' sake, at least put forward a bill that if it had been implemented would have ensured that at least one of the children or adults killed at Sandy Hook would not have been killed.

Otherwise, let's put together laws and let's have this administration finally enforcing laws that both together will reduce violence. Pushing forward a bill that would not save any of the lives lost there or in Colorado is just inappropriate and manipulative, and the victims deserve better.

I still completely understand the families of the victims, their hearts, the struggle, the difficulty. I understand, but let's not manipulate them for an individual political agenda.

Now, I was on C-SPAN this morning with the host, Greta Brawner, a terrific host, as is Susan Swain. I've enjoyed being on with both of them. But we were talking about border security and a bill that the so-called "Gang of Eight" is putting forward. They're great people in the "Gang of Eight," and I know they mean well. They want good for this country.

I'm also reminded of a line that I was told back in the Soviet Union in the summer of 1973 when I got close to a Soviet college student and we had a free exchange of ideas. He never put down his country at all. Despite that, he was ordered not to talk to me anymore after we became good friends because that's what happens in a country where the government becomes too powerful: you can't even choose your friends any more.

At one point we were sitting alone visiting, and he tugged on my shirt and he said, We don't have material this good for our individual citizens. We wish we did, but we recognize you have so much more and better things for your citizens in the United States than we do here in the Soviet Union. He said, But you've got to understand that here in the Soviet Union, since we were

formed in 1918, we have had two major wars fought on our own soil that have kept this country just in turmoil, and we have had to spend most of our resources not on such nice clothes and good things for individuals, but in defending our country because we never had two oceans protecting us the way you have in the United States.

I was able to point something out to President Bush some years back when he was President and I was a freshman here. I said, Look, for most of this Nation's history, as the young Soviet college student told me when I was a college student, you have had two oceans protecting your country, the United States. He was exactly right. For most of our history, two oceans have protected the United States.

I remember having conversations in the eighties and nineties, as we would see violence in other places, whether it was Beirut or the terrible atrocities inflicted on Israelis on their own soil, the constant bombings and people being blown up just as occurred at the terrible and evil event in Boston.

People have actually said the thing about America is if somebody were to decide to be a suicide bomber in America, they'd have to cross either the Atlantic or the Pacific, and they'd have such a cooling-down time, that even though they might be whipped up into a rage before they left to fly to America, all of the hours of sitting quietly on a plane or days on a ship would be enough to cause them to pause; and when they got to America, they would think, Nah, I really didn't want to blow myself up after all. That seemed to work pretty well.

But then the radicalization of Muslims got to the point where they were actually able to radicalize people who could cross an ocean, who could come into America; and as the 9/11 hijackers, they could come in here and unthinkably live in America, enjoy our liberties, our freedoms, enjoy the company of neighbors, share food with their neighbors, have neighbors invite them over and share food, share things such as if they need a cup of flour or whatever it is, share and see the way Americans share and are such a friendly country. They were able to live here. And too many of them were here on visas, and the visas expired.

□ 1940

Since neither Republican nor Democratic administration was effectively enforcing visas when they expired, these 9/11, hate-filled hijackers were able to keep on the mask that they enjoyed America, enjoyed the liberties, while all the time looking for the opportunity to kill themselves in a manner that would most effectively kill the greatest number of innocent people they could in America. It's unthinkable for American citizens.

The only thing closely akin that came to mind after 9/11 was when some were talking about, Well, you know what, in World War II, the idea that

someone would get in an airplane and fly it toward an American ship and crash their plane into the ship, trying to sink the ship, and kill as many as possible was foreign to Americans. We couldn't believe there was such a thing as kamikaze pilots. Who would do such a thing? Who would have that little regard for life and such hatred for other life that you would do all you could, including giving up your own life, just to kill as many people as you possibly could who just want to live free? That was foreign during World War II. It was strange. We couldn't believe it. I remember being taught about that in public schools while growing up. The teachers thought it was so strange, and we thought it was strange.

Now we've seen that same type of mentality that was told to Thomas Jefferson when he went to negotiate with the Barbary pirates. In essence, he couldn't understand why these radical Muslims, the Barbary pirates, would be attacking American ships. As Jefferson and the other diplomats explained, We've never attacked your ships. We've never attacked you. We're not any threat to you. Why would you attack American ships?

It was explained, In our religion, we believe that, if you die killing infidels, which you Americans are and since you don't believe what we do, then we go to paradise.

Jefferson thought that so strange. He was so well read, so intelligent that he couldn't believe it. He got his own copy of the Koran, in English translation, and read it. He could not believe there was a religion that anybody believed was teaching that you would go to paradise by killing innocent people. That just seemed so strange.

I am extremely grateful that most Muslims don't believe that. They don't believe they should get themselves a ticket to paradise by killing innocent people. They believe in reason and in talking and in trying to work things out. They don't want to be ruled and reigned over by radical Islamists either. Amazingly, I've had people approach me, the last in DFW airport, who have come up and indicated:

Aren't you in Congress?

Yes.

I'm from Egypt.

The last was getting ice cream there at DFW. He said, Aren't you in Congress?

Yes.

He said, You're helping the wrong people.

He had family still in Egypt, and he said, You're helping the wrong people. You're helping the radicals. You're helping the Muslim Brotherhood. We don't want the Muslim Brotherhood running Egypt. We want freedom in Egypt. That's what we thought we were going to get, and then your government helps the wrong people. You help the radicals. You help the Muslim Brotherhood. Quit doing that. Please, tell others in Washington to quit doing that. Quit helping the radicals.

I was surprised. That was not the first time, but it was the most recent time that someone turned out who was from Egypt, a Muslim. They want to live in peace. They don't want radicals ruining their lives, and they think it's wrong for radical Muslim Brotherhood members to persecute, kill, inflict pain and suffering on Coptic Christians and Jews. They don't think that's appropriate. They may not agree with them, but they want to live in peace. Yet this administration continues to help the wrong people.

After I met the young man from Egypt at DFW, I find out we're sending tear gas to Egypt in order to help the radicals in the Muslim Brotherhood use it against people like Coptic Christians, like Jewish residents in Egypt, like moderate Muslims who disagree with the kind of radicalism that is being forced on them in Egypt. Then we find out this week that this administration is sending more tanks to be used to crush those who just want freedom in Egypt. They're moderate Muslims. They want to have freedom. They don't want radicals running their country.

Just like our allies, the Northern Alliance—the moderate Muslims in Afghanistan who fought—many gave their lives. They lost friends and family in fighting the Taliban on our behalf, and now this administration has figuratively thrown them under the bus, and it's trying to buy friendship and peace—literally buy it with money—with the Taliban. That's not how you deal with the Taliban. The Northern Alliance knew how to deal with them. We helped them with some arms. We embedded less than 500 Special Operations people in intelligence, and within 3 or 4 months, the Northern Alliance had defeated the Taliban.

Then as I learned in my first meeting with Northern Alliance leaders some years ago, we told them, Give us back the significant weapons we've given you because we're America. We will make sure you're safe now. We'll make sure Afghanistan is safe and peaceful now. So they turned in the weapons. They trusted the United States, and now they find an administration that had previously been offering to buy elegant, first-class international offices in Qatar, in the Middle East, to give the Taliban—who still wants to kill Americans and destroy our way of life—international standing, classing them up in their efforts to kill Americans and destroy our way of life.

And what did the Northern Alliance get for their loyalty for defeating the Taliban initially before we allowed them to re-surge? They got betrayed. They have been betrayed.

It was reported that the administration was offering to release some of the Taliban's murdering thugs and buy them elegant offices in Qatar. No preconditions. Just sit down and talk with us, and we will buy you stuff, and we will let your murdering thugs go from confinement. We've already done that.

One of them was on television over a year ago, telling the Afghanistan people on the most watched television station. If you do not fully support the Taliban, then you have one chance, and that is to come apologize to us and, under sharia law, beg our forgiveness and ask for our protection. Then you will fall under our protection, and you will not be killed. They explained to the nation of Afghanistan—the leader that this administration let out of confinement and who is now back leading the Taliban against us—that everyone in the world knows that the Americans have been defeated, and so their President is pulling everyone out. They're running away; they're scared; they're cowards; they're afraid of us. So once the cowardly Americans finish running away from us, in 2014, we, the Taliban, will be back in charge.

□ 1950

And so you've got a choice. You either come back, apologize, pledge devotion to us, ask forgiveness and protection, and under sharia law, we'll protect you. Otherwise, life may not last long once the Americans are gone.

The message has been going around the world. In Egypt when we turned—this administration, at least—turned its back on our ally, Mubarak. When Qadhafi had blood on his hands since 2003, he had been an important ally of this country, giving us more information about terrorists because it was in his interest to keep terrorists at bay, giving us more information about terrorism at times than any other countries were able to give us; and that was repaid by this administration—helped bomb Qadhafi and his troops, and support the radicals. Back at the time, some of us here on the floor were explaining, we don't know who all's involved in the revolution, but we know there are al Qaeda elements of this revolution. Let's stop. This is not a good idea until we know whose side we should be on.

But the world has seen this administration turns against its allies and tries to buy off its enemies. So if this administration were going to be consistent, it would seem that the thing to do, to expect for this administration to offer something, as the Clinton administration did to North Korea: hey, you know, we'll build you a nuclear plant; we'll do something if you just promise you won't develop nuclear weapons. Well, we saw how that worked. Madeleine Albright and President Clinton worked out a heck of a deal. We helped them get nuclear weapons because of the naivete of that administration, and now we're faced with a very difficult situation.

Also understand, if North Korea continues on this path and Iran is not stopped, that what North Korea has Iran may have, and then no one in Israel will be safe at all. And Israel is considered in their minds, in radical Islamist minds, the Little Satan, and we're the Great Satan.

I mentioned this morning on C-SPAN that we have been aware that not everyone that wants to come into this country wants to come for jobs. We know that. Most of the Hispanics are fantastic people. They want to work hard. They believe in God. They're devoted to family. And that is a bit of a generalization, but it's my hope that that Hispanic culture coming into this country will help bring a resurgence and make us the strong country we once were when it came to family values and an acknowledgement that "In God We Trust," as is our national motto.

Or as Ben Franklin said during the Constitutional Convention:

I've lived, sir, a long time, and the longer I live the more convincing proofs I see of this truth: God governs in the affairs of men.

And as Franklin said:

If a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His notice, is it possible an empire could rise without His aid? We've been assured in the sacred writing, that unless the Lord build the House, they labor in vain that build it. I firmly believe that.

So I welcome people. And I've met Christian friends that I just fell in love with in West Africa. And one of them, an elderly black West African, wonderful, wonderful man, a heart as big as all outdoors, but he said, please tell others in Washington to quit getting weaker because if America grows weak, yes, we know where we go when we die, but if America grows weak, we have no chance of peace. We have no chance of a good life in this world. So please stop getting weaker. It looks like you're getting weaker.

He started off by saying, We were excited when you elected your first black President, but please urge him to quit getting weaker in America. We need you to be strong.

And I mentioned this morning that we even are aware that we've had al Qaeda, we've had radical Islamists try to disguise themselves as Hispanics and sneak across our southern border because Americans have never been worried about our Hispanic friends being radical and wanting to kill innocent people to go to paradise. That's not part of the Hispanic culture.

And I've been amazed since then that the left wing always wants to try to distort, to create a story out of a twisted—I have to choose my words wisely because it'll be interesting to see what the twisted mind of the left does—but the ignorance was apparently only coupled by laziness by left wing media, so they go nuts trying to paint me as a bigot when obviously they are the bigots, and not only bigots but they're lazy because if they had bothered to even turn on their computer and use it for something besides mean-spirited, twisted, distorted untruths, they could have found this story from the "American Thinker" back on August 2, 2010. In the story by Norah Petersen, it points out, it discusses that:

In 2001, the brother of a Hezbollah military chief illegally entered the United States by

crossing the Mexican border. He then settled in Dearborn, Michigan, and raised money for Hezbollah.

In 2002, illegal immigrants from Lebanon who were thought to have ties to Hezbollah were smuggled into the United States via the Mexican border, according to a congressional report:

“In December 2002, Salim Boughader Mucharrافية, a cafe owner in Tijuana, Mexico, was arrested for illegally smuggling more than 200 Lebanese illegally into the United States, including several believed to have terrorist ties to Hezbollah.”

The congressional report also revealed that the FBI has confirmed that persons from al Qaeda-linked nations have been known to disguise themselves as Hispanic immigrants:

“Federal Bureau of Investigation Director Robert Mueller has confirmed in testimony ‘that there are individuals from countries with known al Qaeda connections who are changing their Islamic surnames to Hispanic-sounding names and obtaining false Hispanic identities, learning to speak Spanish, and pretending to be Hispanic immigrants.’”

These are the kinds of things that our enemies are doing to try to bring down this Nation. I hope the administration will wise up and do something about it.

With that, Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. SHIMKUS (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today and April 18 on account of personal matters.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 18, 2013, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1139. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's Evaluation of the TRICARE Program for Fiscal Year 2013, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1073 note; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1140. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Daniel P. Bolger, United States Army, and his advancement on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1141. A letter from the Acting Chairman, National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities, transmitting the Federal Council on the Arts and the Humanities' thirty-seventh annual report on the Arts and Artifacts Indemnity Program for fiscal year 2012; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1142. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting

Transmittal No. 13-03, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1143. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting extension of the waiver of Section 907 of the FREEDOM Support Act, Pub. L. 107-511, with respect to assistance to the Government of Azerbaijan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1144. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's fiscal year 2012 annual report 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.

1145. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission, transmitting the Commission's FY 2012 Annual Report pursuant to Section 203, Title II of the Notification and Federal Anti-discrimination and Retaliation (No FEAR) Act of 2002; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1146. A letter from the Chairman, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting the Board's FY 2012 Buy American Act report; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1147. A letter from the Director, National Science Foundation, transmitting the Foundation's annual report for FY 2012 prepared in accordance with Title II 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.

1148. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Senate's Resolution of Advice and Consent to the Treaty with Australia Concerning Defense Trade Cooperation (Treaty Doc. 110-10) activities report; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1149. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of VOR Federal Airways V-68, V-76, V-194, and V548 in the Vicinity of Houston, TX [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0231; Airspace Docket No.: 13-ASW-7] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received April 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1150. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Middletown, OH [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0651; Airspace Docket No.: 12-AGL-7] received April 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1151. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; West Union, IA [Docket No.: FAA-2011-1434; Airspace Docket No.: 11-ACE-27] received April 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1152. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Decorah, IA [Docket No.: FAA-2011-1433; Airspace Docket No.: 11-ACE-26] received April 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1153. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Tecumseh, NE

[Docket No.: FAA-2012-1098; Airspace Docket No.: 12-ACE-5] received April 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1154. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Beeville, TX [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0821; Airspace Docket No.: 12-ASW-8] received April 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1155. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Superior, WI [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0656; Airspace Docket No.: 12-AGL-5] received April 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1156. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of VOR Federal Airway V-233, Springfield, IL [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0179; Airspace Docket No.: 05-AGL-6] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received April 6, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1157. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1288; Directorate Identifier 2012-NE-37-AD; Amendment 39-17403; AD 2013-06-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1158. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Robinson Helicopter Company Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1088; Directorate Identifier 2012-SW-005-AD; Amendment 39-17987; AD 2013-05-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1159. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Hughes Helicopters, Inc., and McDonnell Douglas Helicopter Systems (Type Certificate is currently held by MD Helicopters, Inc.) Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0890; Directorate Identifier 2011-SW-019-AD; Amendment 39-17388; AD 2013-05-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

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. COURTNEY (for himself, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, and Mr. SCHRADER):

H.R. 1590. A bill to amend the Specialty Crops Competitiveness Act of 2004 to include farmed shellfish as specialty crops; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CARTER (for himself, Mr. BURGESS, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 1591. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment and maintenance of an undiagnosed diseases network, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MICA (for himself, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. RADEL, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. GARCIA, Ms. ROSLEHTINEN, and Mr. MILLER of Florida):

H.R. 1592. A bill to provide for the conveyance of the David W. Dyer Federal Building and United States Courthouse in Miami, Florida, to Miami Dade College in Miami Dade County, Florida; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. BASS, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BERA, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. CHU, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FARR, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. JONES, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KIND, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. POLIS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RAHALL, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. SCHRAMMER, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TONKO, Mr. WALZ, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut):

H.R. 1593. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to improve the prevention of and response to sexual assault in the Armed Forces by establishing a Sexual Assault Oversight and Response Council and an enhanced Sexual Assault Oversight and Response Office and by requiring the appointment of a Director of Military Prosecutions for sexual-related offenses committed by a member of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. LAMALFA, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. POSEY, Mr. FLEMING, and Mr. OLSON):

H.R. 1594. A bill to prohibit the use of Federal funds for the costs of official portraits of members of Congress, heads of executive agencies, or heads of offices of the legislative branch; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, 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. COURTNEY (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CAR-

SON of Indiana, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. ESTY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. KILMER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MOORE, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. POLIS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCHRAMMER, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. TONKO, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. VELA, Mr. WALZ, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WELCH, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. PETERS of California, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. TITUS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ENYART, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KIND, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. CAPUANO, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.R. 1595. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to extend the reduced interest rate for Federal Direct Stafford Loans; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 1596. A bill to increase the employment of Americans by requiring State workforce agencies to certify that employers are actively recruiting Americans and that Americans are not qualified or available to fill the positions that the employer wants to fill with H-2B nonimmigrants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEUTCH:

H.R. 1597. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit to individuals for legal expenses paid with respect to establishing guardianship of a disabled individual; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas (for himself, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. NUNNELEE, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. KEATING, Mr. HIMES, Mr. RUSH, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. JONES, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BUCHSHON, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. LATTI, Mr. LONG, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. OLSON, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. STEWART, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. POLIS, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 1598. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to issue, upon request, veteran identification cards to certain veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO):

H.R. 1599. A bill to amend section 520E of the Public Health Service Act to require States and their designees receiving grants for development or implementation of statewide suicide early intervention and prevention strategies to consult with each Federally recognized Indian tribe, tribal organization, and urban Indian organization in the State; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 1600. A bill to prescribe procedures for effective consultation and coordination by Federal agencies with federally recognized Indian tribes regarding Federal Government activities that impact tribal lands and interests to ensure that meaningful tribal input is an integral part of the Federal decision-making process; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself, Ms. CHU, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. SERRANO):

H.R. 1601. A bill to amend title XVI of the Social Security Act to update eligibility for the supplemental security income program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 1602. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Indian tribes to transfer the credit for electricity produced from renewable resources; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIMM (for himself, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. MEEKS):

H.R. 1603. A bill to support and promote community financial institutions in the mutual form, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LAMBORN:

H.R. 1604. A bill to establish the National Geospatial Technology Administration within the United States Geological Survey to enhance the use of geospatial data, products, technology, and services, to increase the economy and efficiency of Federal geospatial activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform, Science, Space, and Technology, and 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. LARSON of Connecticut:

H.R. 1605. A bill to protect Second Amendment rights, ensure that all individuals who should be prohibited from buying a firearm are listed in the National Instant Criminal Background Check System, and provide a responsible and consistent background check process; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER:

H.R. 1606. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act to make available to producers a supplemental coverage option based on both an individual yield and loss basis and an area yield and loss basis in order to allow producers to cover all or a portion of their deductible under the individual yield and loss policy, to improve the accuracy of actual production history determinations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. NOEM (for herself and Mr. TERRY):

H.R. 1607. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act to extend certain supplemental agricultural disaster assistance programs to cover fiscal years 2012 through 2018,

and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 1608. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to promulgate regulations regarding the authorship, content, format, and dissemination of Patient Medication Information to ensure patients receive consistent and high-quality information about their prescription medications and are aware of the potential risks and benefits of prescription medications; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 1609. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to make grants to support fire safety education programs on college campuses; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. RIBBLE (for himself, Mr. WALZ, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. PETRI, and Mr. DUFFY):

H.R. 1610. A bill to amend the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 to authorize producers on a farm to produce fruits and vegetables for processing on the base acres of the farm; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RIBBLE:

H.R. 1611. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to use funds derived from conservation-related programs executed on National Forest System lands to utilize the Agriculture Conservation Experienced Services Program; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, 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. ROGERS of Alabama (for himself, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BONNER, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mrs. ROBY, and Ms. SEWELL of Alabama):

H.R. 1612. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to convey a parcel of land in Tuskegee, Alabama, to Tuskegee University, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LATHAM (for himself, Mr. COLE, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. HANNA, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mr. NUGENT):

H. Res. 166. A resolution condemning any proposals for the arbitrary seizure of funds from federally insured deposit accounts in the United States by the Government without due process; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri (for himself, Mr. HANNA, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SIMPSON, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. NEAL, Mr. HOLT, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. WALZ):

H. Res. 167. A resolution recognizing the roles and contributions of America's teachers to building and enhancing our Nation's civic, cultural, and economic well-being; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. NEAL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. KEATING):

H. Res. 168. A resolution condemning the horrific attacks of April 15, 2013, in Boston, Massachusetts, and expressing support, sympathy, and prayers for all persons impacted by this tragedy; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

tives, 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. COURTNEY:

H.R. 1590.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, Clause 1 and Article IV, section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution of the United States grant Congress the authority to enact this bill.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.R. 1591.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

By Mr. MICA:

H.R. 1592.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 1593.

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 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CASSIDY:

H.R. 1594.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. COURTNEY:

H.R. 1595.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3
The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 1596.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8. Clause 4.
To establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States

By Mr. DEUTCH:

H.R. 1597.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas:

H.R. 1598.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 1599.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 1600.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 1601.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. I, §§1 and 8.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 1602.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GRIMM:

H.R. 1603.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. LAMBORN:

H.R. 1604.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3—

Article IV—The States

Section 3—New States

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; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut:

H.R. 1605.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 6

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.

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER:

H.R. 1606.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 "The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States", 18 ("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").

By Mrs. NOEM:

H.R. 1607.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, the Commerce Clause.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 1608.

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, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 1609.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. RIBBLE:

H.R. 1610.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representa-

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. RIBBLE:

H.R. 1611.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ROGERS of Alabama:

H.R. 1612.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1—This bill promotes the general welfare of the United States by returning vacant land to its original charitable donor, Tuskegee University.

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18—Creates necessary and proper authority for the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to convey the vacant land to Tuskegee University.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolution as follows:

- H.R. 139: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
- H.R. 164: Mr. STEWART, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. PAULSEN.
- H.R. 198: Mr. McDERMOTT.
- H.R. 274: Mrs. BUSTOS and Ms. SINEMA.
- H.R. 300: Mr. YODER.
- H.R. 335: Mr. GARAMENDI.
- H.R. 357: Mr. RUNYAN.
- H.R. 377: Mr. RUIZ and Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.
- H.R. 382: Mr. RADEL and Mr. BURGESS.
- H.R. 445: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
- H.R. 452: Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. TONKO, Mr. HIGGINS, and Mrs. LOWEY.
- H.R. 485: Mr. SWALWELL of California and Ms. TITUS.
- H.R. 495: Mr. NUNES.
- H.R. 521: Ms. SINEMA.
- H.R. 523: Mr. KING of New York, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. LABRADOR, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. RIGELL, Ms. ROSLEHTINEN, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. WOODALL, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
- H.R. 525: Mr. RADEL.
- H.R. 526: Mr. SCHIFF.
- H.R. 556: Mr. CHABOT, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. YOHO, and Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.
- H.R. 627: Mr. VELA, Ms. BASS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. TITUS, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. TERRY, Mr. ROSKAM, Ms. SINEMA, Mrs. WAGNER, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. OLSON, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. WOLF, Mr. FORBES, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Mr. VEASEY.
- H.R. 649: Mr. FARR.
- H.R. 693: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
- H.R. 721: Mr. ANDREWS.
- H.R. 724: Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. BENISHEK, and Mr. PALAZZO.
- H.R. 730: Mr. POE of Texas.
- H.R. 732: Mr. BENTIVOLIO.
- H.R. 755: Ms. MATSUI.

- H.R. 763: Mr. WALBERG, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. HANNA, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, and Mr. REICHERT.
- H.R. 769: Mr. ENYART.
- H.R. 786: Mrs. CAPPS.
- H.R. 792: Mr. CLAY.
- H.R. 807: Mr. CRAWFORD, Mrs. ELLMERS, and Mr. COBLE.
- H.R. 809: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
- H.R. 820: Mr. RANGEL and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
- H.R. 846: Mr. DENHAM, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. RAHALL, and Mrs. LUMMIS.
- H.R. 847: Mr. MURPHY of Florida and Mr. SHERMAN.
- H.R. 851: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
- H.R. 855: Mr. MAFFEL.
- H.R. 892: Ms. SCHWARTZ.
- H.R. 893: Mr. CHABOT and Mr. STOCKMAN.
- H.R. 894: Mr. COHEN.
- H.R. 904: Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. ROSKAM, and Mr. FORBES.
- H.R. 906: Mr. POCAN, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.
- H.R. 938: Mr. GARDNER, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. ROSS, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. COTTON, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. SESSIONS.
- H.R. 940: Mr. GOSAR.
- H.R. 949: Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Ms. DELAURO.
- H.R. 959: Mr. SHIMKUS and Mr. PITTS.
- H.R. 961: Mr. LOBIONDO and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
- H.R. 962: Mr. PETERS of California.
- H.R. 974: Mr. HECK of Washington.
- H.R. 997: Mr. YOUNG of Florida.
- H.R. 1010: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
- H.R. 1014: Mr. COLE.
- H.R. 1015: Mr. GERLACH and Mr. WOLF.
- H.R. 1026: Mr. GOSAR, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. RIBBLE.
- H.R. 1029: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
- H.R. 1074: Mr. TAKANO, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. BISHOP of New York.
- H.R. 1077: Mr. COTTON, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, and Mr. FINCHER.
- H.R. 1078: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
- H.R. 1095: Mr. KLINE.
- H.R. 1130: Ms. LEE of California.
- H.R. 1149: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
- H.R. 1173: Mr. LEVIN and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
- H.R. 1179: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia and Mr. OWENS.
- H.R. 1199: Mr. COHEN, Mr. WALZ, Mr. KILMER, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. CHU, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. SCHRADER, and Ms. DELBENE.
- H.R. 1209: Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. VELA, Mr. FLORES, Mrs. BLACK, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. KEATING, Mr. BARTON, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. DAINES, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. JONES, Mr. PETERS of California, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. KINGSTON, Ms. EDWARDS, and Mr. FORBES.
- H.R. 1242: Mr. BARR.
- H.R. 1245: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. KEATING, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. HAHN, and Mr. GALLEGRO.

- H.R. 1249: Mr. SMITH of Washington and Mr. POE of Texas.
- H.R. 1250: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.
- H.R. 1252: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. COFFMAN, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
- H.R. 1276: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. MARINO, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. TONKO, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. YARMUTH.
- H.R. 1286: Mr. ANDREWS.
- H.R. 1288: Mr. COHEN, Mr. FORBES, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. LATHAM.
- H.R. 1354: Ms. WILSON of Florida and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
- H.R. 1355: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. YOHO, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. BARTON.
- H.R. 1362: Mr. OWENS.
- H.R. 1406: Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. NUNES, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. GARRETT.
- H.R. 1416: Mrs. WALORSKI, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. LANCE, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida.
- H.R. 1427: Ms. TITUS.
- H.R. 1435: Mr. GRIJALVA.
- H.R. 1466: Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. POCAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. TITUS, Ms. EDWARDS, and Mr. YARMUTH.
- H.R. 1494: Mr. LATTA and Mrs. DAVIS of California.
- H.R. 1496: Mr. COSTA.
- H.R. 1502: Mr. GOHMERT and Mr. NEUGEBAUER.
- H.R. 1528: Mr. PETERSON and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
- H.R. 1538: Mr. VELA.
- H.R. 1549: Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. LONG, Mr. TERRY, and Mr. HALL.
- H.R. 1551: Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. SCHOCK, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
- H.R. 1588: Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. ENGEL.
- H. Con. Res. 4: Mr. LONG.
- H. Con. Res. 23: Mr. ROSKAM.
- H. Res. 36: Mrs. NOEM, Mr. ROONEY, and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
- H. Res. 76: Mr. LONG.
- H. Res. 134: Mr. WOLF and Mr. TERRY.
- H. Res. 144: Mr. LANCE.
- H. Res. 154: Mr. RANGEL, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. HAHN, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. PETERS of California, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. HONDA.