

and other means that people now have of communicating that they didn't have just a few years ago, the word can get out to everyone to be on the lookout for people who are committing crimes. This will help us to apprehend criminals and prevent crimes, and we very much urge our colleagues to support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.
Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Judiciary Committee and the representative from Houston, which lays claim to one of the most effective police departments in the nation, and a co-sponsor of the legislation, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 180, the "National Blue Alert Act of 2013." I support this bill as a good and necessary measure. Everyday, more than 900,000 officers protect and serve the people of the United States. Every 57 hours, one of these men and women die in the line of duty. These officers deserve nothing less than a system that ensures an efficient method to support and protect them, and to bring justice to those who would harm them. It is for this reason that I support the legislation before us.

The National Blue Alert Act directs the Attorney General to establish a national communications network within the Department of Justice to disseminate information when an officer is seriously injured or killed in the line of duty, and assign a Department of Justice officer to act as the national coordinator of the Blue Alert Network. The Blue Alert system is modeled after the Amber Alert and the Silver Alert programs, which have been very successful in finding abducted children and missing seniors. Currently 18 states, including my home state of Texas, have local Blue Alert programs in operation.

The National Blue Alert Coordinator will provide assistance to states and local governments using Blue Alert plans; establish voluntary guidelines for states and local governments for developing these plans; develop protocols for efforts to apprehend suspects; work with states to ensure regional coordination of various elements of the network; and establish advisory groups, to assist states, local governments, law enforcement agencies and other entities in initiating, facilitating, and promoting Blue Alerts through the network.

The National Blue Alert Coordinator will determine what procedures and practices to use in notifying law enforcement and the public when a law enforcement officer is killed or seriously injured in the line of duty and which procedures and practices are the most cost effective to implement.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that this legislation enjoys the strong support of the Fraternal Order of Police, and the National Sheriffs Association. As I stated, 18 states currently have a Blue Alert program in place, and it is time to expand this excellent program nationwide.

This bill will enhance officer safety, which should always be one of our major concerns. Since the first recorded line-of-duty death in 1791, more than 19,000 men and women have died in the line of duty. It saddens me that 1,665 of the names on the National Law Enforcement Memorial in Washington D.C. come from Texas. That is more than any other state. My city of Houston has lost 112 officers in the line of duty.

It should be clear to everyone that the regular dangers our officers face have only in-

creased. The 40 deaths that have occurred in 2013 represent a 21% increase over the comparable period in 2012; and gun related deaths are up 7 percent.

Mr. Speaker, passage of H.R. 180, the Blue Alert Notice Act of 2013, will not prevent brave law enforcement officials from falling in the line of duty in the future, but it will help. If it saves the life of at least one policeman and enables him or her to return safely home to his loved ones, this legislation will have proven its value.

I urge all members of the House to join me in supporting H.R. 180, the National Blue Alert Notification Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 180, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

POLICY REGARDING INTERNET GOVERNANCE

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1580) to affirm the policy of the United States regarding Internet governance.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1580

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

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) Given the importance of the Internet to the global economy, it is essential that the Internet remain stable, secure, and free from government control.

(2) The world deserves the access to knowledge, services, commerce, and communication, the accompanying benefits to economic development, education, and health care, and the informed discussion that is the bedrock of democratic self-government that the Internet provides.

(3) The structure of Internet governance has profound implications for competition and trade, democratization, free expression, and access to information.

(4) Countries have obligations to protect human rights, whether exercised online or offline.

(5) The ability to innovate, develop technical capacity, grasp economic opportunities, and promote freedom of expression online is best realized in cooperation with all stakeholders.

(6) Proposals have been, and will likely continue to be, put forward at international regulatory bodies that would fundamentally alter the governance and operation of the Internet.

(7) The proposals would attempt to justify increased government control over the Internet and could undermine the current multi-stakeholder model that has enabled the

Internet to flourish and under which the private sector, civil society, academia, and individual users play an important role in charting its direction.

(8) The proposals would diminish the freedom of expression on the Internet in favor of government control over content.

(9) The position of the United States Government has been and is to advocate for the flow of information free from government control.

(10) This Administration and past Administrations have made a strong commitment to the multistakeholder model of Internet governance and the promotion of the global benefits of the Internet.

SEC. 2. POLICY REGARDING INTERNET GOVERNANCE.

It is the policy of the United States to preserve and advance the successful multistakeholder model that governs the Internet.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) and the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials into the RECORD on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise in support of H.R. 1580, sometimes called the Internet Freedom Bill.

The Internet is possibly the most important technological advancement since the printing press. Governments' hands-off approach has enabled the Internet's rapid growth and made it a powerful engine of social and economic freedom. This bipartisan bill is designed to combat recent efforts by some in the international community to regulate the Internet, which could jeopardize not only its vibrancy, but also the benefits that it brings to the entire world.

Nations from across the globe met at the December 2012 World Conference on International Telecommunications in Dubai. They considered changes to the international telecommunications regulations. The treaty negotiations were billed as a routine review of rules governing ordinary international telephone service. A number of countries, such as Russia, China, and Iran, sought to use the negotiations, however, to pursue regulation of the Internet through the International Telecommunication Union, a United Nations agency. None other than Russian President Vladimir Putin has been clear in his objective of "establishing international control over the Internet using the monitoring and supervisory capabilities of the International Telecommunication Union."

The developments in Dubai were not unanticipated. That is why leading up to the conference last year, the House

and Senate unanimously passed Senate Concurrent Resolution 50. That resolution expressed the sense of Congress that the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Commerce should advocate “the consistent and unequivocal policy of the United States to promote a global Internet free from government control and preserve and advance the successful multi-stakeholder model that governs the Internet today.”

□ 1720

Now, under that multi-stakeholder model, non-regulatory institutions seek input from the public and private sectors to develop best practices for managing the content, applications, and networks that make up the Internet. The Internet is organized from the ground up and not from the government handed down. This is not to say that government has no role in policing unlawful behavior. Illegal activity is no less illegal simply because someone has used digital tools to perpetrate the act. Child pornography, for example, is no less illegal if it is disseminated over the Internet rather than in photographs or magazines. There is a big difference, however, between punishing illegal acts committed over the Internet and government control of its management and operation. Refraining from regulating the underpinning of the Internet has allowed it to evolve quickly to meet the diverse needs of users around the world and to keep governmental or non-governmental actors from controlling the design of the network or the content it carries.

Buttressed by the unanimous passage of Senate Concurrent Resolution 50, the United States and 54 other countries left Dubai without signing the treaty. Unfortunately, 89 nations did sign. The revised ITRs will be implemented by those nations, and that begins in January of 2015. Now, a number of upcoming conferences will present additional opportunities for countries to pursue international regulation of the Internet, including the World Telecommunication/ICT Policy Forum in Geneva, which starts today, and the ITU Plenipotentiary Conference in Busan, South Korea, in 2014.

The growing threat of such regulation prompted the subcommittee of which I chair, the House Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Communications and Technology, to hold a joint hearing earlier this year with the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. Just as international opponents of an unregulated Internet are redoubling their efforts, so must we. That is why the hearing we held focused on draft legislation elevating the language of last year’s resolution from a mere sense of Congress aimed at particular treaty negotiations to a generalized statement of U.S. law.

I want to thank Foreign Affairs Chairman ED ROYCE; Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations Subcommittee Chairman CHRIS SMITH; and

Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade Subcommittee Chairman TED POE for their leadership and their help in calling attention to this important legislation and the issue broadly.

I also want to address the elephant in the room, if you will: the FCC’s network neutrality regulations. As the legislation we consider today was moving through the subcommittee and then the full committee, some of my colleagues expressed concern that transforming the exact language of last year’s unanimous resolution into law would somehow interfere with the FCC’s network neutrality rules. In particular, they saw a conflict with the language in making it U.S. policy “to promote a global Internet free from government control.”

Let me be clear: while I oppose the FCC’s rules regulating the Internet, this legislation does not address those regulations. While statements of policy can help delineate the contours of statutory authority, they don’t create statutorily mandated responsibilities. Nonetheless, in the interest of reaching bipartisan consensus and moving this important legislation forward, I agreed to drop the “government control” language. The result is the language you see today in H.R. 1580, which I introduced with Ranking Member ESHOO. This bill would make it U.S. policy “to preserve and advance the successful multi-stakeholder model that governs the Internet.”

Passing H.R. 1580 will show we are united against efforts by authoritarian nations to exert their grip on the Internet. For the sake of the Internet and the social and economic freedoms that it brings, I urge my colleagues to vote for the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

To my colleague and my chair on the subcommittee, thank you for your fine leadership and for your leadership on this legislation as well.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support H.R. 1580. As my colleague mentioned, it is a bill to affirm the policy of the United States to preserve and advance the successful multi-stakeholder model that governs the Internet. It has worked. If it ain’t broke, don’t fix it. The Internet has been a unique and powerful driver of social and economic progress, and it is changing nearly every part of the American economy and society, everything from education to health care delivery to agriculture.

This is especially true for rural communities, where communications technology can have an even greater impact in areas where populations are small and distances are vast. The Internet enables connections from even the most far-flung corners of our country to people, goods, and services around the globe, allowing rural America to compete just as effectively in the 21st century digital economy.

A critical element of the Internet’s success story has been the open man-

ner in which the Internet is governed. Rather than relying on centralized control by governments, the Internet instead adopts a multi-stakeholder model in which all who have an interest can have a voice in the Internet’s operation. Lately, however, the multi-stakeholder model towards Internet governance has been under assault on the global stage.

At the World Conference on International Telecommunications in Dubai last December, as my colleague mentioned, the International Telecommunication Union adopted several proposals that could fundamentally alter the way the Internet operates. These proposals undermine the successful decentralized approach to Internet governance and impose a government-controlled management regime, thereby threatening citizens’ access to content and information via the Internet as well as the global free flow of information online.

I am pleased that Congress unanimously passed a resolution last year urging the administration to preserve and advance the successful multi-stakeholder model. That’s what governs the Internet today. That’s what we want to govern the Internet tomorrow. I applaud the decision by the U.S. delegation not to sign that final treaty, but efforts to bring the Internet under the control of international regulatory bodies continues. This week, member-states of the International Telecommunication Union will meet again in Geneva to debate issues surrounding global Internet governance. The passage of H.R. 1580 will be timely in, once again, demonstrating the unwavering support of our Congress of the multi-stakeholder Internet governance model.

I want to thank Chairman UPTON, and I want to thank Chairman WALDEN, and their staff, for working with us on the Democratic side to address the concerns. Ranking Member WAXMAN and Ranking Member ESHOO raised these concerns during the bill’s markup in the Energy and Commerce Committee. We worked it out.

Mr. WALDEN, thank you.

I appreciate the modifications made to the bill, which make it clear that this policy statement will not implicate the legitimate activities of the U.S. Government online or the authorities of Federal agencies. Because of these changes, Democrats and Republicans in Congress once again stand united with the administration in its efforts to resist proposals that would undermine the existing multi-stakeholder approach.

I join my colleague Mr. WALDEN in urging my colleagues on the Democratic side to vote for this bill so we can once again demonstrate that there is support across the entire political spectrum for continuing the multi-stakeholder model that allows the Internet to thrive, which is for the benefit of every American and citizens around the world.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. WALDEN. In closing, Mr. Speaker, freedom of the Internet is as essential as America's long held constitutional belief in freedom of the press, and we don't need governments—ours or others—infringing on how the Internet is managed and governed, nor in terms of maintaining the freedom of the press.

So, with that, I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1580, which reaffirms current policy to preserve and advance the successful multi-stakeholder model that governs the Internet, which is so very critical to our economic and social well-being.

In June 2011, the thirty-four member countries of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, business representatives, and technical experts agreed on principles that included a commitment to promote the open, distributed and interconnected nature of the Internet. The 34 OECD members range from the United States to France to South Korea to Mexico.

This landmark OECD communiqué recognized the importance of the multi-stakeholder approach, stating that “The Internet's openness to new devices, applications and services has played an important role in its success in fostering innovation, creativity and economic growth.” That's right.

Yet somehow the United Nations missed the memo. In December 2012, the U.N.'s International Telecommunications Union—a government-only membership body—took a vote on a binding global treaty that would establish the ITU as the forum for Internet standard setting. Despite U.S. opposition, 89 of 144 countries voted for the revised International Telecommunications Regulations. They included China, Cuba, Russia and other countries hostile to political freedom.

In a UN system where each country has one vote—no matter how undemocratic—this UN overreach could shift the idea of Internet governance from what is best for netizens to what is best for a group of governments. There is no need for a UN Internet treaty. The Internet is flourishing in the current multi-stakeholder framework just fine.

In addition, there are serious concerns around the lack of transparency and inclusivity of the UN's ITU process. The Internet has transformed our ability to access and share information—surely Internet policy should not be developed behind the closed doors of the UN.

The U.S. State Department, Commerce Department, business community and civil society leaders must step up their outreach. We must clearly explain the huge economic and social benefits that are derived from the Internet and the policy framework that is needed to maximize those benefits. Going forward, a concerted effort must be made to turn around as many as possible of the 89 votes for the International Telecommunications Regulations.

Congress is unified in our support of an open Internet—we recognize the importance of the Internet to our economy and society. We recognize the threat of proposed international control of the Internet. It is now time to rally the international community against this dangerous policy.

I want to thank Chairman WALDEN for his work on H.R. 1580 and want to recognize the

excellent cooperation between the Energy and Commerce Committee and the Foreign Affairs committee on Internet governance. Our committees held a joint hearing in February entitled “Fighting for Internet Freedom: Dubai and Beyond.” We will continue to coordinate. And we will certainly continue to fight for Internet Freedom.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, as the World Telecommunication/ICT Policy Forum (WTPF) begins in Geneva, Switzerland today, it's fitting that the House is considering legislation that affirms the support of the United States for the multi-stakeholder process of global Internet governance.

As we've debated before the Communications and Technology Subcommittee time and time again, H.R. 1580 is not about our views on domestic Internet policy. The legality of the FCC's 2010 Open Internet Order will be decided by the Courts. H.R. 1580 is about ensuring that this week and at future conferences, the international community knows that the U.S. Congress stands behind the multi-stakeholder process and the importance of a free and open Internet.

The Internet continues to advance rapidly and with this growth, billions around the world will experience the innovation, openness and transparency that have enabled the Internet to flourish. I thank Chairman WALDEN for bringing this legislation to the floor in a bipartisan manner and urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1580.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to support H.R. 1580, a bill to affirm the policy of the United States to preserve and advance the successful multistakeholder model that governs the Internet.

Democrats and Republicans in Congress and the Administration have been united in our support for a global open Internet governed from the bottom up. We worked together last Congress on a bipartisan, bicameral basis to express our support for that successful approach to Internet governance.

On some domestic issues, I have strong differences with the majority over Internet policy. One example is my support for a domestic Internet policy that prevents Internet service providers from acting as “gatekeepers” that control what American citizens can do online. But those differences appropriately stop at the water's edge.

I want to thank Chairman UPTON and Chairman WALDEN for listening to the concerns we had about the initial draft of this bill. They worked with me and other Committee Democrats to address those issues by removing certain language from the draft and assuring us that the legislation is in no way intended to direct domestic Internet policy. With these changes and the assurances of my colleagues, I am pleased that we stand together on a bipartisan basis in support of our diplomats and the multistakeholder model for global Internet governance.

I urge my colleagues to support this measure so we can send a strong, united signal to the global community.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1580.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

□ 1730

AUTHORIZING USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL TO CELEBRATE BIRTHDAY OF KING KAMEHAMEHA

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 10) authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for an event to celebrate the birthday of King Kamehameha.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

S. CON. RES. 10

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),

SECTION 1. USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL FOR EVENT TO CELEBRATE BIRTHDAY OF KING KAMEHAMEHA.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center is authorized to be used for an event on June 9, 2013, to celebrate the birthday of King Kamehameha.

(b) PREPARATIONS.—Physical preparations for the conduct of the ceremony described in subsection (a) shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as may be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) and the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HANABUSA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support, Mr. Speaker, of Senate Concurrent Resolution 10, authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall on June 9 to celebrate the birthday of King Kamehameha, a legendary figure in Hawaiian history and culture.

On June 11, the people of Hawaii will celebrate the 97th annual Kamehameha Day commemorating the life of Kamehameha the Great, who between 1795 and 1810 unified the islands into the Kingdom of Hawaii.

Known for being a fierce warrior who fought for unity and independence, King Kamehameha was highly regarded for ruling with fairness and compassion. He's remembered for his law