



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 22, 2015

No. 59

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
April 22, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DOUG COLLINS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 6, 2015, 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, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

IN MEMORY OF SCOTTY PROBASCO

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

Mr. FLEISCHMANN. Mr. Speaker, Chattanooga, Tennessee, the great State of Tennessee, and our Nation lost a wonderful man last Friday.

Scotty Probasco, my dear friend, passed away suddenly. All of this week, we have had memorials, tributes, eulogies—all justly deserved for this great man. I was wondering what I was going to say today as I put together these notes, but I want all of America to

know about this special man and my dear friend.

Scotty Probasco was born on November 26, 1928. He attended the Bright School in Chattanooga. He attended the Baylor School in Chattanooga, Dartmouth College, and then the Wharton School at Penn. He was a gifted man, a very bright man, a great businessman, but he was a giver.

As I was thinking this week as to what I was going to say about Scotty, it was what did Scotty mean to me and what did Scotty mean to our community and to our Nation.

Scotty was something else. He would walk into a room, and he would smile. I think of Scotty Probasco's smile. Always an optimist. In our profession, sometimes you have good days and bad days. Whenever I would run into Scotty, he would smile and always encourage me, but he didn't just do that with me; he did that with everyone.

As most of you all know, I proclaim Chattanooga is the greatest midsized city in America, sometimes as the greatest midsized city in the world. It is because of people like Scotty Probasco that we got there. Scotty was truly outstanding. He gave and he gave and he gave. As a community leader, whether it was the United Way or any other charity, he was always there. As a man of Christ, he was there for the First Presbyterian Church.

He is survived by his loving wife, Betty; by their four children, Scott, Zane, Ellen, and Ben; and by 12 wonderful grandchildren.

As I think of what our Nation needs today more than ever it is more Scotty Probascos—folks who will always accentuate the positive, who are always looking for the good in people, and who are always encouraging us to do our best.

There is always a loss when we lose a friend, and there was a great loss when Chattanooga lost Scotty Probasco last week, and we all feel that. We feel that

dearly. I feel that dearly. Yet, when I think of the generations to come and of the generosity, of the philanthropy, and of the kindness of Scotty Probasco and what that means to us as a people, this will be his legacy.

I am going to say something to him and to his great family today: Scotty Probasco, thank you, dear friend. Thank you for a job well done, and God bless you.

MIGRANTS ARE HUMAN BEINGS

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

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, this past weekend, we witnessed the most gruesome example of a story that is becoming ever more common. Hundreds of migrants are missing and feared dead—700 or more—because the smuggling boat they were packed onto capsized in the Mediterranean Ocean off the coast of Libya. It was on the front page of every paper around the world. An estimated 3,500 people died in 2014 while making the journey from North Africa to the southern coast of Europe.

Right now, along our southern border, illegal immigration is at historically low levels, but we, too, have a border that is known for smuggling, tragic losses of life, and smugglers no less brazen and no less indifferent to the lives of their human cargo than those off the Libyan coast.

With few legal options and with great opportunity for work and freedom on the other side, migrants throughout the world are risking their lives in the hopes of surviving the journey to live a better life.

During the peak of illegal immigration to this country a decade or so ago, one person died every single day, on average, when trying to come to the U.S. They died of dehydration in the desert or died in trucks or in boxcars in

□ 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.

H2359

botched smuggling operations or perished as stowaways, and those are the ones we know about.

Now we hear about “La Bestia,” or “The Beast,” which is the train carrying migrants from southern Mexico to the border of our country. Think about hundreds of people, most of them children and teenagers, clinging to the outside of a moving train while they are preyed upon by smugglers, sexual predators, and every kind of deviant.

The migrants who are fleeing violence and poverty and gang- and drug lord-infested communities in Central America, like those fleeing African and Asian countries, are willing to literally risk life and limb for the slim chance of a better life on this side.

Europe is responding to the migrant crisis by committing to more rescue operations. The rightwing, anti-immigration parties across Europe see the crisis as validation for their call to build a big wall around “fortress Europe.” There are a few people here in this Congress, in this building, who want to build a wall just like theirs.

Most people in Europe understand that building civil society and stable economies in the Southern Hemisphere is the best way to entice people to stay home. Foreign aid and international economic development are not dirty words in Europe the way they are here.

In the U.S., the policies set in Washington directly relate to the instability of neighboring countries in Central America, the Caribbean, and Latin America. Trade policies initiated here in this country have had devastating consequences in rural areas across our hemisphere, driving people from the land and driving people into drug cultivation. It is our insatiable appetite here in the United States for illegal drugs, funded with our dollar bills and enforced with U.S. guns, that creates and maintains a lot of the instability and chaos that drives people from their homes to America. Yet almost every budget that is considered in this Congress cuts mental health and drug counseling, addiction treatment and prevention, and does little to address our role in fueling instability.

With specific regard to immigration and asylum, in this Congress, we are debating laws to make it harder for children to apply for asylum and laws to make it easier to deport children or to put families into lengthy and expensive detention.

To add insult to injury, the Judiciary Committee just approved a measure to allow those who want to homeschool their children but who are prevented from doing so by their own government to be considered as a special class of oppressed victims to be considered eligible to apply for political asylum in the U.S. For the people from Germany and Sweden who want to homeschool their children, that is the kind of oppression that Congress responds to—people from Central America whose governments are unwilling or unable to protect children from murder and sexual assault, not so much.

The reality is that we need to do more to engage and strengthen our neighbors; we need to do much more to make sure that the actions, trade, and consumption of our people are helping, not hurting; and we need to do much more to make sure that we have secure borders by also remembering to put doors on those borders so that people can come with visas in a controlled way and not risking their lives with smugglers.

First and foremost, we must remember the message that Pope Francis reminded us of when he said of those who drowned in the ocean: “They are men and women like us, our brothers seeking a better life, starving, persecuted, wounded, exploited, victims of war. They were looking for a better life.”

Let us not forget that migrants are human beings.

HONORING FORMER BRAZOS COUNTY JUDGE RANDY SIMS

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

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor former Brazos County Judge Randy Sims, who passed away on April 2 of this year.

Judge Sims served the Brazos Valley community for decades. He served as the Brazos County commissioner of precinct 3 from 1972 to 1976 and again from 1989 to 2001. He also served on the Bryan City Council from 1987 to 1988. Lastly, he served as the Brazos County judge from 2003 to 2010.

Arthur Randolph Sims was born in Houston on July 31, 1939. He graduated from Stephen F. Austin High School. During his high school days, he was quite an athlete, playing both baseball and football. He passed up a chance to play professional baseball to get a college education. Legendary coach Bear Bryant recruited Randy to play football for Texas A&M University. Not only was Randy a top running back for Texas A&M, but he also held a long-standing record in the Southwest Conference for kicking a 52-yard field goal.

Following graduation from A&M, Randy remained in Brazos Valley. In May of 1960, he married Brenda Bryan. They were married for nearly 55 years. Randy and Brenda have one son and one daughter, and they are blessed with nine grandchildren.

In the mid-1960s, Randy opened a restaurant called Randy Sims Barbecue, which operated for 27 years. Randy was a great cook, and his restaurant carried recipes from Brenda’s dad and from Brenda’s brother, Red Bryan and Sonny Bryan.

Randy was a loving father, and he cherished his family time. He quickly learned how to balance his career in order to spend quality time with his family. Last year, the Bryan-College Station Chamber of Commerce named Randy and Brenda as its Citizens of the Year. This award was bestowed on them for their long and dedicated service to our community.

As an active community leader, Randy Sims served tirelessly on various boards and organizations, including on the State of Texas Regional Review Committee, the Presidential Library Committee, the Bryan-College Station Economic Development Corporation, the Bear Bryant Scholarship Foundation, the Brazos Valley Fellowship of Christian Athletes, the Solid Waste Advisory Board, the Brazos Beautiful Initiative, the Brazos Valley Museum of Natural History, the Grace Bible Church Deacon Board, and the Brazos County 911 Board.

His service to the Brazos Valley also included serving as a Bryan ISD host volunteer, as vice president of the Bryan-College Station Chamber of Commerce, as chair of the Brazos County Health Board District, and as the chair of the Brazos County Juvenile Board.

Mr. Speaker, Randy Sims was a great leader, a dedicated public servant, and an outstanding family man. His selfless devotion to our community will be greatly missed. He will long be remembered as a great public servant to our community and as a loving husband, father, grandfather, and friend to his family and friends.

My wife, Gina, and I offer our deepest sympathy and our heartfelt condolences to Brenda Sims and to her family. We also lift up Randy Sims’ family and friends in our prayers.

As I close, Mr. Speaker, I ask that all Americans continue to pray for our country during these difficult times, for the men and women in uniform, who protect it from external threats, and for our first responders, who protect us from threats here at home.

NATIONAL PUBLIC SAFETY TELECOMMUNICATORS WEEK

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

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize National Public Safety Telecommunicators Week.

After working 18 years as a 911 dispatcher, I know firsthand the challenges our public safety dispatchers face, the stress that they are put under, and the critical importance of their work. This is why, last week, I was proud to introduce a resolution commemorating National Public Safety Telecommunicators Week.

I remember working the graveyard shift four floors below ground and taking calls from people from all walks of life, often during their most vulnerable moments. 911 dispatchers hear it all. They are the first point of contact for public safety, and no matter the crisis, losing control is simply not an option.

National Public Safety Telecommunicators Week also provides us with the opportunity to remind our constituents of the importance of keeping emergency lines open for just that—emergencies. 911 isn’t an information line, and local governments have limited resources.

□ 1015

They can't afford to have 911 lines tied up with non-life-threatening emergencies. Simply put, there is no excuse for 911 abuse.

I encourage people to familiarize themselves with their local police and fire departments' nonemergency phone numbers, have them readily available or refer to 311 or their local info line where available. Keeping 911 lines clear is crucial to ensuring dispatchers are readily available during an emergency.

Every day public safety dispatchers help save lives. They provide comfort and reassurance, and they are an integral part of our law enforcement teams. Yet, too often, their work goes unrecognized.

When you need a calming voice to guide you through a crisis, when law enforcement, fire safety, and rescue personnel are in need of seamless coordination at a moment's notice, when every second counts, 911 dispatchers are on the other end of the line. They are the unsung heroes of the first responder community.

This National Public Safety Telecommunicators Week, let's recognize and honor the hundreds of thousands of public safety telecommunicators working round the clock to keep our communities safe.

NATIONAL FINANCIAL LITERACY MONTH

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

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize April as National Financial Literacy Month and highlight the key role that the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, or the AICPA, and State CPA societies and CPAs across the country play in educating all Americans about their personal finances.

National Financial Literacy Month is a yearly reminder of the importance of working to improve Americans' understanding of their personal finances. For over 10 years, the AICPA, its members, and State CPA societies have been the leaders in the financial literacy campaign by providing free programs, tools, and resources for all consumers. Thousands of CPAs across 55 States and jurisdictions are volunteering their time to educate consumers to understand their personal finances and their financial goals.

The AICPA, along with the State CPA societies and like-minded financial educational institutions, plays an essential role in educating all Americans so that they will have the knowledge to make decisions for a lifetime of financial well-being. By focusing on financial education as a lifelong endeavor, CPAs are encouraging children to learn about the value of money and teaching adults the importance of saving for a secure retirement.

Mr. Speaker, we have thousands of college students who are unfamiliar

with the impact their student loan debt will have on their early career. A financially literate college student will understand those implications and ramifications and would be better served and be better suited or be better able to make better decisions with respect to whether or not to take on that debt as they pursue their college education.

All Americans, from high school students to older adults, need the tools and resources to make educated decisions about their personal finances. Through the AICPA's flagship 360 Degrees of Financial Literacy program, CPAs across the country are volunteering to help all Americans understand their personal finances through every stage of life. The program combines grassroots advocacy with free public resources and tools for CPAs to educate Americans of all ages.

There is an urgent need to improve the financial literacy of all Americans. A recent survey showed that 47 percent of American households are not saving any of their current income for retirement. This means almost half of all Americans are living paycheck to paycheck and without any savings plan for financial hardships or retirement. Providing all Americans with the information necessary to make educated decisions will help households understand the value of savings for retirement and lead to a lifetime of financial well-being.

Again, I would like to congratulate the AICPA and State societies for this effort in helping Americans become more financially literate.

PHMSA IS ACTUALLY A TOOTHLESS KITTEN

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

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, last week before the Transportation and Infrastructure's committee on pipeline safety, I called the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, known as PHMSA, "a toothless tiger that has overdosed on quaaludes and is passed out on the job."

Today I stand before you to say I was wrong. I was wrong to call PHMSA a toothless tiger. PHMSA is actually a toothless kitten, a fluffy industry pet that frightens absolutely no one. This has been proven beyond a shadow of a doubt by yesterday's excellent Politico investigation of PHMSA's ineffectual "can't do" attitude, written by Elana Schor and Andrew Restuccia. Allow me to highlight some of the shocking incompetence brought to light by this article.

All rules made by PHMSA undergo peer review by two advisory committees: one on oil and one on gas. In theory, the committee is made up of five members each from industry, government, and public. Sounds good, right? Well, that might be true except the committee's current rosters are miss-

ing seven members on the government and public sides. This means the industry is calling the shots and voting for their own initiatives. On these committees there is almost no formal resistance to doing the industry's bidding.

That is what Deborah Hersman, former head of the National Transportation Safety Board, meant when she said: "For the regulator to delegate too much authority to the regulated to assess their own system risks and correct them is tantamount to the fox guarding the henhouse."

As we have seen in my district and in so many others, the fox has very little incentive to prevent oil or gas from spoiling the henhouse or to prevent the hens from blowing up. Of course, everyone is very sorry about the fact, but the will to prevent these accidents in the first place is simply not there. That is what happened in Mayflower, Arkansas, in 2013 when PHMSA let ExxonMobil operate an oil pipeline that was known to be faulty for 7 years, and then it blew up.

Nowhere is this more obvious than PHMSA's pitiful fines. Fines are supposed to be a deterrent, and yet the fines that PHMSA levies are so pathetic compared to the cost of pipeline leaks and explosions that they can't even be seen on this graph. Here you see that over the last 12 years PHMSA has issued just \$44.2 million in fines for incidents that cost over \$5 billion. Look at these tiny red lines. You can't even see them. You can see these other graph points that show how much damage was actually done, but the fines are next to nothing.

Take the Mayflower, Arkansas, example where dumping 200,000 gallons of heavy crude into a neighborhood cost ExxonMobil \$2.7 million, or 0.008 percent of that year's profits. To industry, this measly fine is just the cost of doing business. No need to fix a pipeline. Fines are so small, it is cheaper to just pay them.

But, of course, damage from pipeline leaks and explosions can't be reduced to just gray bars. In my district, the city of San Bruno, where eight people were killed by a pipeline explosion in 2010, the public remains traumatized by the idea that their entire neighborhood could be wiped out by one carelessly inspected or uninspected pipeline. Life has risks, but one of them shouldn't be coming home to find your husband and son and mother-in-law dead and your house obliterated, as happened to one of the families in my district.

That is why I find PHMSA's utter failure to implement more rigorous safety regulations so disgusting. PHMSA's reasoning that such regulations are "too costly for the pipeline industry compared with the expected benefits" is the reasoning of movie villains, not well-intentioned safety professionals who are supposed to be taking care of the public interest. Whose side is PHMSA on?

Now, one could argue that the low penalties are Congress' fault, not

PHMSA's. After all, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission has power to impose civil penalties of a million dollars per day. Compare that to PHMSA's relatively paltry \$200,000 a day. But that doesn't explain PHMSA's failure to even start civil penalty cases.

Even as pipeline incidents increase, PHMSA started fewer civil penalty cases in 2014 than in the past 10 years and proposed 73 percent fewer fines. For the few fines that are proposed, PHMSA does that behind closed doors where the public is not welcome.

ExxonMobil dumped 63,000 gallons of oil into Yellowstone River in 2011 but managed to argue that the original \$1.7 million fine should be put down to \$1 million. Why did PHMSA allow this? Nobody knows.

Though I've talked about San Bruno, I want to emphasize that the lack of adequate pipeline safety measures is a nationwide problem, not a Bay Area or California problem. In 2011, a leak from an 83-year-old cast-iron main in Allentown, Pennsylvania, caused a blast that killed 5 people. In 2012, a gas pipeline explosion outside of Charleston, West Virginia, destroyed several properties. In 2014, a leak in a 127-year-old pipeline in Harlem, New York, killed 8 and injured 50 more. In each incident, we see the same, recurring problems—aging infrastructure and inadequate inspection. How many more of these tragedies do we need before we get serious about pipeline safety?

The saddest part about this whole situation is that we know how to prevent pipeline leaks and explosions. The National Transportation Safety Board has been saying the same thing for years, after so many deaths and the destruction of property and the environment. We need automatic or remote control shutoff valves. We need existing pipelines to accommodate internal inspection tools. We need PHMSA to be a strong voice for safety for the public and we need industry to cease being apologists for lethal incompetence.

Like so many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, I'm tired of PHMSA's excuses and prevarications. I'm frustrated that Congress seems powerless to induce PHMSA to take its job seriously. That's why I'm looking into legislation that will provide PHMSA with the proper encouragement to do its job. It's time for the toothless kitten to wake up, smell the leaking gas, and take decisive action.

SAVE OUR WATER

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, California is now in the fourth year of the worst drought on record. Hydrologists estimate it is the worst drought in 1,200 years. The Sierra snowpack today is just 5 percent of normal. One of our largest reservoirs, the New Melones Reservoir on the Stanislaus River, is at just 22 percent of its capacity, with the rainy season now officially over.

Water rationing is in effect in many communities. Many Californians face \$500 fines if they take too long in the

shower or spill a gallon of water on their sidewalks. And yet in the last several weeks, the Bureau of Reclamation has released about 10 billion gallons of what precious little water remains behind the New Melones Dam in order to nudge a handful of steelhead trout toward the ocean. That is enough water to meet the annual residential needs of a human population of about 300,000 for the whole year.

How many fish are affected? Well, biologists estimate that it will affect the offspring of about 29 steelhead trout on the Stanislaus River, a few hundred smolts, almost all of which will be eaten by predators long before they reach the ocean; and that assumes that they won't swim toward the ocean on their own, as they have been doing without our helpful assistance since time immemorial.

Put in financial terms, with water selling for \$700 per acre-foot, the cost of this ridiculous exercise is about \$21 million. But the real cost will be felt in the fall if the rains don't return. At that point, these releases guarantee there will be no water left for human beings or for fish.

All this occurs after a compromise without which Lake Tulloch, below New Melones, would have been drained below the water intake pipes that serve a population of nearly 10,000 human beings.

When are we going to wake up to the lunacy of these current environmental laws and the ideological zealots who are administering them? Who in his right mind would dump enough water to meet the annual residential needs of a population of 300,000 human beings in order to nudge toward the ocean the offspring of maybe 29 steelhead trout—it could be as few as 6—in the worst drought in 12 centuries? Yet that is precisely the policy of this administration.

President Obama has authority under the existing Endangered Species Act to convene a process to suspend these laws during the drought. Governor Brown also has the authority to request the President to act, yet despite repeated calls to do so, neither has responded. Ironically, before we built these dams, in a drought like this, there would be no rivers and there would be no fish.

Nor is this waste limited to just one reservoir and one river. The Bureau of Reclamation is ordering pulse flows throughout the State, completely uncaring of the impact on the rapidly endangered species called homo sapiens.

Mr. Speaker, 3 weeks ago I introduced H.R. 1668, the Save Our Water Act. It simply provides that during an extreme drought the requirements of massive environmental pulse flows are suspended. I want to urge speedy consideration and passage of this act, but I fear it will not come in time to prevent the exhaustion of our remaining water supply.

I warned of this practice last year, and I appealed to State and Federal

water managers to suspend these water releases during the drought. Sadly, I was unable to rally much public interest, I think in large part because few people actually believed that our water policy could possibly be so foolish.

Well, they believe now. We are now reaching a crisis that can no longer be ignored, and Californians are now starting to realize that our environmental laws long ago passed from the realm of reason to the realm of ideological extremism.

Droughts are nature's fault. Water shortages are our fault. We once built dams to store water from wet years so that we would have it in dry ones, but the same radical environmental laws that are squandering our existing water supply have also obstructed the construction of any major new storage since 1979, while the State's population has nearly doubled.

Dr. Johnson once said that when a man is to be hanged in the morning, it concentrates his attention remarkably. Well, if any good comes out of this drought, it may be that the American people finally have awakened to the damage these laws have done and are ready to change them and change the zealots in government who are responsible for them.

□ 1030

AN UPDATE ON THE PUERTO RICO STATEHOOD ADMISSION PROCESS ACT

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

Mr. PIERLUISI. Mr. Speaker, for the sixth time this year, I rise to discuss Puerto Rico's political status.

I am an optimist about Puerto Rico's future. The island is blessed with natural beauty, a rich history, a vibrant culture, a sophisticated and diverse private sector, and talented and hard-working professionals who can compete with anyone, anywhere.

But my optimism is tempered by realism. Because to change the world for the better, you must first see the world as it is. And the reality is that Puerto Rico's potential is being squandered. Puerto Rico should be a blooming flower, but instead it is withering on the vine.

Puerto Rico is ensnared in the worst economic crisis in its history. The island's healthcare system is in a precarious state, the territory's homicide rate—despite recent improvements—still far exceeds that of any U.S. State, and residents of Puerto Rico are relocating to the States in record numbers.

I have heard it argued that leaders in Puerto Rico should concentrate solely on the immediate problems at hand and set aside the issue of political status until those problems are resolved or their severity is reduced. This argument has superficial appeal, but it is completely wrong. All of Puerto Rico's

major problems are directly linked to our status. They are rooted in the unequal treatment that Puerto Rico receives because it is a territory.

If you want to understand why Puerto Rico has always had higher unemployment and poverty than any State, you must recognize that the territory is excluded from the earned income tax program, partially excluded from the child tax credit program, excluded from the Supplemental Security Income program, and treated unequally under the Federal nutrition assistance program.

If you want to understand why Puerto Rico has high debt, you must realize that the territory government has borrowed so heavily in the bond market in order to compensate for its disparate treatment under Federal programs.

If you want to understand why patients in Puerto Rico received inadequate care, why physicians and hospitals are not fairly compensated, and why the cost of providing health care is disproportionately borne by the Puerto Rico Government rather than shared equitably with the Federal Government, you must grasp that Puerto Rico is treated in a discriminatory fashion under Medicaid, traditional Medicare, Medicare Advantage, and the Affordable Care Act.

If you want to understand why drug-related violence is pervasive in Puerto Rico, then you must come to terms with the fact that Federal law enforcement agencies have dedicated insufficient personnel and equipment to Puerto Rico because States invariably take priority over territories when it comes to the allocation of finite resources.

To solve its deeply entrenched problems and to reach its enormous potential, Puerto Rico must receive equal treatment. And to receive equal treatment, Puerto Rico must become a State. To pretend otherwise is just that: to pretend.

That is why less than 3 months ago I introduced H.R. 727, the most forceful statehood admission bill for Puerto Rico in history.

I am proud to report that the bill is likely to obtain its 100th cosponsor as early as today. Cosponsors come from 31 States, the District of Columbia, and the four other territories. They are both Democrats and Republicans. Indeed, about 1,900 bills have been introduced so far in this Congress, and H.R. 727 has more bipartisan support than over 99 percent of them.

Every Member who cosponsors this bill is standing up for a powerful principle, which is this: the people of Puerto Rico are American citizens who have enriched the life of this Nation for generations.

My constituents have fought—and many have died—for a flag that contains 50 stars, but no star that represents them. If they reaffirm their desire in a federally sponsored vote to become a full and equal member of the American family, they have earned the right to be first-class citizens.

SHEPHERD'S MEN

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

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, 13 men, 911 miles, and 1 week to make a difference.

A group of brave warriors known as the Shepherd's Men set out on a journey that will take them from the Freedom Tower in New York City to the Shepherd's Center in Atlanta, Georgia.

Every day, servicemen and -women from across our country return from the fields of combat only to fight another battle at home. While this battle may not include heavy artillery or enemy combatants, it is just as devastating.

Post-traumatic stress disorder, or PTSD, and traumatic brain injuries are disorders that take years—and sometimes a lifetime—to heal. These enemies invade the mind and cause unspeakable pain for those suffering and for their families.

For this reason, 13 brave men, whose mission is to raise awareness and funding for those with PTSD and traumatic brain injuries, have accepted the arduous task of running from the Big Apple to the Peach State.

With each step forward, the Shepherd's Men are one step closer to reaching their goal of raising \$250,000 for the Shepherd Center's SHARE Military Initiative, a comprehensive rehabilitation program that provides assistance and support for servicemen and -women who have sustained mild to moderate traumatic brain injury and PTSD from the conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan.

While the wounds may have been inflicted years ago, the scars still remain, and that is why the Shepherd's Men run 911 miles with 22-pound packs strapped to their chests.

These courageous men do not run for their own glory, but for their fellow servicemembers whose lives may be forever changed by the effects of these conditions.

Today, one out of five servicemembers returning home from Iraq or Afghanistan have been diagnosed with one of these debilitating conditions. If left unchecked, these injuries could be life threatening. As our servicemembers return home from Active Duty, it is important for them to know that they do not suffer alone.

This morning, the Shepherd's Men are a few steps closer to reaching their final destination. As the Sun rose gently against the backdrop of the Iwo Jima Memorial, the Shepherd's Men arrived in our Nation's Capital. It was here—at the place that memorialized one of the most historic moments in our history—where I joined the Shepherd's Men for a short 1-mile run out of their 911-mile journey.

As I stood in the shadow, Mr. Speaker, of the Iwo Jima Memorial, one of the Shepherd's Men following our run came up to me and said: When we go into combat, we know that we may not

come back out. And I lost many of my men in combat, and I can accept that, but what is hard is when these men survive combat, and they come back home and lose their life to these debilitating conditions. That is hard to swallow.

As a veteran of the United States Air Force, I am extremely grateful to the unwavering commitment the Shepherd's Men have shown to defend their fellow servicemen and ensure that they have the resources they need to begin their road to recovery.

Although the road may be long and fraught with setbacks, people across this Nation are going the extra mile to ensure our servicemembers are given the help they deserve.

To the Shepherd's Men, Godspeed on the rest of your journey, and thank you for your commitment to our Nation's military.

HONORING BISHOP WALTER SCOTT THOMAS, SR., AND HIS FORTY YEARS OF SERVICE TO GOD

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor, admiration, and respect that I take this time to honor one of this Nation's most distinguished citizens, Bishop Walter Scott Thomas, Sr., in recognition of his 40 years of service to God as a pastor, mentor, and community leader.

I am honored to rise today to share with my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives the accomplishments of this remarkable man.

For the last 40 years, Bishop Walter Scott Thomas, Sr., has faithfully served as the pastor of the New Psalmist Baptist Church located in the Seventh Congressional District in Baltimore, Maryland. Bishop Thomas is a Baltimore native who was called to proclaim God's Word to the world.

He received a bachelor's of science degree from the University of Maryland in economics, a master's of divinity degree from Howard University School of Religion, and a doctor of ministry degree from St. Mary's Seminary and the University of Baltimore.

In 1975, Bishop Thomas was called to pastor the New Psalmist Baptist Church. He is a devoted leader who cares about the needs of his congregation, the community, and the world.

Under his dynamic leadership over the last four decades, New Psalmist Baptist Church has grown to serve several thousand members. His vision and message of "empowering disciples" has inspired thousands to make a positive impact in their personal lives, communities, the State of Maryland, the country, and the world.

He is an influential leader who graciously uses his gifts to serve clergy and religious leaders. From 1999 to 2002, Bishop Thomas served as the president

of the Hampton University Ministers' Conference. He has coached and mentored pastors, church leaders, staff, and ministry teams all over the country.

On July 20, 2005, Bishop Thomas was elevated to the office of bishop and presiding prelate of the Kingdom Association of Covenant Pastors by ministers from across this great Nation.

Bishop Thomas has led multiple outreach initiatives to provide services and resources to the community. These initiatives include assisting economically disadvantaged families and homeless persons, providing employment assistance for job seekers, and partnering with school principals to provide school resources.

In 2013, Bishop Thomas and the New Psalmist Baptist Church donated \$40,000 to the Baltimore City North-western Police District to renovate the station entrance and lobby for our police officers and community members.

In addition to his leadership in the local community, Bishop Thomas has been a global leader, supporting projects to improve the quality of life for the world's underserved citizens. Bishop Thomas and New Psalmist Baptist Church support a school in Nairobi, Kenya, as well as clean water and sanitation projects in Africa.

Bishop Thomas has also been the guest of His Royal Highness Prince Philip, Duke of Edinburgh, and United Nations Secretary General Ban Ki-moon to represent the United States and the Christian faith in the Many Heavens, One Planet faith and conservation event in Windsor, England.

In 2009, Bishop Thomas had the honor of delivering the invocation during President Barack Obama's whistlestop tour at Baltimore's War Memorial Building. In 1998, Bishop Thomas hosted President William Jefferson Clinton at the New Psalmist Baptist Church.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, Bishop Thomas is a devoted husband, father, and friend. He is the loving husband to first lady Patricia Thomas and the proud father of three very successful children: Joi; Walter, Jr.; and Joshua.

Bishop Thomas is a source of wisdom and encouragement to his family and friends. Bishop Thomas is a great friend who has inspired me through his faithful leadership of his family and the New Psalmist Baptist Church.

I am honored that God allowed our lives to eclipse, and today I wish to thank him on behalf of Baltimore, Maryland, and indeed the Nation and the world for his dedication, commitment to God, his church, his family, and his community.

ACCESS TO INPATIENT REHABILITATION THERAPY ACT OF 2015

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I joined the

gentleman from North Carolina, Congressman G.K. BUTTERFIELD, to introduce H.R. 1906, the bipartisan Access to Inpatient Rehabilitation Therapy Act of 2015.

Coordinated medical rehabilitation provided in an inpatient setting is crucial to Medicare beneficiaries with injuries, disease, disabilities, or chronic conditions.

Unfortunately, beginning in 2010, the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services began placing limitations on what types of therapy a beneficiary could receive, despite the professional judgment of the treating physician.

Mr. Speaker, these limitations restrict recreational therapy from being prescribed, despite it being medically necessary in many cases.

The bipartisan Access to Inpatient Rehabilitation Therapy Act of 2015 that I have introduced with Congressman BUTTERFIELD will undo these unnecessary barriers imposed by CMS that place limitations on what types of therapy a beneficiary may receive.

□ 1045

This legislation will not cost the American taxpayer any money; will help facilitate access to the appropriate mix of services in an inpatient rehabilitation facility; and will benefit patients with brain injuries, spinal cord injuries, and those who have sustained strokes, amputations, individuals living with neurological disorders, and a wide range of other conditions.

Mr. Speaker, I stand here today and strongly urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to get behind this commonsense bipartisan legislation.

REAUTHORIZATION OF THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965 AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE REFORM

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the Speaker and acknowledge that 1965 is a very unique and special year. It is the commemoration of the march across the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma, Alabama, which symbolized to the world the cry and passion to have your voices heard through the vote.

I stand here today asking this body and its leadership to put on the floor of the House the reauthorization of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, a bill that was reauthorized in 2006, 2007, under the leadership of President George W. Bush and the Members of the United States Congress, in a bipartisan manner. The vote in the Senate was 98-0, and we had an equally impressive vote here in the United States House of Representatives.

The question would be why, a simple task of updating this legislation to ensure that thousands, maybe millions, are not denied the right to vote.

I start with that because the walk across the Edmund Pettus Bridge was particularly brutal, and I want to give

credit to all those who marched, many names that I know, our own colleague JOHN LEWIS, Hosea Williams, and many that we have met over the years in Selma. They marched and stood non-violently against violence and, might I say, under the auspices of the misinterpretation of the law, those law enforcement officers—misguided, of course—that stopped those individuals from expressing their rights.

Today, I come to match the need for the reauthorization of the Voting Rights Act to the enormous need, in a bipartisan manner, to reform our criminal justice system.

Over the news airwaves of the last 24 hours, right here in Washington, D.C., there was a statement about a young father who stood on his doorsteps in Fairfax, Virginia, that, finally, his two beautiful daughters had a settlement from that law enforcement department. He was shot on his doorsteps. The facts are such that I won't discuss today, but one can almost assume that that father did not need to lose his life.

Yesterday, the #marchtojustice, the Justice League of New York City, came to the west lawn to petition the government to end racial profiling and to begin to address the question of how do we have a criminal justice system that meets the equality and justice of America.

Sadly, just a few miles away, in Baltimore, we understand that a young man was picked up and, ultimately, went into a coma and died. What happened in the midst of the time where his spinal cord was nearly severed in the custody of law enforcement officers?

Let me be very clear. As a senior member of the Judiciary Committee, my commitment is that law enforcement officers go home to their families. In a few days, we will be honoring those who fell in the line of duty. We will be standing and respecting the fact that they provide a protection for this Nation and they serve us. We thank them for that.

But we must come to a point where we hold the Constitution dear and that citizens of the United States have the right to access and speech and protest and that protesters are not dangerous outsiders.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced two initiatives that I would ask my colleagues to join me on, initiatives that should draw bipartisan support. One is the Build TRUST legislation that simply indicates that there should be a process by which local jurisdictions use various citations and nuisance citations and stopping people on the street as a source of revenue, the same kind of issue that confronted Eric Garner—who, by the way, Mr. Speaker, was a large man who everybody knew, who was simply trying to support his family, maybe selling a few cigarettes.

No one has suggested that, dealing with the laws of New York, that that wasn't against the law. What we are saying is that Eric Garner did not need

to, in essence, lose his life, nor did Walter Scott in South Carolina, shot five times in the back because he ran.

We are legislators. We know the law. We understand that there is a framework for dealing with police officers, and we need to get there.

The Build TRUST bill says, however, that you cannot heavily burden a particular community, and you must report where all your revenue is coming from in terms of, if it is overly excessive, then you will lose Federal funds because we know that you are going into certain communities.

The other is the CADET Act, which I hope will draw bipartisan support. It does what South Carolina is doing. It codifies the collection of data of lethal force by law enforcement and citizens.

Mr. Speaker, it is time now to use the CADET bill for the science of criminal justice reform and the Build TRUST bill to rebuild trust and have police accountability.

I believe that this 50th year of Selma, Mr. Speaker, pushes us to reauthorize the Voting Rights Act and move toward a just criminal justice reform.

SEXUAL ASSAULT AWARENESS MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED) for 5 minutes.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize, again, April as Sexual Assault Awareness Month.

Mr. Speaker, we must stand up and raise awareness across this country that sexual assault and domestic violence can no longer be allowed to exist in our country. We must be proactive on raising awareness on this issue. That is why I come to this floor today to do just that.

Each Member—Democrat, Republican, East, West, North, South—has an opportunity, and I hope they join me to do this throughout April, to say “no more” to sexual assault in the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, every 2 minutes, another American is sexually assaulted, every 2 minutes. That is 237,868 victims—our fellow citizens—a year that are impacted by this heinous crime and assault and violence.

Now, Mr. Speaker, one of the other things that we need to do, on top of raising awareness, is change our culture in America. Earlier this month, a graphic video was shown across this Nation and across this world of a gang rape that took place in broad daylight on the beaches of Panama City, Florida. The victim was clearly incapacitated and was clearly assaulted by several men on that beach.

Mr. Speaker, those perpetrators should and will be held accountable. Justice will be done; but what culture exists in America to allow the hundreds of people that were standing nearby who witnessed this assault and did nothing? Bystanders need to under-

stand that, in America today, we stand up and say “no more” to this heinous crime.

Mr. Speaker, because this victim was unconscious and incapacitated, it would have been likely, absent this video, that this crime would have gone unreported. That is the norm in America. Sixty-eight percent of the assaults in the last 5 years were not reported. We need to change our culture, and we need to say “no more.”

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have been on this floor numerous times; and, as many of you have seen before, I have shared my personal story from our family situation with this issue. I will tell you, just as I said the first time I came here and shared that story with the Nation, I say it again: there are no excuses for sexual assault and domestic violence in America.

It is time for us to come together as a nation and say “no more” to sexual assault and domestic violence on our fellow citizens.

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

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

Reverend Boyd Thomas Tucker, Sisk Memorial Baptist Church, Fort Mill, South Carolina, offered the following prayer:

With praise and thanksgiving we bow before You, Father. We thank You for Your love and guidance in each person's life who serves in this room. Grant to the Members of this body wisdom to take up their duties today. James said, “If any man lack wisdom, it shall be given him.”

So we pray for wisdom and discernment in their decisions, understanding in their thinking, mercy in their judgments.

We know that without You, Your guidance, we can do nothing, but with You, we can do all things. May we not be frightened by the problems that confront us as a nation, but give thanks that You are with us in this hour.

May Your Word be a lamp unto our feet and a light unto our path. Guide us this day, I pray in my Lord and Savior's name, Jesus Christ.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's pro-

ceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. GUINTA) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. GUINTA 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 REVEREND BOYD THOMAS TUCKER

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. MULVANEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor and pleasure that I introduce to the Chamber today Reverend Tom Tucker. Tom is the senior pastor at Sisk Memorial Baptist Church in Fort Mill, which is just down the street from my house.

I was talking to Reverend Tucker beforehand, and he said he was called to ministry, Mr. Speaker, when he was 18, but he fought it until he was 30. I think it is a wonderful story.

He has been the president of the South Carolina Baptist Convention Pastors Conference; he is currently the first vice president of the South Carolina Baptist Convention; he is a featured devotional speaker for the Billy Graham Evangelistic Association; and he has ministered, literally, all over the world.

He is married to Brenda. They have two children who are here today, one of whom, Krystal, is married to Jared Ribble, the son of my good friend, Congressman REID RIBBLE from Wisconsin.

So it is an honor and a privilege to have, today, as our guest chaplain, Reverend Tom Tucker.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana). The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

NO SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBERS AND BENEFITS FOR ILLEGAL ALIENS

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, last summer's border crisis was the result of President Obama's 2012 decision to grant amnesty to some

illegal immigrants. And then last November, Obama granted amnesty to even more illegal immigrants—millions more. To make matters worse for American taxpayers, these illegal immigrants can now get work permits. This enables them to get Social Security numbers and government benefits.

Make no mistake; what Obama is doing is bilking hard-working American taxpayers. That is why I am reintroducing my bill, the No Social Security Numbers and Benefits for Illegal Aliens Act. America is a country of laws, not men. I am fully committed to stopping the President's illegal action.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to avoid improper references to the President.

COMMEMORATING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

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

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in solidarity with the Armenian community to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the events that led to the Armenian genocide.

One hundred years ago, on April 24, more than 300 Armenian leaders were taken from their homes, arrested, and systematically executed. They were the first massacred in a genocide that resulted in the deaths of 1½ million innocent men, women, and children.

The children, grandchildren, and younger descendants of the genocide's victims have worked hard to remember and honor those who suffered. I am proud to be a member of the Congressional Armenian Caucus and to cosponsor H. Res. 154, the Armenian Genocide Truth and Justice Resolution.

I praise the Armenian American community throughout Los Angeles County and elsewhere in California and the United States for making sure that the history of that tragic period is known and urging our government to officially recognize the genocide.

SUPPORT ELECTRIC COOPERATIVES

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, over 1.5 million rural South Carolinians receive their power through local electric cooperatives, who work to keep costs low and maintain high energy standards. Unfortunately, President Obama established new regulations for electric water heaters 5 years ago, destroying jobs. These regulations went into effect last week and have negatively impacted the cooperatives by limiting their ability to manage water heaters during peak time, making consumers pay for an inefficient use of resources.

I am grateful to support the Energy Efficiency Improvement Act of 2015.

This legislation reduces new regulations for grid-enabled water heaters, which benefit consumers by keeping costs low. Local businesses like the electric cooperatives are the backbone of America's economy, the forefront of new innovations, and are leaders in providing affordable, reliable energy, creating jobs for American families.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and may the President by his actions never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

SOLAR READY VETS PROGRAM

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Solar Ready Vets program, the recently announced Federal initiative to train veterans for jobs in the solar industry.

Solar power accounted for 32 percent of electricity-generating capacity that came online in the United States last year, creating 31,000 American jobs. The energy company, SolarCity, will soon open one of the largest solar panel manufacturing plants in the world in my home community of Buffalo, New York, creating 3,500 jobs in our region. The solar industry employs 174,000 Americans, a number that is quickly increasing. We should seize the opportunity to ensure that our veterans can participate in this growth.

The Solar Ready Vets program trains veterans for jobs in the solar industry at 10 military bases across the country. We are calling for the Niagara Falls Air Reserve Station to be one of those sites. This program creates jobs, fights climate change, and provides economic opportunity to returning veterans.

I call on Congress to support our veterans, support clean energy, and support American jobs by supporting the Solar Ready Vets program.

HONORING JEFF INGALLS

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

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Jeff Ingalls, a Granite Stater, American hero, and former prisoner of war. This week he is being rightfully recognized during the Prisoner of War Medal ceremony this Friday.

Master Chief Jeff Ingalls grew up in North Woodstock, New Hampshire, and enlisted in the United States Navy in July of 1978, where he served as a member of an elite unit of highly technical divers. Ingalls served in missions that were not only incredibly complex and challenging, but also extremely dangerous.

In June of 1985, Ingalls was aboard TWA flight 847 when it was hijacked by terrorists. The six-man detachment, including five U.S. Navy divers, was held in captivity by terrorists, during which time one bravely lost his life.

These six men showed bravery, courage, and dedication in the face of an enemy. We will never forget your sacrifices, your fight in the name of freedom and democracy.

American heroes like Jeff Ingalls are the reason our country remains the "land of the free and the home of the brave." For that we are forever grateful.

100 DAYS OF REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, last week the House Republicans marked 100 days of Republican control of both bodies of Congress: 100 days spent working for the wealthy special interests against the hard-working American families, 100 days where we saw our national security threatened when we came dangerously close to shutting down the Department of Homeland Security, 100 days where we saw Republicans vote to end the Medicare guarantee and turn it into a voucher program.

Now, today, we are seeing House Republicans attempt to undermine the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, an entity designed to protect American consumers, by taking what was a bipartisan bill that came out of committee with nearly unanimous support and using it as a vehicle through the Committee on Rules to slash funding for this important Federal program.

We had a bipartisan bill that could have been an important piece of legislation that we all could get behind, and it had to be used as a way to undermine this really important and essential government function of protecting the American consumer. We have just gone too far with this. We need to get back to doing the work that the American people sent us here to do.

PUTTING DECISIONMAKING BACK IN THE DISTRICTS

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, while we are all hard-working Americans dedicated to the freedom and future of our country, our districts and States are vastly different. House Republicans reject the notion that Washington knows best, and our policies reflect that. By putting power back into the hands of the States, we can ensure the decisions made best reflect the Americans we represent.

In the people's House, we understand this more than any other branch. We understand that a top-down approach to government is unrealistic and unfair. We hear the voices of those we represent. Parents don't need bureaucrats in Washington, D.C., to tell them where to send their children to school

or what doctor they should see. Our approach gives families the flexibility they need to make these essential decisions.

What works for one district may not for another, and we understand that. In the people's House, we are so proud of the individual districts we come from, like mine in the great State of North Carolina, and we are going to advance policies that let the people there thrive.

COMMEMORATING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

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

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in remembrance of the 1½ million victims of the Armenian genocide, which began 100 years ago on April 24. I join with the Armenian National Committee of the Merrimack Valley of Massachusetts and Armenian communities across the country and throughout the world in mourning those lost and honoring the survivors and their descendants as we recognize this centennial commemoration.

As a member of the Armenian Congressional Caucus, I strongly support H. Res. 154, the Armenian Genocide Resolution. The systematic, premeditated mass murder committed by the Ottoman Empire against the Armenians was genocide. Other countries have formally acknowledged dark and painful chapters in their past, and it is time for Turkey to do the same. The Armenians and the descendants of those who were victimized deserve justice.

On this somber anniversary, we have a responsibility to acknowledge the truth about this horrific event. It is a necessary step to building a more just future for all Armenians.

IRAN IS A TERRORIST STATE

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

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, as we meet today shortly after noon here, it is evening in the Persian Gulf. It is evening off the coast of Yemen. As we speak, Iran is supplying the rebels, the Houthi rebels, with weapons. Their ships are heading toward them.

Iran is, in fact, our enemy; and Iran is, in fact, in an active war to destabilize many of the Arab countries, as we speak. Iran is a terrorist state, but we are pretending it isn't. The Houthis have been determined by the United Nations to be stopped as rebels, and yet the *Theodore Roosevelt* is circling rather than, in fact, sinking that ship or stopping it.

We, America, are negotiating a nuclear deal that may or may not work—that remains to be seen—but we are negotiating with a terrorist state, a ter-

rorist state that will, I guarantee it, continue going forward to destabilize the region and cause American lives to continue to be lost.

This is the peril that we have. We have had it since 1979. If we do not stop Iran far beyond its nuclear ambitions, we, in fact, will lose American lives every day for the rest of my life.

□ 1215

CLIMATE SOLUTIONS ACT

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

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Speaker, in a modern society, all of us deal with a thousand issues, but there is only one issue that can kill humanity as a species, and that is climate change. Rising sea levels, more extreme weather events, and hotter temperatures are not partisan issues.

Last month, President Reagan's former Secretary of State George Shultz wrote a column in *The Washington Post* asking for action on climate change. Today, on Earth Day, I am introducing the Climate Solutions Act, which will tackle climate change by focusing on three areas: slashing carbon pollution, implementing bold renewable portfolio standards, and setting high energy efficiency standards.

In the future, our history books will write that America led the world on climate change and saved the planet—or there will be no more history books.

NUCLEAR NEGOTIATIONS WITH IRAN

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

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with great concern over the Obama administration's ongoing nuclear negotiations with Iran. I also rise in support of the efforts of our colleagues in the Senate to ensure that any agreement made with Iran has the consent of our constituents' elected officials here in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen, in regions across the world, the Obama administration's limited ability to enforce its international agreements and promote our country's interests. The recent horrific chemical weapon attacks in Syria, the growth of ISIS, and Moscow's continued dominance in Ukraine all call into question the strength and resolve needed by this administration to enforce an agreement with one of our Nation's most dangerous foes: Iran.

As these negotiations continue, I strongly urge my colleagues to carefully consider the ability of the administration to uphold and enforce the terms decided on with Iran and the impact that this will have on our security and the security of one of our Nation's closest allies: Israel.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this is a critical moment for our Nation and for

the world and for future generations. We must be determined to make sure that enemies do not get a hold of weapons that could destroy our friends and allies.

RIGHT-TO-WORK ZONES

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

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to commend the communities in my district that have rejected the Governor of Illinois' efforts to create so-called right-to-work zones.

Rather than lifting Illinois up to make life better for working families, the Governor's divisive plan would drag down all corners of the State into a race to the bottom. These zones are a gimmick to pit communities against each other, to deprive workers of their rights, and to weaken unions.

Rather than creating good-paying jobs for Illinois workers, these zones will depress wages across the State by incentivizing companies to move to whatever town offers them the possibility of paying lower wages and offering fewer benefits.

We shouldn't be asking hard-working men and women to work for poverty-level wages to make up for the fiscal deficit Illinois faces, a deficit which is caused, in large part, by laws that we pass right here on the floor of Congress that cause the citizens of Illinois to pay \$20 billion more each year in taxes than we get back in Federal spending.

Unions did not cause the problems that Illinois faces, and cutting workers' pay will not solve them. So I commend those in Naperville, Aurora Township, Oswego, and communities throughout Illinois fighting against this bad policy. I am proud to stand with you.

CONGRATULATING DUKE BASKETBALL

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

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as a proud graduate of Duke University's Graduate School, I rise today to honor the Duke men's basketball team and their coach, Mike Krzyzewski, who recently won the NCAA title.

The 2015 Duke men's basketball team was led by veteran senior guard Quinn Cook and freshman Chicagoan Jahlil Okafor, who was named ACC Player of the Year and was a unanimous All-American selection. Coach K led the team to a 35-4 record and the national title with a hard-fought victory over Wisconsin in the title game.

Coach K, a Polish American from Chicago, has won more men's college basketball games than any other coach in history—over 1,000, including 945 wins and five NCAA titles at Duke. And, as all college basketball fans

know, there is no place to see a game like Cameron.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today in recognizing the outstanding achievement of the 2015 Duke University men's basketball team and Coach Mike Krzyzewski on winning the 2015 NCAA Tournament championship.

DEBT-FREE COLLEGE

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

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, a college education should be accessible to all Americans.

Currently, 40 million Americans have student loans, with an average balance of \$29,000. This impacts our entire economy, as it prevents young people from buying homes, starting a family, and even buying a car.

Mr. Speaker, we provide a high school education for all students because we recognize the advantages for our children and our society of having a good education.

But a high school education is no longer enough if you want to get a good-paying job. A college education is necessary and essential in today's society in order to move ahead. It is an essential step to getting a good-paying job and joining the middle class.

Mr. Speaker, we are stacking the deck against our young people. The cost of higher education is through the roof, and student loans are weighing on our youth at one of the most vulnerable points in their lives.

Mr. Speaker, our parents and grandparents didn't have to take on this level of debt just to get an education. It is our responsibility to ensure that future generations have the same opportunities that our parents and grandparents had to access higher education without the burdensome student loan debt that we now carry.

VACCINATE YOUR CHILDREN

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, there was a story in today's Washington Post about the Salk vaccine being approved for usage in this country 50 years ago, on April 12, 1955. There was a picture of a second-grade student getting a shot as a test case in 1954. It brought back memories to me that I wanted to relate here.

My father was a physician. In 1954, he gave shots to second-grade children as part of the testing of the Salk vaccine. I had a brother in the second grade. My father gave him the shot that he gave all other second-graders.

I was in kindergarten. My father's mission was not to give shots beyond the second grade. So while the vaccine was in my home, he thought about giving it to me but didn't.

In the spring of 1954, I came down with polio. My father never forgave

himself for not giving me that vaccination. I have suffered for it ever since and will continue for the rest of my life.

I relate this story to tell the American people: Vaccinate your children. Don't listen to the hysteria. Science has given us ways to stop children from getting diseases that have threatened society for generations. Do vaccinate. It is safe.

ANNIVERSARY OF ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in solemn recognition of the 100-year anniversary of the genocide of over 1 million Armenians at the hands of the Ottoman Turks.

The Armenian genocide began April 24, 1915, when 250 Armenian intellectuals and community leaders were arrested. By 1918, between 800,000 and 1.5 million Armenians had disappeared, been killed through massacres, or subjected to forced labor and death marches in the desert.

The Armenian genocide joins other great human tragedies of the 20th century, including the Holocaust perpetrated by Nazi Germany against Jews, Gypsies, homosexuals, Christians, and political opponents; the massacre of the Tutsis in the Rwandan genocide; the Khmer Rouge; and Joseph Stalin's mass murders.

I rise today to remember those whose lives perished in the Armenian genocide and to recognize the Armenian Americans in their ongoing quest to ensure that those who perished are remembered for their loss of life in one of the most tragic genocides of the 20th century.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1560, PROTECTING CYBER NETWORKS ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1731, NATIONAL CYBERSECURITY PROTECTION ADVANCEMENT ACT OF 2015

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 212 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 212

Resolved, That at any time after 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. 1560) to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, 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. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part A of 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 committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. At any time after 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. 1731) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to enhance multi-directional sharing of information related to cybersecurity risks and strengthen privacy and civil liberties protections, 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 amendments specified in this section and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Homeland Security. 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 Committee on Homeland Security 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 114-12. 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 part B of 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.

SEC. 3. (a) In the engrossment of H.R. 1560 the Clerk shall—

(1) add the text of H.R. 1731, as passed by the House, as new matter at the end of H.R. 1560;

(2) conform the title of H.R. 1560 to reflect the addition of H.R. 1731, as passed by the House, to the engrossment;

(3) assign appropriate designations to provisions within the engrossment; and

(4) conform cross-references and provisions for short titles within the engrossment.

(b) Upon the addition of the text of H.R. 1731, as passed by the House, to the engrossment of H.R. 1560, H.R. 1731 shall be laid on the table.

□ 1230

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) is recognized for 1 hour.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on H. Res. 212, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring this rule forward on behalf of the Rules Committee. It is a rule that respects the legislative process and reflects the responsibility of Congress to address a critical deficit in the infrastructure of our Nation.

This rule provides for consideration of both cybersecurity measures under a structured amendment process. As a result of a thorough and deliberative committee hearing yesterday evening, there are five amendments to H.R. 1560 and 11 amendments to H.R. 1731 that this body will have the opportunity to debate and ultimately vote for or against.

The bipartisan nature of these bills speaks to the critical need for this legislation. Both bills passed their respective committees with bipartisan support, and I am hopeful this rule will enjoy similar overwhelming support.

For each bill, amendments offered by Democrats exceeded those offered by

Republicans. I would like to thank Chairman NUNES and also Chairman MCCAUL for their work, both within our conference and across the aisle, to ultimately bring forward two bills that reflect compromise, consistency, and a deep understanding of the dangers that cyber attacks pose every day.

If both bills are adopted, this rule combines the bills and sends them to the Senate as a package in an effort to work with the other Chamber, go to conference, and to produce a product that will be signed into law. This is a fair rule that respects this body, the importance of this issue, and the legislative process as a whole.

The world has changed greatly since this body last discussed cybersecurity. The “Internet of Things” has created unforeseen risks and exposed vulnerabilities and defects in the ability of companies to even simply talk to each other without fear of frivolous litigation.

Our enemy is adapting, growing bolder and more sophisticated. North Korea, Iran, Russia, and China seek to exploit and devastate our economic security as a nation and our data security as individuals through cyber attacks that we cannot adequately anticipate, respond, or even communicate about.

Foreign governments aren’t the only ones who wish to do Americans harm. Terrorists and criminal enterprises have also recognized that American companies are crippled by the ambiguity in our law as it relates to sharing cyber threat information.

The cyber attack surface has expanded. Wearables, connected vehicles, and embedded devices have made it possible for cyber attacks to literally be driven into the parking lot or walked through doors.

The traditional ways of responding to cyber threats and recovering from them are not sufficient to safeguard the data privacy of Americans and the economic security of our Nation. The scope of these attacks and devastating damages are increasing as rapidly as the attackers are themselves.

These bills are not a magic pill. They will not render inoperable the scores of foreign countries and enterprises that want to see American exceptionalism brought to its knees; but they do give clear, positive legal authority to American companies to allow them to protect their own and to appropriately share cyber threats with other countries and, in certain cases, Federal agencies.

Let me be clear. These are not surveillance bills. These are not data collection bills. This is not the PATRIOT Act or FISA. This body will debate intelligence gathering, collecting, sharing, and using at some point in the future, but today is not that day.

I know those rightly concerned with government surveillance, like myself, would like to use this rule for that purpose and the underlying measures as a platform to debate that, but I urge

them to refrain. We will have that debate.

Today’s focus is on the perpetrating of the thousands of cyber threats American businesses face every single day. Let the attention be on North Korea. Let it be on Iran. Let it be on the countless enemies of the United States who want to destroy this Nation. For today, we speak with a united voice that they will fail.

We declare with one voice that American companies have the right to protect their own, to protect and defend their own networks, to share technical information with the appropriate agencies on a voluntary basis if they so choose.

I thank the Intelligence and Homeland Security Committees and their staff for their tireless work they have done to ensure that we can protect our economy, our infrastructure, and our private information.

I know detractors of the legislation may attempt to paint this rule and underlying measures in a different light, so let’s allow the facts to speak for themselves.

These bills have three key components. First, they provide for completely voluntary participation by private companies in a program with positive legal authority. This program allows three kinds of sharing—private company to private company, government to private company, and private company to government—but this sharing of information is limited only to cyber threat indicators.

Second, they require the removal of all unrelated personal information. It is the technical cyber threat information that is being shared, zeros and ones. In fact, there is a requirement that both the government and the private entity remove personally identifiable information when the information is shared and also when it is received.

Third, the legislation expressly prohibits the cyber threat indicators from being used for surveillance.

These bills will benefit all Americans by helping businesses better protect sensitive information. Attacks against our network often seek to steal Americans’ personal information. This can include credit and debit card information, medical records, or even Social Security numbers.

Many of the recent attacks that we have all read about in the news were specifically aimed at stealing the personal information of Americans. Cyber attackers are also increasingly targeting small businesses. In fact, in 2014, 60 percent of all targeted attacks struck at small- and medium-sized businesses.

The underlying legislation will also help protect American jobs by protecting the intellectual property of American businesses. It is estimated that cyber attacks cost Americans roughly 500,000 jobs a year. Foreign companies often use cyber attacks to target the trade secrets of U.S. companies and then use the information to produce their own competing product.

The threat is real, both to our economic security as a nation and our personal information as individuals. If we fail to act and pass this rule and the underlying bills, our Nation and our personal privacy is more at risk than ever before.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and the underlying legislation.

Today, the House is convening to debate a matter that we all agree is critical for our national security, our economic competitiveness, our prosperity, and the success of our private sector.

The recent cyber attacks on Sony and Anthem are but two prominent examples of cases in which American businesses or government entities have come under attack by hackers, among many other instances that haven't even been reported.

I want to recognize the work that the House Intelligence and Homeland Security Committees did on these pieces of legislation and their attempts to address these issues. Unfortunately, in spite of their hard work and the work of those that went into crafting these two bills, I regret that they fall short of their goals and would likely do more harm than good.

Not only do both bills, particularly the Protecting Cyber Networks Act, raise enormous concerns about inappropriate sharing of personal information and surveillance on Americans' private lives, but they are built on the premise that many security experts have warned is fundamentally flawed, that sharing information with the Federal Government should be the central focus of our efforts to protect American cyber networks, rather than simply one aspect to a multipronged strategy to defeat hackers, foreign and domestic.

Now, before I address the substance of these two bills, I want to discuss this unusual rule before us and how it treats two bills which contradict each other in significant ways.

Ordinarily, when two committees share jurisdiction over a matter—in this case, the Homeland Security Committee and the Intelligence Committee—they collaborate. One committee handles one portion of the bill, reports it out; the other committee handles the other portion, reports it out, and they work together to bring a single piece of legislation to the floor for Members to debate, amend, and vote for or against.

This is what happened, for example, with the recent SGR repeal legislation, which had components under the jurisdiction of no less than six different committees in this body, but was presented before us as a single bill.

In this case, however, because there seems to be some kind of turf war be-

tween the Intelligence Committee and the Homeland Security Committee, we are actually voting on two overlapping bills that, in several respects, contradict one another.

For instance, the bills have drastically different determinations of what kind of information may be shared, what purposes the government may use the information for, and what hacking countermeasures companies are allowed to take to protect their networks.

Instead of having a meaningful debate on the merits of each bill's approach, this body, if this rule passes, would forego that, and we would simply debate and vote on each bill separately, and if they both pass, the rule directs the Clerk to mesh them together through something called conforming amendments.

Not only would this leave businesses to wade their way through two separate, contradictory regulatory schemes, but it leaves it unclear which bill's provisions would actually prevail in practice and under which circumstances. It actually would create more uncertainty in the marketplace, rather than less.

I don't think anybody could reasonably call this an open process. We shouldn't be depriving our constituents of an open debate on important issues. The major amendments of this bill that would have restored privacy, many of which I was a cosponsor, are not even allowed to be debated on the floor of the House, not for 10 minutes, not for 5 minutes, not even for 1 minute.

My colleagues and I on both sides of the aisle are being denied a vote on the very amendments that we feel could address the concerns we have with the cybersecurity legislation and make sure that we keep American networks safe.

Mr. Speaker, in the 2 years since the NSA's shockingly broad data collection program PRISM came to light, we have heard from many of our constituents. The American people want an end to unwarranted surveillance. They want Congress to restore desperately needed accountability and transparency to our Nation's often out-of-control intelligence-gathering apparatus.

It is bewildering to many people that, at the very time the American people have spoken out that we want more safeguards, instead, we are bringing forward two bills whose central objective is to facilitate the flow of more personal information to the Federal Government, when we continue to put off the question of surveillance reform and bringing an end to the NSA's bulk data collection without warrants.

It is especially disappointing in light of the fact that several PATRIOT Act provisions will sunset at the end of next month, giving Congress a crucial opportunity to reexamine and rein in Federal surveillance programs.

By putting off that issue and bringing mass information sharing to the floor, Congress is asking the American

people for a blank check. Congress is saying: Trust the President. No President would allow this information sharing to infringe on your civil liberties, even though we have utterly failed to pass a single piece of legislation to end the privacy abuses that we know have occurred under this administration and the prior administration.

The problem with these bills is that they go far beyond, and they open up additional loopholes and potential abuses with regard to privacy abuses, particularly H.R. 1560, the so-called Protecting Cyber Networks Act. Both bills open up Americans' private information to inappropriate scrutiny by the Federal Government.

Now, I expect we will hear proponents of both bills argue at length that the protections against sharing personal information are sufficiently robust.

For instance, under both bills, they will cite that cyber threat data is scrubbed twice for personal information, once by private entities before they transmit it to the government and once by government entities before they store the information or share it with anybody else.

Now, that sounds good, but, unfortunately, the devil is in the details, and a close reading of the bill shows that there is an enormous loophole in the information-scrubbing component and that it fails to offer Americans safeguards for the personal information.

□ 1245

Under both bills, any Federal entity in receipt of cyber data threat information may store and share personal information it receives—unscrubbed information—if they believe that it is related to a cybersecurity threat.

Now, this standard isn't too vague, considering that information "related" to a cybersecurity threat could be interpreted to mean just about anything, but it is also incredibly broad. It includes an implicit assumption that Americans' personal information should be shared, unless Federal officials have information that it is not related to a cybersecurity threat. In many cases, the burden is to show that the personal information is not related to a cybersecurity threat for it to be scrubbed, rather than the other way around.

So, yes, companies and Federal entities are required to scrub the data for information that can be used to identify a specific person. But the loophole then calls on them not to remove any personally identifiable information unless they can show that it is not related to cybersecurity. Even if there is an off chance that something at some point might be pertinent to some kind of investigation, it puts Americans' personal information—without warrants, without due process, including information about patterns of Internet use, location, content of online communications—at great risk.

We have seen before that the Federal Government has a poor track record of

safeguarding our personal information when they are entrusted with it. The last thing we should be doing is empowering Federal agencies even more with a broad discretion to look at personal information unless there is clear evidence that doing so would combat a cybersecurity threat.

I introduced, along with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, a number of amendments to both bills—one with the gentlewoman from California, Representative ZOE LOFGREN, and one with Representative ZOE LOFGREN and the gentleman from Michigan, Representative JUSTIN AMASH—to impose a higher standard on Federal entities who are entrusted with this personal information. Our proposal would simply require the Federal Government to remove personally identifiable information unless it is directly necessary to identify or mitigate a cybersecurity threat—the purported purpose of this bill.

These amendments would have imposed no additional burdens on private companies, but they would have given our Nation's technology companies and the customers who keep them globally competitive more confidence that private information shared under these bills would not be subjected to inappropriate mass scrutiny by the government.

Sadly, our amendments met the same fate as nearly two dozen others put forth to add in important privacy safeguards.

The potential for abuse of private information under H.R. 1560 is even more far-reaching. The Homeland Security bill at least makes clear that the information companies transmit to DHS should be shared specifically with other agencies that need it to protect critical infrastructure. But the circumstances under which information can be shared under the Intelligence bill—and who it can be shared with—are fuzziest and broader.

Under the approach taken by H.R. 1560, every cyber threat indicator shared with a civilian agency of the Federal Government is immediately shared with a host of other government agencies, including the NSA. This increases the threat to cybersecurity by having repositories of information replicated across numerous government agencies, creating additional avenues for attack by malicious hackers. That means that private sector companies will not be able to participate in the program and promise their users they will not share information with NSA or other government agencies unless required by law.

Furthermore, it is true that the Homeland Security bill includes some troubling provisions that allow the government to use cybersecurity threat information for criminal investigations unrelated to cybersecurity. Fortunately, the Rules Committee made in order an amendment by Representatives JOHN KATKO, ZOE LOFGREN, and ANNA ESHOO that would ad-

dress this problem in the Homeland Security bill. I hope that my colleagues adopt this amendment.

Unfortunately, no such amendment is being considered to address this issue within the Intelligence bill, H.R. 1560, where the problem actually runs much deeper. H.R. 1560 permits cyber threat data, including Americans' private information, that is shared with the Federal Government to be stored and used for a raft of unrelated purposes, unconstrained by congressional directive, including investigations and potential prosecution of crimes completely unrelated to cybersecurity.

Obviously, all of us want law enforcement agencies to be equipped to prevent and prosecute violent crime, but the inclusion of these matters completely unrelated to cybersecurity broadens the scope of the measure far beyond what it is purported to be: a cybersecurity bill. In fact, it reduces the focus of our efforts on combating cybersecurity when you open it up to everything under the sun.

By including a vast array of other reasons the government can invoke to store and share personal information, the authors of the bill essentially transformed the information-sharing initiative into a broad new surveillance program.

Yes. Rather than a cybersecurity measure, effectively, these bills are a stalking horse for broad new surveillance authority by multiple agencies of the Federal Government without warrants, without oversight.

H.R. 1560 empowers Federal entities to hold onto any information about an individual that may be "related to" any of the many law enforcement purposes lumped into the bill. That gives the Federal Government enormous incentive to retain and scrutinize personal information, even if it is unrelated to a cybersecurity threat.

The scope of the use authorizations also undermines due process protections that exist to protect Americans against unwarranted search and seizure. Private information about a person that was transmitted warrantlessly to the NSA under a program that was purportedly designed to combat hackers should not be admissible or used in court against them on an unrelated offense—not related to cybersecurity, not related to hacking. It would render all of our due process protections invalid simply because of the medium of the information that is used with regard to these matters in this case: Internet and cyber-related mediums and communications through them.

I joined Representatives ZOE LOFGREN, DARRELL ISSA, and BLAKE FARENTHOLD on an amendment to make clear that information sharing may only be used for the purpose of mitigating cybersecurity threats, again, the purported purpose of this bill. If the proponents of this bill are serious about combating cybersecurity, why did the Rules Committee deny Members the opportunity to limit the

provisions of this bill to cybersecurity rather than a whole host of unrelated offenses?

I also joined the gentleman from Kansas, Representative KEVIN YODER, to sponsor an amendment to address a longstanding due process issue that has plagued our Nation's legal system and our privacy rights.

While the government is required to get a warrant if it wants to search through a person's physical mail, it is not required to get a warrant to search through somebody's old emails, provided the emails are older than 6 months. That contradiction and loophole was based on a 1986 law that was written before most people knew what email was.

Representative YODER and I sponsor a bipartisan bill that has 261 cosponsors, and yet when we offered a provision on this bill, we were not given a chance to vote on it and pass it in spite of the grave due process implications that the underlying legislation has.

In addition to these privacy and due process concerns, I am alarmed by the prospect that H.R. 1560 will actually invite attempts by both private and public entities to deliberately weaken the integrity of software systems in the name of cybersecurity.

H.R. 1560, for instance, authorizes companies to deploy countermeasures that are called defensive measures in the form of hack backs that would otherwise be illegal. A countermeasure operated on one network should never cause harm to another that is prohibited by the Federal antihacking statute, the Computer Fraud and Abuse Act. But that is precisely what can happen when a company places malware on its own network, because if that data gets stolen along with other valuable data, it can harm or lead to unauthorized or backdoor access of other proprietary networks or information.

The gentleman from Virginia, Representative GERRY CONNOLLY, put forward two amendments to address this issue in a very thoughtful manner. Regrettably, neither one will be allowed to be debated or receive a vote on the floor of the House unless we can defeat this rule.

Furthermore, both bills present the risk that Federal entities will use the threat information they receive from private companies to circumvent the security protections safeguarding those same private companies' information systems, effectively creating their own back doors which could later be exploited by malicious hackers.

As a matter of routine, our intelligence apparatus already demands that private companies include defects in their encryption system for the purported purpose of conducting backdoor surveillance. Today's legislation only makes it easier for the NSA to find and exploit more of these back doors and, therefore, easier—not harder—for hackers to find and exploit these very same security weaknesses.

Once again, Representative LOFGREN put forward an amendment that would actually improve cybersecurity by making it clear that Federal entities could not use data obtained through information sharing to demand that private entities create new encryption weaknesses to enable backdoor hacking. Sadly, once again, her amendment will not be heard on the floor of the House, and this bill will encourage and allow additional venues for the illicit hacking it purports to combat.

Mr. Speaker, I don't doubt the intentions and the goals of my colleagues on the Intelligence and Homeland Security Committees, but these bills simply represent a step backwards rather than a step forward, present risks on too many fronts, from privacy, to due process, to the threats that they add to the integrity of the very networks that these bills are designed to safeguard.

In addition, the bills' focus on information sharing negates an important conversation about more important mechanisms Congress should be looking at to protect cyber systems, mechanisms that are not as fraught with risks to our civil liberties and are more effective at protecting our networks. We should be doing more, for instance, to educate businesses and governments about basic network security.

Even here in Congress, we have seen evidence of how woefully lacking even elementary knowledge about cyber threats is. Helping businesses prevent cyber attacks doesn't have to mean that the government vacuums up endless amounts of personal data about how individual Americans are using the Internet and their personal communications.

In fact, if we stop allowing the NSA to demand that U.S. businesses deliberately weaken their own networks for the purpose of government surveillance, that, in itself, would be a big step forward to strengthening our national cybersecurity.

Sadly, today's rule doesn't even allow for a debate or for a vote on the most significant concerns surrounding this legislation and denies Members the opportunity to consider changes that would address the issues that we have raised and improve cybersecurity under this bill. For these reasons, I hope my colleagues join me in opposing the rule and the underlying legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, again, I want to focus this debate. There are many things my friend from Colorado brought up that will be debated, that are coming up, I think, as early, frankly, as tomorrow in some committees and will be debated on this floor. This is about sharing. This is about information protection.

And with that, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. KING), who is a member of both the Homeland Security and the Intelligence Committees. He is the chairman of the Homeland Subcommittee on Counterterror-

ism, and he is also the former chairman of the full committee.

Mr. KING of New York. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule and also of the underlying bills, H.R. 1731 and H.R. 1560.

As was pointed out, I am the only Member of Congress who is on the Homeland Security Committee and the Intelligence Committee; and I was able to both take part and also to observe closely the extent to which the gentleman from Texas, Chairman MCCAUL, and the gentleman from California, Chairman NUNES, worked with Members on both sides of the aisle, worked with privacy groups, worked with Federal officials, government officials, and administration officials to try to make this as bipartisan a bill as possible, to ensure that privacy would be protected, but also to ensure that everything possible can be done to protect our Nation against cyber intrusions.

Now, every day there are attacks upon our infrastructure. The critical infrastructure—mostly in private hands—is being targeted; and Federal networks, databases that are vital to our national security, are under assault every second of every day.

Cyberterrorism, whether it is carried out by a nation-state, such as Iran or Russia or China, or carried out by terrorist organizations, such as ISIS or al Qaeda, is extremely damaging and threatening to our national security; and it is essential that we, especially since so much of our critical infrastructure is in the hands of the private sector, allow for sharing, that we allow companies to share information with the government, that there is mutual sharing with the government, with the private sector, so that these companies can do it without fear of being sued, without fear of liability—they act in good faith; they do what has to be done.

Every measure that was put in there—I know the gentleman from Colorado disagrees, but every measure is in there to ensure that individual rights will not be violated, that privacy will not be violated. And again, we have to look at, for instance, if the gentleman from Colorado is wrong, what this could mean to our country, how this could devastate—devastate—our infrastructure, devastate our national security, devastate our financial system.

So again, this was not something that was rushed into. And when you have both bills passing out of committee with, as far as I recall, not one dissenting vote—not that everyone was in full agreement with the bills. But the fact is this is probably as close to a consensus as you can come in the Halls of Congress on such a critical and, in some ways, such a controversial issue, to find that type of unanimity on the two committees that deal with this most significantly.

□ 1300

H.R. 1731 is the Homeland Security Committee bill that allows this infor-

mation to be shared. The port will be the Department of Homeland Security, and that was done, again, working with privacy groups and working with those who are concerned with civil liberties, at the same time working with those who realize how absolutely essential to our security passage of this legislation is and how we have to have this type of cooperation, this type of sharing, this information sharing, and being done with the government and with the private sector working together to combat these enemies which can come at us from all directions. Again, every second of every day these attacks are being attempted and carried out.

That is the crisis that faces us as a nation. It is not as obvious as a bomb going off in Times Square, and it is not as obvious as a bomb going off at the Boston Marathon, but it is just as critical.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. KING of New York. It is just as critical and just as vital, in some ways more so, in that the ultimate result could be so devastating to our Nation.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would ask, again, passage of the rule, which I believe is obviously essential, but also passage of the underlying bills because, again, our Congress has been criticized, with some validity, for not being able to work together and for not being able to get things done. But to have such a vital, controversial issue as this, to have both committees who deal with it most closely, to have them come together, all the effort and work that went into it, to have them come together to come up with this package of legislation, this shows Congress works. It shows we take this issue seriously, and it means we are going to go forward in all we can to combat terrorism in all its forms. Right now, probably the most lethal are the cybersecurity attacks being made on us.

Mr. Speaker, I urge strong support of the rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would just add that demanding that private companies deliberately include defects in their own encryption systems for the purpose of allowing the NSA to conduct backdoor surveillance only increases the risk of our cybersecurity networks rather than decreases it, which is exactly what the bill does.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON), the ranking member of the Committee on Homeland Security.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, though I support H.R. 1731, the National Cybersecurity Protection Advancement Act, as approved by voice vote in my committee, I rise to express my disappointment with the rule.

Yesterday the White House announced support for House passage of H.R. 1731 but said that “improvements to the bill are needed to ensure that its liability protections are appropriately targeted to encourage responsible cybersecurity practices.” The White House was referring to the language that was inserted at the direction of the Judiciary majority.

Instead of providing a targeted safe harbor for companies to share timely cyber threat information, it establishes an unduly complicated legal framework that runs the risk of providing liability relief to companies that act negligently. Moreover, it explicitly immunizes companies from not acting on timely cyber information. This language runs counter to the fundamental goal of the legislation: to get companies timely, actionable information to use to protect their networks.

Yet when H.R. 1731 is considered tomorrow, Members will not be allowed to vote on a single amendment to fix the liability provision that the White House has called “sweeping” and said may weaken cybersecurity overall. Remarkably, none of the seven amendments that were filed to fix it are being allowed.

I would also like to register my disappointment that the rule calls for H.R. 1731, upon passage, to be attached to the Intelligence Committee bill. From my conversation with Members, I know that there is a great deal of support for authorizing cyber information sharing with the Federal civilian lead, the Department of Homeland Security. As such, I would argue that the rule should have called for H.R. 1560 to be folded into our bill.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. At this point, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA), the chairman of the Judiciary Committee’s Subcommittee on Courts, Intellectual Property, and the Internet.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I will be supporting the rule, but not without trepidation. I will be opposing the underlying bill, but not without regret. The underlying bill could have done what we wanted it to do. It could have allowed for the exchange of information while protecting individuals’ privacy. It could have limited that information to preventing a cyberterrorist attack. But, in fact, amendments that were offered on a bipartisan basis, a number of them, that could have limited this would have, in fact, allowed us to have the confidence that this information would be used only for what it was intended.

Mr. Speaker, since 9/11, the government has begun to know more and more about what we are doing, who we are, where we live, where we sleep, whom we love, whom we do business with, and where we travel. And we have known less and less. Just a few days ago, the Ninth Circuit in northern California had to rule that the government

had to turn over information in a usable format. It took a Federal court order to do so.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. ISSA. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, this bill should mandate our knowing more and the government not knowing. It should have ensured that the government only had what it needed. It should have protected private companies who wanted to exchange appropriate information between each other. It should not have created a vast treasure trove here in Washington or somewhere in the hinterland where the government now and in the future can dig in for any purpose—criminal background investigations or perhaps simply checking to see if you paid your taxes. The fact is, this is a data vault that is not narrowly construed, and, therefore, sadly, without the amendments that were not allowed, I am not in a position to vote for this bill. I thank the chairman, and I thank Mr. POLIS for his kind remarks also.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, we will offer an amendment to the rule that will allow the House to consider the Department of Veterans Affairs Cybersecurity Protection Act.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. KIRKPATRICK) to discuss our proposal.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for giving me a couple of minutes to talk about the importance of protecting our veterans from cyber attack.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1128, the Department of Veterans Affairs Cyber Security Protection Act. My bill will protect veterans’ personal and sensitive information from cyber attacks without compromising the VA’s ability to provide the health care, benefits, and services our veterans have earned.

This legislation will do primarily three things. First, it will require the VA to develop an information security strategic plan that protects current veterans’ information and anticipates future cybersecurity threats. Second, it mandates a report on VA actions to hold employees accountable for data breaches. Third, it requires the VA to propose a reorganization of the VA’s information-security infrastructure to protect veterans and provide greater levels of accountability and responsibility in the VA.

My bill will also require the VA to report employee violations of its policy and report any incidents involving the compromise of veterans’ personal information by the VA or from outside cyber attacks.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is one common-sense way that we can hold the VA accountable and protect veterans’ private and personal information from cyber

threats, and I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 1128.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER), a member of the Homeland Security Committee and a colleague of mine from Georgia.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, national cybersecurity will be an issue this House will have to constantly address for the foreseeable future. To achieve a system that will protect our Nation’s citizens and its infrastructure, we must create a public-private partnership between Federal agencies and American businesses. This partnership will allow Federal agencies and American businesses to share cyber threat information, vulnerabilities within our cyber network, and the creation of new systems to protect consumer information. However, private businesses need to be provided protections and incentives to ensure they are protected from government abuse and private legal proceedings meant to gain access to private security information.

Mr. Speaker, one of our top priorities with these two bills should be to clearly acknowledge protections given to companies that engage in penetration testing and clearly state that company proprietary information is protected from nefarious legal proceedings and exempted from Freedom of Information Act requests. It is reasonable to think that individuals would actively pursue this sort of proprietary information for the sole purpose of accessing the vulnerabilities of private cyber networks if we do not clearly state that this information is protected and exempt from those actions.

I believe we should consider these possibilities and ensure that protections are provided so our country and its citizens can fully benefit from these laws.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I want to thank my colleague from Georgia who sits on the Homeland Security Committee for his passion and his commitment to addressing these critical defects in the laws governing this voluntary sharing of cyber threat information. The legislation before us today is good policy reflective of the hard work of the committees on which you sit, Homeland Security and the Intelligence Committee, as well as input from a vast array of stakeholders. It is important to know that the legislation is supported by every sector of the economy.

As my friend so eloquently noted, the legislative process will rightly continue after these bills are considered by the full House this week and for years to come as we revisit and reassess the needs of Americans’ privacy and also the laws governing cybersecurity.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with my friend that if there is a conference committee on this bill, we should encourage them to seek additional clarification language as needed to ensure that companies are appropriately incentivized to share cyber threat information.

I just want to say personally that I appreciate all the hard work that you have done on this issue bringing this forward and continuing to work for not only the companies in Georgia but across this Nation who depend on a safe and secure cyber network.

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

Mr. Speaker, it is ironic that on this very day, leaders on the Judiciary Committee will introduce legislation designed to reform and rein in the Federal Government's surveillance programs. I haven't had the opportunity to review those bills yet, so I can't speak to their merits. But I hope that if it is a strong bill, it will make its way through both Chambers and become law.

But, today, this body is considering a rule that would take us in the wrong direction. Recent history has shown that this body shares the American people's concerns that we don't take the threat of unwarranted surveillance seriously enough and that Congress needs to pass meaningful reforms that balance our liberties, our freedoms, and our privacy with the need to keep America safe.

Senate Majority Leader MITCH MCCONNELL introduced legislation yesterday that would extend the NSA's surveillance program without any of the reforms that many of us on both sides of the aisle have advocated to rein them in. This is despite the national outcry and, indeed, international embarrassment that has been counterproductive to the very American security goals that these provisions are designed to advance.

This makes me fear that Congress is not learning from the mistakes of the past, mistakes of overly broad surveillance authorities, but instead is about to repeat them. So before we approve faster, broader, and easier sharing of vast amounts of personal information from innocent Americans with the Federal Government, Congress should be taking up legislation to prove that we have the ability to curb abuse and the Federal Government's penchant for abusing its access to this kind of data.

So far Congress has not shown its aptitude for preventing this kind of abuse. Yet today we ask the American people to trust us, to trust the President, yet again, by opening up even more information to the NSA and other surveillance agencies.

Our experience with the NSA has shown us that to protect American civil liberties from an overzealous surveillance apparatus, the authorities to review and share Americans' personal information need to be construed as narrowly, as unambiguously, and as specifically as possible by the United

States Congress. We need to limit very specifically to a specific set of circumstances under which sharing data and information is necessary for mitigating a security threat.

We offered to do that through bipartisan amendments, working with Representative LOFGREN, Representative ISSA, and others, but none of those amendments are allowed to be discussed or debated under this rule.

Both the Protecting Cyber Networks Act and the National Cybersecurity Protection Advancement Act fall well short of the standard—and in the case of the Protecting Cyber Networks Act can even be counterproductive and falls woefully short.

□ 1315

These pieces of legislation would enable Federal agencies to store and share Americans' private information, such as Internet usage patterns, even the content of online communications, based on a vague or broad standard that doing so is not unrelated to a cybersecurity threat.

Again, not affirmatively, they don't have to prove that it is related to a cybersecurity threat; the burden of proof is to show that it is not unrelated to a cybersecurity threat. How can you demonstrably show that about anything?

It would make it easier for government agencies to deliberately weaken software systems for the purpose of creating new surveillance back doors that foreign nation-states and hackers can presumably also exploit.

It would leave the door wide open to more NSA surveillance by allowing the sharing of personal information for a raft of purposes unrelated to cybersecurity. We can do better.

By rejecting this rule, Members of Congress will show that, yes, we take cybersecurity seriously, so seriously that we want to take the time to get it right. Whether that takes another week or 2 weeks or 3 weeks, getting it right means allowing Members of this body input into the formulation of the final bill meaningfully through the kinds of amendments that have been rejected outright under this rule without discussion, without debate, without a vote.

Unfortunately, the rule before us today denies us the ability to consider amendments that would have addressed many of the concerns with the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote "no" and defeat the previous question.

I urge a "no" vote on this bizarre rule that combines two, at times, contradictory bills and rejects bipartisan

amendments that would have addressed the concerns that many of us have with the underlying legislation.

I urge a "no" vote on the previous question and the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As we move forward, I think one of the things—and there are many things that are going to be discussed, and I encourage all Members to vote for this rule. As we move into general debate, there will be a lot of discussion that talks about what we are moving forward; but, also, I want to bring forward that we are—as is seemingly not discussed bringing forth, there are amendments being brought forth on both of these bills.

There also were 20-something amendments in Homeland Security; there was also an amendment in Intelligence. These are vetted bills. This is a proper role with what we are doing in Congress in bringing these to the floor.

Are there times that someone may want others? Yes; but, at this point, we are going to have that debate here on the floor. That is why voting for this rule and moving this forward is the proper thing to do.

Before we also move back from this, I want to talk about this need and why we are here even to start with. Most Americans recognize and understand that the growing attacks against our cyber networks and critical infrastructure and our laws fail to provide proper legal authority for information regarding cyber threats to be shared.

In fact, when I am back home in the Ninth District of Georgia discussing this, most people don't realize there is this barrier, and especially everything that is going on, they don't understand why some of these impediments were put into place that keeps companies from protecting their own, but also protecting their own personal information.

One of the things that is missing in this debate is the discussion of what has actually happened and the personal information that is shared by these hackers who are getting into our system.

Some of the latest attacks perpetrated by North Korea and other criminal enterprises on Sony Pictures and health insurance providers Anthem and Blue Cross Blue Shield speak to the type of attacks that occur on a daily basis that target the backbone of American business and the privacy of America's most sensitive data.

As we look to constrain this, as we look to put in proper safeguards, we have to realize that doing nothing exposes more and more of our American citizens to personal information being shared. If we don't believe it, just read the headlines from Sony, Anthem, and these others that have come out recently.

According to the Department of Homeland Security, in 2014 alone, they

received almost 100,000 cyber incident reports and detected 64,000 cyber vulnerabilities, and these numbers are just based on information given to DHS and does not reflect the full scope of the attacks on our Nation.

When we look at this and we talk about the personal information, the FBI Director James Comey said:

There are two kinds of big companies in the United States. There are those who have been hacked . . . and those who don't know they have been hacked.

A recent survey by the Ponemon Institute showed an average cost of a cyber crime for U.S. retail stores more than doubled from 2013 to an annual average of 8.6 million per company in 2014.

The annual average cost for a company of a successful cyber attack in 2014 increased to 20.8 million in financial services, 14.5 million in the technology sector, and 12.7 million in the communications industry.

The scope of many attacks are not fully known. For example, in July of 2014, the U.S. Computer Emergency Readiness Team issued an advisory that more than 1,000 U.S. businesses have been affected by the Backoff malware, which targets point-of-sale systems used by most retail industries. These attacks targeted administrative and customer data and, in many cases, financial data. Most companies encounter multiple cyber attacks every day, many unknown to the public and many unknown to the companies themselves even.

Again, as we look back over the attacks of just the past year, Target announced an additional 70 million individual contact information was taken during the December 2013 breach in which 40 million customers' credit and debit information was stolen.

Between May 2013 and January 2014, the payment cards of 2.6 million Michaels customers were affected. Attackers targeted the Michaels POS system to gain access to their systems.

The email service Yahoo! Mail was reportedly hacked in for 273 million users, although the specific number of accounts affected was not released.

For 2 weeks, AT&T was hacked from the inside by personnel who accessed user information, including Social Security information.

Foreign nationals from China have been indicted for computer hacking and economic espionage. We have seen these attacks all over the board.

Looking at this, the real issue that comes to mind is if we sit back and are not productive and not proactive as the Intelligence Committee and the Homeland Security Committee have been here, we are putting in danger more personal information being exposed in ways that no American needs to have their personal information exposed and are being targeted in the process.

This is good legislation that needs to stay on the floor, and that is why we are here today to support this rule and to look forward to that debate that has

already happened and will continue to happen.

I appreciate the discussion we have had over the past hour. Although we may have some differences, our unity should be clear against the cyber attacks and our resolve to prevent them and show their success is strong.

This rule provides for ample debate on the floor, the opportunity to debate and to vote on 16 amendments, and a smooth and deliberative process for sending one bill to the Senate. These bills will help protect American consumers, jobs, and small businesses.

Allowing companies, again, to voluntarily share cyber threat indicators with other companies and government agencies will help bring awareness to new threats and vulnerabilities.

If businesses can learn about a new threat from another business or from the government before they are targeted themselves, they can better act to protect their customers' personal information from a similar attack.

I would like to thank Intel, Homeland Security, Judiciary, and Rules Committee members and staff for the thoughtful and involved processes that have brought us to this point.

I urge my colleagues to support the rule and these two cybersecurity bills.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on the Rule governing debate on H.R. 1731 and H.R. 1560.

I support the Rule for H.R. 1731 and H.R. 1560 because it: 1. provides for consideration of important improvements to both bills; 2. makes clear the role of the Department of Homeland Security in securing civil government networks; and 3. the responsibilities of DHS in assist private sector entities in improving overall cybersecurity for themselves and their customers.

The bipartisan process that the Homeland Security Committee followed through the leadership of Chairman MCCAUL and Ranking Member THOMPSON is an example of what can be accomplished when partisanship is removed from the policymaking equation.

I would also like to thank Chairman SESSIONS and Ranking Member SLAUGHTER as well as members of the Rules Committee for making 4 of my amendments in order.

I join my colleagues in the work to secure our nation's cybersecurity, while preserving the privacy and civil liberties of our citizens.

The road to today began in 2011, when President Obama took several steps to move the issue of cybersecurity to the forefront by:

1. releasing a cybersecurity legislative proposal;
2. calling on Congress to take urgent action to give the private sector and government the tools needed to combat cyber threats at home and abroad; and
3. issuing the International Strategy for Cyberspace to make clear to nations abroad that the United States was firmly committed to improving cybersecurity and combating cyber terrorism.

I will be offering several amendments as the two bills are considered.

The Jackson Lee amendments are simple and will improve the privacy protections already in the bills and allow the Department of Homeland Security to become a better partner with the private sector in its work to improve domestic cybersecurity.

One of the Jackson Lee amendments that will be offered to the both bills will improve privacy and civil liberties by providing the public with a report from the Government Accountability Office that their privacy and civil liberties are not being compromised by the programs established by this bill.

Other Jackson Lee Amendments to H.R. 1731 will include an assurance that DHS's remains current on innovations: 1. on data security that can improve privacy and civil liberties protections; 2. in industrial control systems to keep pace with industry adoption of new technologies; and industry best practices; and 3. that can aid DHS in aligning federally funded cybersecurity research and development with private sector efforts to protect privacy and civil liberties.

These amendments will make sure that technology and equipment purchased with taxpayer dollars provided to ensure cybersecurity will remain current and focused on real-world applications that reflect constitutional values and how businesses and industry function.

An important building block for improving the Nation's cybersecurity is ensuring that private entities can collaborate to share timely cyber threat information with each other and the Federal Government.

The Administration is expressing concerns with H.R. 1560's broad liability protections offered to companies that sharing information with federal government programs established under this bill.

Appropriate liability protections should be established that incentivize good cybersecurity practices and would not grant immunity to a private company for failing to act on information it receives about the security of its networks.

The important component of cybersecurity is that computer network owners and managers will act to improve cyber defense of their systems when provided with information that vulnerabilities in their computer networks exist.

Legislation should not provide incentives for companies not to act when presented with evidence of network cyber security vulnerabilities.

Electronic data breaches involving Sony, Target, Home Depot, Neiman Marcus, JPMorgan Chase, and Athem are only a few of the cyber incidents that have plagued private sector networks.

These data breaches also are a reminder that the Internet is not yet what it must become to continue to meet the remote communication needs of a global marketplace.

As with other threats this nation has faced in the past and overcome we must create the resources and the institutional responses to protect our nation while preserving our liberties and freedoms.

We cannot accomplish the task of better cybersecurity without the cooperation and full support of citizens; the private sector; local state and federal government; computing research community; and academia.

This level of cooperation requires the trust and confidence of the American people that the actions taken by government to combat cyber threats will not threaten our way of life nor our hard fought Constitutional rights.

H.R. 1731 makes clear that the Department of Homeland Security will be the federal government agency responsible for securing civilian government networks and supporting voluntary efforts by private sector companies and institutions to improve coordination and response to cyber security threats.

The issues regarding liability protection related to cybersecurity must be addressed in order for H.R. 1560 and H.R. 1731 to have any chance of succeeding.

It is my understanding that Chairman MCCAUL and Ranking Member THOMPSON have reached agreement on language that addresses concerns that have been raised regarding liability.

There are talented and resourceful people outside and inside of government who can inform Congress on approaches to information sharing that will yield the desired results without compromising privacy or civil liberties.

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Rule for H.R. 1560 and H.R. 1731. Members from both parties have a shared goal of bolstering cybersecurity and improving the quality of information that the private sector receives about timely cyber threats so that they can protect their systems. I am greatly disappointed that the Rules Committee failed to make in order any of the several amendments submitted by both Democrats and Republicans to refine what the White House has called “sweeping” liability protections, as they appear in both cyber information sharing bills to be considered this week.

Extending liability protection to a company that “fails to act” on timely threat information could encourage companies to simply do nothing despite receiving information critical to the security of its systems. Appropriate liability protection does not grant immunity to companies for failing to act on such cybersecurity threat information, but rather incentivizes sound cybersecurity practices. The provision also effectively preempts state laws—including those in California, Massachusetts, and Maryland—that hold businesses liable for failing to maintain reasonable security of their systems, thereby undermining important protections for consumers and their sensitive data.

Instead, my Democratic colleagues on the Homeland Security Committee and I support President Obama’s straightforward, tailored approach to addressing what some in industry have identified as a major barrier to the sharing of cyber threat information—the risk that sharing such information would expose companies to legal liability. Unfortunately, the liability protection provision included in the bill puts in place an unduly complicated structure that runs the risk of providing liability relief to companies that fail to act on timely cyber information. I submitted two amendments to address the liability protection problems that exist in both information sharing bills to be considered this week. The first would have struck the provision immunizing companies that fail to act on timely threat information and clarified that the Act has no impact on a duty to act on shared cybersecurity threat information. The second would have removed all potential liability exemptions for willful misconduct by government actors.

These provisions would have improved both bills greatly, and at a minimum they deserved to be debated on the House floor today. The effectiveness of information sharing legislation and efforts to improve the security of companies’ systems depends on getting liability protection right. I look forward to continuing the discussion on liability protection with Members from both sides of the aisle as the bill moves forward.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, House Report 114–88, the report to accom-

pany H. Res. 212, the special rule governing consideration of H.R. 1731, does not reflect a request by Mr. MULVANEY of South Carolina to add Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi as a cosponsor of his amendment, number 8 printed in part B of the report.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 212 OFFERED BY
MR. POLIS OF COLORADO

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 4. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1128) to amend title 38, United States Code, to make certain improvements in the information security of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes. 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 Committee on Veterans’ Affairs. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 5. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 1128.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT
IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

The Republican majority may say “the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate

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

In Deschler’s Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled “Amending Special Rules” states: “a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.” (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: “Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.”

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARCHANT). The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 237, nays 179, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 163]

YEAS—237

Abraham	Brat	Collins (NY)
Aderholt	Bridenstine	Comstock
Allen	Brooks (AL)	Conaway
Amash	Brooks (IN)	Cook
Amodei	Buchanan	Costello (PA)
Babin	Buck	Cramer
Barletta	Bucshon	Crawford
Barr	Burgess	Crenshaw
Barton	Byrne	Culberson
Benishek	Calvert	Davis, Rodney
Bilirakis	Carter (GA)	Denham
Bishop (MI)	Carter (TX)	Dent
Bishop (UT)	Chabot	DeSantis
Black	Chaffetz	Diaz-Balart
Blackburn	Clawson (FL)	Dold
Blum	Coffman	Duffy
Bost	Cole	Duncan (SC)
Boustany	Collins (GA)	Duncan (TN)

Ellmers (NC) LaMalfa
 Emmer (MN) Lamborn
 Farenthold Lance
 Fincher Latta
 Fitzpatrick LoBiondo
 Fleischmann Long
 Fleming Loudermilk
 Flores Love
 Forbes Lucas
 Fortenberry Luetkemeyer
 Foxx Lummis
 Franks (AZ) MacArthur
 Frelinghuysen Marchant
 Garrett Marino
 Gibbs Massie
 Gibson McCarthy
 Gohmert McCaul
 Goodlatte McClintock
 Gosar McHenry
 Gowdy McKinley
 Granger McMorris
 Graves (GA) Rodgers
 Graves (LA) McSally
 Griffith Meadows
 Grothman Meehan
 Guinta Messer
 Guthrie Mica
 Hanna Miller (FL)
 Hardy Miller (MI)
 Harper Moonenar
 Harris Mooney (WV)
 Hartzler Mullin
 Heck (NV) Mulvaney
 Hensarling Murphy (PA)
 Herrera Beutler Neugebauer
 Hice, Jody B. Newhouse
 Hill Noem
 Holding Nugent
 Hudson Nunes
 Huelskamp Palazzo
 Huizenga (MI) Palmer
 Hultgren Paulsen
 Hunter Pearce
 Hurd (TX) Perry
 Hurt (VA) Pittenger
 Issa Pitts
 Jenkins (KS) Poliquin
 Jenkins (WV) Pompeo
 Johnson (OH) Posey
 Johnson, Sam Price, Tom
 Jolly Ratcliffe
 Jones Reed
 Jordan Reichert
 Joyce Renacci
 Katko Ribble
 Kelly (PA) Rice (SC)
 King (IA) Rigell
 King (NY) Roby
 Kinzinger (IL) Roe (TN)
 Kline Rogers (AL)
 Knight Rogers (KY)
 Labrador Rohrabacher

NAYS—179

Adams Conyers
 Aguilar Cooper
 Ashford Courtney
 Bass Crowley
 Beatty Cuellar
 Becerra Cummings
 Bera Davis (CA)
 Beyer Davis, Danny
 Bishop (GA) DeFazio
 Blumenauer DeGette
 Bonamici Delaney
 Boyle, Brendan DeLauro
 F. DelBene
 Brady (PA) DeSaulnier
 Brown (FL) Dingell
 Brownley (CA) Doggett
 Bustos Doyle, Michael
 Butterfield F.
 Capps Duckworth
 Capuano Edwards
 Cárdenas Ellison
 Carney Engel
 Carson (IN) Eshoo
 Cartwright Esty
 Castor (FL) Farr
 Castro (TX) Fattah
 Chu, Judy Foster
 Cicilline Frankel (FL)
 Clark (MA) Fudge
 Clarke (NY) Gabbard
 Clay Gallego
 Cleaver Garamendi
 Clyburn Graham
 Cohen Grayson
 Connolly Green, Al

Rokita
 Rooney (FL)
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roskam
 Ross
 Rothfus
 Rouzer
 Royce
 Russell
 Ryan (WI)
 Salmon
 Sanford
 Scalise
 Schweikert
 Scott, Austin
 Sensenbrenner
 Sessions
 Shimkus
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Smith (MO)
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Stefanik
 Stewart
 Stivers
 Stutzman
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tiberi
 Tipton
 Trott
 Turner
 Upton
 Valadao
 Wagner
 Walberg
 Walden
 Walker
 Walorski
 Walters, Mimi
 Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL)
 Wenstrup
 Westerman
 Westmoreland
 Whitfield
 Williams
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Womack
 Woodall
 Yoder
 Yoho
 Young (AK)
 Young (IA)
 Young (IN)
 Zeldin
 Zinke

NOT VOTING—15

Brady (TX)
 Costa
 Curbelo (FL)
 DesJarlais
 Deutch
 Graves (MO)

Hastings
 Murphy (FL)
 Neal
 Olson
 Payne
 Poe (TX)

Shrader
 Smith (WA)
 Wasserman
 Schultz

□ 1349

Messrs. CLEAVER and GENE GREEN of Texas changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. NEUGEBAUER, HUDSON, and STIVERS changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

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

Stated against:
 Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 163, had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered. The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 238, noes 182, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 164]

AYES—238

Abraham
 Aderholt
 Allen
 Amodei
 Ashford
 Babin
 Barletta
 Barr
 Barton
 Benishek
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (MI)
 Bishop (UT)
 Black
 Blackburn
 Blum
 Bost
 Boustany
 Brat
 Bridenstine
 Brooks (AL)
 Brooks (IN)
 Buchanan
 Buck
 Bucshon
 Burgess

Graves (LA)
 Griffith
 Grothman
 Guinta
 Guthrie
 Hanna
 Hardy
 Harper
 Harris
 Hartzler
 Heck (NV)
 Hensarling
 Herrera Beutler
 Hice, Jody B.
 Hill
 Holding
 Hudson
 Huizenga (MI)
 Hultgren
 Hunter
 Hurd (TX)
 Hurt (VA)
 Issa
 Jenkins (KS)
 Jenkins (WV)
 Johnson (OH)
 Johnson, Sam
 Jolly
 Jordan
 Joyce
 Katko
 Kelly (PA)
 King (IA)
 King (NY)
 Kinzinger (IL)
 Kline
 Knight
 Labrador
 LaMalfa
 Lamborn
 Lance
 Latta
 LoBiondo
 Long
 Loudermilk
 Love
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Lummis
 MacArthur
 Marchant
 Marino
 McCarthy
 McCaul

NOES—182

Adams
 Aguilar
 Amash
 Bass
 Beatty
 Becerra
 Bera
 Beyer
 Bishop (GA)
 Blumenauer
 Bonamici
 Boyle, Brendan
 F.
 Brady (PA)
 Brown (FL)
 Brownley (CA)
 Bustos
 Butterfield
 Capps
 Capuano
 Cárdenas
 Carney
 Carson (IN)
 Cartwright
 Castor (FL)
 Castro (TX)
 Chu, Judy
 Cicilline
 Clark (MA)
 Clarke (NY)
 Clay
 Cleaver
 Clyburn
 Cohen
 Connolly
 Conyers
 Cooper
 Courtney
 Crowley
 Cuellar
 Cummings
 Davis (CA)
 Davis, Danny

DeFazio
 DeGette
 Delaney
 DeLauro
 DelBene
 DeSaulnier
 Deutch
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Doyle, Michael
 F.
 Edwards
 Ellison
 Engel
 Eshoo
 Esty
 Farr
 Fattah
 Foster
 Frankel (FL)
 Fudge
 Gabbard
 Gallego
 Garamendi
 Graham
 Grayson
 Green, Al
 Green, Gene
 Grijalva
 Gutiérrez
 Hahn
 Heck (WA)
 Higgins
 Himes
 Hinojosa
 Honda
 Hoyer
 Huelskamp
 Huffman
 Israel
 Jackson Lee
 Jeffries
 Johnson (GA)

Russell
 Ryan (WI)
 Salmon
 Sanford
 Scalise
 Schweikert
 Scott, Austin
 Sensenbrenner
 Sessions
 Shimkus
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Sinema
 Smith (MO)
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Stefanik
 Stewart
 Stivers
 Stutzman
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tiberi
 Tipton
 Trott
 Turner
 Upton
 Valadao
 Wagner
 Walberg
 Walden
 Walker
 Walters, Mimi
 Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL)
 Wenstrup
 Westerman
 Westmoreland
 Whitfield
 Williams
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Womack
 Woodall
 Yoder
 Yoho
 Young (AK)
 Young (IA)
 Young (IN)
 Zeldin
 Zinke

Napolitano	Ruppersberger	Takano
Nolan	Rush	Thompson (CA)
Norcross	Ryan (OH)	Thompson (MS)
O'Rourke	Sánchez, Linda	Titus
Pallone	T.	Tonko
Pascrell	Sanchez, Loretta	Torres
Pelosi	Sarbanes	Tsongas
Perlmutter	Schakowsky	Van Hollen
Peters	Schiff	Vargas
Peterson	Schrader	Veasey
Pingree	Scott (VA)	Vela
Pocan	Scott, David	Velázquez
Polis	Serrano	Viscosky
Price (NC)	Sewell (AL)	Walz
Quigley	Sherman	Waters, Maxine
Rangel	Sires	Watson Coleman
Rice (NY)	Slaughter	Welch
Richmond	Speier	Wilson (FL)
Roybal-Allard	Swalwell (CA)	Yarmuth
Ruiz	Takai	

NOT VOTING—11

Brady (TX)	Hastings	Payne
Curbelo (FL)	Murphy (FL)	Smith (WA)
DesJarlais	Neal	Wasserman
Graves (MO)	Olson	Schultz

□ 1356

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.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 971. An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for an increase in the limit on the length of an agreement under the Medicare independence at home medical practice demonstration program.

S. 984. An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide Medicare beneficiary access to eye tracking accessories for speech generating devices and to remove the rental cap for durable medical equipment under the Medicare Program with respect to speech generating devices.

BUREAU OF CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION ADVISORY BOARDS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DENHAM). Pursuant to House Resolution 200 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. 1195.

Will the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. YODER) kindly take the chair.

□ 1358

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. 1195) to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to establish advisory boards, and for other purposes, with Mr. YODER (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Tuesday, April 21, 2015, amendment No. 2 printed in part D of House Report 114-74 offered

by the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. KUSTER) had been disposed of.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. KUSTER

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, the unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 1 printed in part D of House Report 114-74 offered by the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. KUSTER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 244, noes 173, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 165]

AYES—244

Adams	Deutch	Kilmer
Aguilar	Diaz-Balart	Kind
Ashford	Dingell	Kirkpatrick
Barletta	Doggett	Kuster
Barton	Dold	Lance
Bass	Doyle, Michael	Langevin
Beatty	F.	Larsen (WA)
Becerra	Duckworth	Larson (CT)
Benishkek	Duncan (TN)	Latta
Bera	Edwards	Lawrence
Beyer	Ellison	Lee
Billirakis	Engel	Levin
Bishop (GA)	Eshoo	Lewis
Blumenauer	Esty	Lieu, Ted
Bonamici	Farenthold	Lipinski
Boyle, Brendan	Farr	LoBiondo
F.	Fattah	Loeb
Brady (PA)	Fitzpatrick	Lofgren
Brooks (IN)	Fleming	Lowenthal
Brown (FL)	Flores	Lowey
Brownley (CA)	Foster	Lujan Grisham
Buchanan	Frankel (FL)	(NM)
Bustos	Fudge	Luján, Ben Ray
Butterfield	Gabbard	(NM)
Calvert	Galleo	Lynch
Capps	Garamendi	MacArthur
Capuano	Gibson	Maloney,
Cárdenas	Graham	Carolyn
Carney	Graves (GA)	Maloney, Sean
Carson (IN)	Graves (LA)	Marino
Cartwright	Grayson	Matsui
Castor (FL)	Green, Al	McCollum
Castro (TX)	Green, Gene	McDermott
Chu, Judy	Grijalva	McNerney
Ciциlline	Gutiérrez	McSally
Clark (MA)	Hahn	Meehan
Clarke (NY)	Hanna	Meeks
Clay	Heck (WA)	Meng
Cleaver	Herrera Beutler	Messer
Clyburn	Higgins	Moolenaar
Cohen	Himes	Moore
Collins (NY)	Hinojosa	Moulton
Comstock	Honda	Nadler
Connolly	Hoyer	Napolitano
Conyers	Huffman	Nolan
Cooper	Hurd (TX)	Norcross
Costa	Israel	Nugent
Costello (PA)	Issa	O'Rourke
Courtney	Jackson Lee	Pallone
Crowley	Jeffries	Pascrell
Cuellar	Johnson (GA)	Paulsen
Cummings	Johnson, E. B.	Pearce
Davis (CA)	Jolly	Pelosi
Davis, Danny	Jones	Perlmutter
Davis, Rodney	Joyce	Peters
DeFazio	Kaptur	Pingree
DeGette	Katko	Pocan
Delaney	Keating	Polis
DeLauro	Kelly (IL)	Posey
DelBene	Kelly (PA)	Price (NC)
Dent	Kennedy	Quigley
DeSaulnier	Kildee	Rangel

Reed	Scott (VA)	Tonko
Renacci	Scott, David	Torres
Ribble	Sensenbrenner	Tsongas
Rice (NY)	Serrano	Upton
Richmond	Sewell (AL)	Van Hollen
Rigell	Sherman	Vargas
Rohrabacher	Simpson	Veasey
Ros-Lehtinen	Sinema	Vela
Roybal-Allard	Sires	Velázquez
Royce	Slaughter	Viscosky
Ruiz	Smith (NJ)	Walden
Ruppersberger	Speier	Walters, Mimi
Rush	Stefanik	Walz
Ryan (OH)	Stivers	Waters, Maxine
Sánchez, Linda	Swalwell (CA)	Watson Coleman
T.	Takai	Webster (FL)
Sanchez, Loretta	Takano	Welch
Sanford	Thompson (CA)	Wilson (FL)
Sarbanes	Thompson (MS)	Yarmuth
Schakowsky	Thompson (PA)	Yoder
Schiff	Tiberi	
Schrader	Titus	

NOES—173

Abraham	Hardy	Peterson
Allen	Harper	Pittenger
Amash	Harris	Pitts
Amodei	Hartzler	Poe (TX)
Babin	Heck (NV)	Poliquin
Barr	Hensarling	Pompeo
Bishop (MI)	Hice, Jody B.	Price, Tom
Bishop (UT)	Hill	Ratcliffe
Black	Holding	Reichert
Blackburn	Hudson	Rice (SC)
Blum	Huelskamp	Roby
Bost	Huizenga (MI)	Roe (TN)
Boustany	Hultgren	Rogers (AL)
Brat	Hunter	Rogers (KY)
Bridenstine	Hurt (VA)	Rokita
Brooks (AL)	Jenkins (KS)	Rooney (FL)
Buck	Jenkins (WV)	Roskam
Bucshon	Johnson (OH)	Ross
Burgess	Johnson, Sam	Rouzer
Byrne	Jordan	Russell
Carter (GA)	King (IA)	Ryan (WI)
Carter (TX)	King (NY)	Salmon
Chabot	Kinzinger (IL)	Scalise
Chaffetz	Kline	Schweikert
Clawson (FL)	Knight	Scott, Austin
Coffman	Labrador	Sessions
Cole	LaMalfa	Shimkus
Collins (GA)	Lamborn	Shuster
Conaway	Long	Smith (MO)
Cook	Loudermilk	Smith (NE)
Cramer	Love	Smith (TX)
Crawford	Lucas	Stewart
Crenshaw	Luetkemeyer	Stutzman
Culberson	Lummis	Thornberry
Denham	Marchant	Tipton
DeSantis	Massie	Trott
Duffy	McCarthy	Turner
Duncan (SC)	McCaul	Valadao
Ellmers (NC)	McClintock	Wagner
Emmer (MN)	McHenry	Walberg
Fincher	McKinley	Walker
Fleischmann	McMorris	Walorski
Forbes	Rodgers	Weber (TX)
Fortenberry	Meadows	Wenstrup
Foxo	Mica	Westerman
Franks (AZ)	Miller (FL)	Westmoreland
Frelinghuysen	Miller (MI)	Whitfield
Garrett	Mooney (WV)	Williams
Gibbs	Mullin	Wilson (SC)
Gohmert	Mulvaney	Wittman
Goodlatte	Murphy (PA)	Womack
Gosar	Neugebauer	Woodall
Gowdy	Newhouse	Yoho
Granger	Noem	Young (AK)
Griffith	Nunes	Young (IA)
Grothman	Palazzo	Young (IN)
Guinta	Palmer	Zeldin
Guthrie	Perry	Zinke

NOT VOTING—14

Aderholt	Hastings	Payne
Brady (TX)	McGovern	Rothfus
Curbelo (FL)	Murphy (FL)	Smith (WA)
DesJarlais	Neal	Wasserman
Graves (MO)	Olson	Schultz

□ 1405

Mr. LATTA changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 165 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

The Acting CHAIR. There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MARCHANT) having assumed the chair, Mr. YODER, 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. 1195) to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to establish advisory boards, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 200, he reported the bill, as amended by that resolution, back to the House with sundry further amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Ms. KUSTER. I am opposed in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Kuster moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1195 to the Committee on Financial Services with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Add at the end the following:

SEC. 4. PROHIBITION AGAINST PARTICIPATION BY PERSONS EMPLOYED BY COMPANIES ENGAGED IN PREDATORY PRACTICES RELATED TO SERVICEMEMBERS.

No person shall be eligible to be a member of the Small Business Advisory Board, the Credit Union Advisory Council, or the Community Bank Advisory Council who has, in the last ten years, been employed by or acted as an agent of a company that has been subject to a State or Federal enforcement action, including a consent order, settlement or deferred prosecution agreement, for:

(1) Unfair, abusive, or deceptive acts or practices in relation to the provision of consumer credit products to veterans or servicemembers.

(2) Unfair, abusive, or deceptive acts or practices in relation to the provision of consumer credit products within 50 miles of a United States military installation, or that has targeted or harmed veterans, servicemembers, or their families who live on or are deployed to such installation.

(3) Any violation of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act.

Ms. KUSTER (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The gentlewoman from New Hampshire is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage as amended.

Mr. Speaker, I would first like to commend Congressman PITTEMBERG and Congressman HECK for their tireless work on this bill. The three of us arrived in Congress at the same time, just over 2 years ago, as part of a very large freshman class.

Republicans and Democrats alike, we were all sent here by constituents frustrated with the gridlock and partisanship who want their Representatives to work together to solve problems.

In that spirit, I appreciate the bipartisan work that went into this bill, which addresses a noble goal: ensuring that the voices of small businesses are heard by Federal regulators making important decisions across our entire economy.

I share that goal. Indeed, I have worked across the aisle to bring regulators like the FDA and the SBA to my district in New Hampshire to ensure that they listen to our small businesses and family farmers.

Unfortunately, this bill before us today falls short of what our constituents expect and deserve, and contains a last-minute, partisan amendment to undermine funding for consumer protection.

Regardless of one's position on the bill, however, I believe we should all work together to improve it. Thus, I offer this amendment to help protect veterans and military servicemembers from unscrupulous business practices.

This bill authorizes several advisory boards to ensure that the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau consults with small businesses and community financial institutions.

My amendment is straightforward, simply stating that no person shall be eligible to serve on a CFPB advisory board if they or their company has committed unfair, abusive, or deceptive business practices against veterans or military families.

We can all agree that men and women in uniform should not have their homes foreclosed, their cars repossessed, or their families evicted when they are fighting overseas to protect our freedom. Likewise, military families should not be targeted by predatory interest rates and other abusive lending practices. That is not just wrong; it is illegal.

My amendment is straightforward. If a business violates protections for military families, they should not have

a seat at the table when new rules are being written for the financial services industry.

This amendment is pro-veteran. It supports our military families. And it makes sense.

So, I ask all of us, Republicans and Democrats, to support this amendment. Send a message to our veterans.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1415

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The reservation of the point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I just want the House to, again, focus upon what this underlying bill is all about, a most modest and bipartisan effort to simply ensure that the CFPB, perhaps the single most powerful and unaccountable agency in the history of the Federal Government, has some people to represent the voices of our small-business people, those that are being so harmed as we are losing a community financial institution a day in America, a community financial institution that helped fund our small mom-and-pop restaurants, our automobile transmission repair shops, a farmer, a rancher, all of our small businesses.

All we are asking is that we have that council available, and what started out as a bill that came out of our committee 53-5, unfortunately, yet again, there were some of my friends on the other side of the aisle who were for it before they were against it.

We will have very substantive debates on the issues dealing with the CFPB, but this one is a very modest one to have small business council, one that the Congressional Budget Office says will not cost trillions, will not cost billions, will not cost millions, but actually a figure we rarely hear around here, Mr. Speaker, thousands, on an annual basis, thousands.

We should reject the motion to recommit. There is no reason to include it. Already, veterans' voices will be represented, and if there is any group that deserves representation in all of the forms of council of government, it is our men and women who serve this Nation honorably in uniform—and our veterans, already assured.

It is time to get on to the larger business of the House. I urge all of my colleagues to oppose the motion to recommit and to approve the underlying bill from the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PITTEMBERG), and let's get small business council at the table of the CFPB.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by a 5-minute vote on passage of the bill, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 184, noes 234, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 166]

AYES—184

Adams	Foster	Moulton
Aguilar	Frankel (FL)	Nadler
Ashford	Fudge	Napolitano
Bass	Gabbard	Nolan
Beatty	Gallego	Norcross
Becerra	Garamendi	O'Rourke
Bera	Graham	Pallone
Beyer	Grayson	Pascrell
Bishop (GA)	Green, Al	Pelosi
Blumenauer	Green, Gene	Perlmutter
Bonamici	Grijalva	Peters
Boyle, Brendan F.	Gutiérrez	Peterson
Brady (PA)	Hahn	Pingree
Brown (FL)	Heck (WA)	Pocan
Brownley (CA)	Higgins	Polis
Bustos	Himes	Price (NC)
Butterfield	Hinojosa	Quigley
Capps	Honda	Rangel
Capuano	Hoyer	Rice (NY)
Cárdenas	Huffman	Richmond
Carney	Israel	Roybal-Allard
Carson (IN)	Jackson Lee	Ruiz
Cartwright	Jeffries	Ruppersberger
Castor (FL)	Johnson (GA)	Rush
Castro (TX)	Johnson, E. B.	Ryan (OH)
Chu, Judy	Jones	Sánchez, Linda T.
Cicilline	Kaptur	Sanchez, Loretta
Clark (MA)	Kelly (IL)	Sarbanes
Clarke (NY)	Kennedy	Shakowsky
Clay	Kildee	Schiff
Cleaver	Kilmer	Schrader
Clyburn	Kind	Scott (VA)
Cohen	Kirkpatrick	Scott, David
Connolly	Kuster	Serrano
Conyers	Langevin	Sewell (AL)
Cooper	Larsen (WA)	Sherman
Costa	Larson (CT)	Sinema
Courtney	Lawrence	Sires
Crowley	Lee	Slaughter
Cuellar	Levin	Speier
Cummings	Lewis	Swalwell (CA)
Davis (CA)	Lieu, Ted	Takai
Davis, Danny	Lipinski	Takano
DeFazio	Loeback	Thompson (CA)
DeGette	Lofgren	Thompson (MS)
Delaney	Lowenthal	Titus
DeLauro	Lowey	Tonko
DelBene	Lujan Grisham	Torres
DeSaulnier	(NM)	Tsongas
Deutch	Luján, Ben Ray	Van Hollen
Dingell	(NM)	Vargas
Doggett	Lynch	Veasey
Doyle, Michael F.	Maloney, Carolyn	Vela
Duckworth	Maloney, Sean	Velázquez
Duncan (TN)	Matsui	Visclosky
Edwards	McCollum	Walz
Ellison	McDermott	Waters, Maxine
Engel	McGovern	Watson Coleman
Eshoo	McNerney	Welch
Esty	Meeke	Wilson (FL)
Farr	Meng	Yarmuth
Fattah	Moore	

NOES—234

Abraham	Amash	Barletta
Aderholt	Amodei	Barr
Allen	Babin	Barton

Benishek	Hensarling	Pompeo
Bilirakis	Herrera Beutler	Posey
Bishop (MI)	Hice, Jody B.	Price, Tom
Bishop (UT)	Hill	Ratcliffe
Black	Holding	Reed
Blackburn	Hudson	Reichert
Blum	Huelskamp	Renacci
Bost	Huizenga (MI)	Ribble
Boustany	Hultgren	Rice (SC)
Brat	Hunter	Rigell
Bridenstine	Hurd (TX)	Roby
Brooks (AL)	Hurt (VA)	Roe (TN)
Brooks (IN)	Issa	Rogers (AL)
Buchanan	Jenkins (KS)	Rogers (KY)
Buck	Jenkins (WV)	Rohrabacher
Bucshon	Johnson (OH)	Rokita
Burgess	Johnson, Sam	Rooney (FL)
Byrne	Jolly	Ros-Lehtinen
Calvert	Jordan	Roskam
Carter (GA)	Joyce	Ross
Carter (TX)	Katko	Rothfus
Chabot	Kelly (PA)	Rouzer
Chaffetz	King (IA)	Royce
Clawson (FL)	King (NY)	Russell
Coffman	Kinzinger (IL)	Ryan (WI)
Cole	Kline	Salmon
Collins (GA)	Knight	Sanford
Collins (NY)	Labrador	Scalise
Comstock	LaMalfa	Schweikert
Conaway	Lamborn	Scott, Austin
Cook	Lance	Sensenbrenner
Costello (PA)	Latta	Sessions
Cramer	LoBiondo	Shimkus
Crawford	Long	Shuster
Crenshaw	Loudermilk	Love
Davis, Rodney	Lucas	Smith (MO)
Denham	Luetkemeyer	Smith (NE)
Dent	Lummis	Smith (NJ)
DeSantis	MacArthur	Smith (TX)
Diaz-Balart	Marchant	Stefanik
Dold	Duffy	Stewart
Duffy	Marino	Stutzman
Duncan (SC)	Massie	Thompson (PA)
Ellmers (NC)	McCarthy	Thornberry
Emmer (MN)	McCaul	Tiberi
Farenthold	McClintock	Tipton
Fincher	McHenry	Trott
Fitzpatrick	McKinley	Turner
Fleischmann	McMorris	Upton
Fleming	Rodgers	Valadao
Flores	McSally	Wagner
Forbes	Meadows	Walberg
Fortenberry	Meehan	Walden
Fox	Messer	Walker
Franks (AZ)	Mica	Walorski
Frelinghuysen	Miller (FL)	Walters, Mimi
Garrett	Miller (MI)	Weber (TX)
Gibbs	Moolenaar	Webster (FL)
Gibson	Mooney (WV)	Wenstrup
Gohmert	Mullin	Westerman
Goodlatte	Mulvaney	Westmoreland
Gosar	Murphy (PA)	Whitfield
Gowdy	Neugebauer	Williams
Granger	Newhouse	Wilson (SC)
Graves (GA)	Noem	Wittman
Graves (LA)	Nugent	Womack
Griffith	Nunes	Woodall
Grothman	Palazzo	Yoder
Guinta	Palmer	Young (AK)
Guthrie	Paulsen	Young (IA)
Hanna	Pearce	Young (IN)
Hardy	Perry	Zeldin
Harper	Pittenger	Zinke
Harris	Pitts	
Hartzler	Poe (TX)	
Heck (NV)	Poliquin	

NOT VOTING—13

Brady (TX)	Hastings	Smith (WA)
Culberson	Murphy (FL)	Stivers
Curbelo (FL)	Neal	Wasserman
DesJarlais	Olson	Schultz
Graves (MO)	Payne	

□ 1424

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 235, nays 183, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 167]

YEAS—235

Abraham	Guthrie	Pittenger
Aderholt	Hanna	Pitts
Allen	Hardy	Poe (TX)
Amodei	Harper	Poliquin
Ashford	Harris	Pompeo
Babin	Hartzler	Posey
Barletta	Heck (NV)	Price, Tom
Barr	Hensarling	Ratcliffe
Barton	Herrera Beutler	Reed
Benishek	Hice, Jody B.	Reichert
Bilirakis	Hill	Renacci
Bishop (MI)	Holding	Ribble
Bishop (UT)	Hudson	Rice (SC)
Black	Huelskamp	Rigell
Blackburn	Huizenga (MI)	Roby
Blum	Hultgren	Roe (TN)
Bost	Hunter	Rogers (AL)
Boustany	Hurd (TX)	Rogers (KY)
Brat	Hurt (VA)	Rohrabacher
Bridenstine	Issa	Rokita
Brooks (IN)	Jenkins (KS)	Rooney (FL)
Buchanan	Jenkins (WV)	Ros-Lehtinen
Bucshon	Johnson (OH)	Roskam
Burgess	Johnson, Sam	Ross
Byrne	Jolly	Rothfus
Calvert	Jordan	Rouzer
Carter (GA)	Joyce	Royce
Carter (TX)	Katko	Russell
Chabot	Kelly (PA)	Ryan (WI)
Chaffetz	King (IA)	Salmon
Clawson (FL)	King (NY)	Sanford
Coffman	Kinzinger (IL)	Scalise
Cole	Kline	Schweikert
Collins (GA)	Knight	Scott, Austin
Collins (NY)	Labrador	Sensenbrenner
Comstock	LaMalfa	Sessions
Conaway	Lamborn	Shimkus
Cook	Lance	Shuster
Costello (PA)	Latta	Shuster
Cramer	LoBiondo	Simpson
Crawford	Long	Sinema
Crenshaw	Loudermilk	Smith (MO)
Cuellar	Love	Smith (NE)
Culberson	Lucas	Smith (NJ)
Davis, Rodney	Luetkemeyer	Smith (TX)
Denham	Lummis	Stefanik
Dent	MacArthur	Stewart
DeSantis	Marchant	Stivers
Diaz-Balart	Marino	Stutzman
Dold	McCarthy	Thompson (PA)
Duffy	McCaul	Thornberry
Duncan (SC)	McClintock	Tiberi
Duncan (TN)	McHenry	Tipton
Ellmers (NC)	McKinley	Trott
Emmer (MN)	McMorris	Turner
Farenthold	Rodgers	Upton
Fincher	McSally	Valadao
Fitzpatrick	Meadows	Wagner
Fleischmann	Meehan	Walberg
Fleming	Messer	Walden
Flores	Mica	Walker
Forbes	Miller (FL)	Walorski
Fortenberry	Miller (MI)	Walters, Mimi
Fox	Moolenaar	Weber (TX)
Franks (AZ)	Mooney (WV)	Webster (FL)
Frelinghuysen	Mullin	Westerman
Garrett	Mulvaney	Westmoreland
Gibbs	Murphy (PA)	Whitfield
Gibson	Neugebauer	Williams
Gohmert	Newhouse	Wilson (SC)
Goodlatte	Noem	Wittman
Gosar	Nugent	Womack
Gowdy	Nunes	Woodall
Granger	Palazzo	Yoder
Graves (GA)	Palmer	Young (AK)
Graves (LA)	Paulsen	Young (IA)
Griffith	Pearce	Young (IN)
Grothman	Perry	Zeldin
Guinta	Peterson	Zinke

NAYS—183

Adams	Beyer	Brooks (AL)
Aguilar	Bishop (GA)	Brown (FL)
Amash	Blumenauer	Brownley (CA)
Bass	Bonamici	Buck
Beatty	Boyle, Brendan F.	Bustos
Becerra	F.	Butterfield
Bera	Brady (PA)	Capps

Capuano	Heck (WA)	Norcross
Cárdenas	Higgins	O'Rourke
Carney	Himes	Pallone
Carson (IN)	Hinojosa	Pascrell
Cartwright	Honda	Pelosi
Castor (FL)	Hoyer	Perlmutter
Castro (TX)	Huffman	Peters
Chu, Judy	Israel	Pingree
Cicilline	Jackson Lee	Pocan
Clark (MA)	Jeffries	Polis
Clarke (NY)	Johnson (GA)	Price (NC)
Clay	Johnson, E. B.	Quigley
Cleaver	Jones	Rangel
Clyburn	Kaptur	Rice (NY)
Cohen	Keating	Richmond
Connolly	Kelly (IL)	Roybal-Allard
Conyers	Kennedy	Ruiz
Cooper	Kildee	Ruppersberger
Costa	Kilmer	Rush
Courtney	Kind	Ryan (OH)
Crowley	Kirkpatrick	Sánchez, Linda
Cummings	Kuster	T.
Davis (CA)	Langevin	Sanchez, Loretta
Davis, Danny	Larsen (WA)	Sarbanes
DeFazio	Larson (CT)	Schakowsky
DeGette	Lawrence	Schiff
Delaney	Lee	Schrader
DeLauro	Levin	Scott (VA)
DelBene	Lewis	Scott, David
DeSaulnier	Lieu, Ted	Serrano
Deutch	Lipinski	Sewell (AL)
Dingell	Loeb sack	Sherman
Doggett	Lofgren	Sires
Doyle, Michael	Lowenthal	Slaughter
F.	Lowe y	Speier
Duckworth	Lujan Grisham	Swalwell (CA)
Edwards	(NM)	Takai
Ellison	Luján, Ben Ray	Takano
Engel	(NM)	Thompson (CA)
Eshoo	Lynch	Thompson (MS)
Esty	Maloney,	Titus
Farr	Carolyn	Tonko
Fattah	Maloney, Sean	Torres
Foster	Massie	Tsongas
Frankel (FL)	Matsui	Van Hollen
Fudge	McCollum	Vargas
Gabbard	McDermott	Veasey
Galle go	McGovern	Vela
Garamendi	McNeerney	Velázquez
Graham	Meeks	Visclosky
Grayson	Meng	Walz
Green, Al	Moore	Waters, Maxine
Green, Gene	Moulton	Watson Coleman
Grijalva	Nadler	Welch
Gutiérrez	Napolitano	Wilson (FL)
Hahn	Nolan	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—13

Brady (TX)	Murphy (FL)	Wasserman
Curbelo (FL)	Neal	Schultz
DesJarlais	Olson	Wenstrup
Graves (MO)	Payne	Yoho
Hastings	Smith (WA)	

□ 1432

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Natural Resources:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, Washington, DC, April 22, 2015.

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

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: This letter serves as my official resignation from the House Committee on Natural Resources. It has been my pleasure serving on this Committee since being elected to Congress. Thank you and I will continue working on important

priorities relating to my new appointment on the House Committee on Small Business. Sincerely,

MARK TAKAI, Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted. There was no objection.

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

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 219

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

(1) COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS.—Mr. Takai.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROTECTING CYBER NETWORKS ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NUNES. 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 material on H.R. 1560, the Protecting Cyber Networks Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 212 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. 1560.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MARCHANT) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1436

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. 1560) to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes, with Mr. MARCHANT 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 California (Mr. NUNES) and the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. NUNES).

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

Over the last several years, cyber attacks have become a pressing concern for the United States. Anthem, Home Depot, Sony, Target, JPMorgan Chase, and other companies have been subject to major attacks, resulting in the compromise of personal information of employees and customers alike.

Cyber thieves, whether hostile foreign agents or money-seeking criminals, have stolen credit card numbers, accessed medical records, leaked proprietary information, and published confidential emails affecting tens of millions of Americans. This situation cannot continue.

The House has passed cybersecurity information-sharing legislation with strong majorities in the past two Congresses. The gentleman from California, Ranking Member SCHIFF, and I have continued this bipartisan tradition, working closely together to draft a bill that will increase the security of our networks while protecting users' privacy.

I see the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RUPPERSBERGER) is here. He sponsored this legislation last time, along with the gentleman from Michigan, Chairman Rogers, who is now retired, but I do want to give them a special thanks and gratitude.

I hope that we can get this bill across the floor this year.

We have also worked closely with leadership—the gentleman from Texas, Chairman MCCAUL; the gentleman from Virginia, Chairman GOODLATTE—and the Senate Intelligence Committee to ensure that our bills complement each other.

The Protecting Cyber Networks Act addresses a core problem in our digital security infrastructure. Because of legal ambiguities, many companies are afraid to share information about cyber threats with each other or with the government. If a company sees some threat or attack, this bill will allow the company to quickly report information about the problem without fearing a lawsuit so that other companies can take measures to protect themselves.

The bill encourages three kinds of sharing: private-to-private, government-to-private, and private-to-government. In that third scenario, the bill allows companies to share cyber threat information with a variety of government agencies. If banks are comfortable sharing with the Treasury Department, they can share with Treasury. If utilities prefer sharing with the Department of Energy, they can share with Energy. If companies want to share with the Department of Homeland Security, the Justice Department, or the Commerce Department, they can share with them.

The only sharing that this bill does not encourage is direct sharing to the Department of Defense or the National Security Agency. Companies can still share with DOD and NSA, but they will not receive any new liability protections.

This bill does not provide the government with any new surveillance authorities. To the contrary, it includes robust privacy protections. It only authorizes the sharing of cyber threat indicators and defensive measures: technical information like malware signatures and malicious code.

Before companies share with the Federal Government, they must remove all personal information. If companies don't follow those requirements, there is no liability protection. Furthermore, a government agency that receives the information must scrub it a second time. This will ensure all personal information has been removed. Only then can the information be forwarded to other Federal agencies.

Finally, the bill provides for strong public and congressional oversight by requiring a detailed biennial inspectors general report relating to the government's receipt, use, and dissemination of cyber threat indicators. The Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board must also submit a biennial report on the privacy and civil liberties impact of the bill.

The increasing pace and scope of cyber attacks cannot be ignored. This bill will strengthen our digital defenses so that American consumers and businesses will not be put at the mercy of cyber criminals. I look forward to passing this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 1560, the Protecting Cyber Networks Act. At some point, we need to stop just hearing about cyber attacks that steal our most valuable trade secrets and our most private information and actually do something to stop it. At some point, we need to stop talking about the next Sony, the next Anthem, the next Target, the next JPMorgan Chase, and the next State Department hack and actually pass a bill that will help ensure that there will be no next cyber attack.

A few weeks back, the House Intelligence Committee held an open hearing on the cyber threat to America's private sector. We heard from our witnesses that their businesses are cyber attacked billions of times a day—not thousands, not millions, but billions.

The threat to our economy, our jobs, and our privacy from not acting is massive, and it is certain. We see it happening all around us. So we must act now. That is why I am proud to support this bill.

The Protecting Cyber Networks Act provides for voluntary information sharing of cyber threats between and among the private and public sectors. It does what no executive order can do: it incentivizes cyber threat information sharing by providing limited liability protection. Now companies can pool their resources and say to one another: I found this malicious code or this virus in my system; you need to protect yourself against it as well. And now the government can better warn

companies of an impending cyber attack, just as it can for an approaching hurricane or an impending flu outbreak.

But let me be very clear about this: to get the liability protection, a company that chooses to participate must remove any unrelated private information prior to sharing. This is something privacy advocates and I called for when previous information-sharing bills came before the House.

Unlike prior bills, this measure requires the private sector to strip out private information. In fact, the bill has two, not one, privacy scrubs. The first happens when a company shares with another company or the Federal Government, and the second happens when the Federal Government shares the information further. This bill even holds the government directly liable if it doesn't do what it is required to do.

Second, to get the liability protection, a private company wishing to share with the Federal Government must go through a civilian portal. To be clear: a company can't go directly to the DOD or NSA and get the bill's liability protection.

The lack of a civilian portal in previous bills was another key privacy group criticism, and this bill has resolved that issue, too. In fact, of the five main criticisms of prior cyber bills, this bill has resolved each of them. It has private sector privacy stripping of information. It has a civilian portal. It also has narrow restrictions on what the government can use that shared cyber threat information for. Gone is a national security use provision. Gone is a vague terrorism use provision. And what is left is only the most narrow of uses: to prevent cyber attacks, to prevent the loss of life, to prevent serious harm to a child, and to prevent other serious felonies.

□ 1445

Gone, too, is any question of whether offensive countermeasures or hack back is authorized. This bill makes clear that you cannot take anything but defensive actions to protect your networks and data.

And, lest anyone be confused, Mr. Chairman, this bill makes clear in black-and-white legislative text that nothing in the bill authorizes government surveillance in this act—nothing.

What this bill does is authorize voluntary, private sector sharing of cyber threat information, and it allows the government to be able to quickly share threat information with the private sector, just as we need a CDC to put out timely warnings and advice on how to counteract this year's flu strain or how to prevent a local disease from becoming an epidemic. In addition, the bill requires strong privacy and civil liberties guidelines and intense reporting requirements.

The bill before us today strikes the right balance between securing our networks and protecting our privacy, and addresses the privacy concerns

that I, among others, raised last session. However, there are still some improvements that are yet to be made as the bill moves forward. In particular, we need to further clarify that our liability protection only extends to those who act, or fail to act, reasonably.

Before closing, I want to thank Chairman NUNES for his leadership and for working so hard on this bill. It has been a great pleasure to work with you, Mr. Chairman. I am grateful for all of the hours, energy, and talent that you and your staff have put in to making this bill successful. I want to thank all the members of HPSCI as well as the Judiciary Committee and the Homeland Security Committee for working together on this. We had many differences in opinion, and we still have some, but we kept our eyes firmly on what is best for the American people as a whole. With that, we found ways to come together and produce a stronger bill.

Mr. Chairman, I hope we can continue to work together as well with the Senate and with the White House and all the stakeholders to produce an even stronger bill for the President to sign into law.

I also want to acknowledge the leadership of our predecessors, DUTCH RUPPERSBERGER and former HPSCI Chairman Mike Rogers. We have come this far in part because of the good work they did in the last couple of sessions. I also want to thank all those who came in to speak with us and provide their input in making this a better bill.

Every day we delay more privacy is stolen, more jobs are lost, and more economic harm is done. Let's stop sitting by and watching all of this happen. Let's do something. Let's do what this administration has urged us to do and pass this bill. Let's do it now. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NUNES. Madam Chair, at this time I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND), who also is the chairman of the Subcommittee on NSA and Cybersecurity for the House Intelligence Committee.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Thank you, Chairman NUNES.

Madam Chairman, today I rise in support of H.R. 1560, the Protecting Cyber Networks Act. The bill encourages and protects information sharing on cyber threats between private companies and the government and private companies. The bill safeguards personally identifiable information from being exchanged during the process by requiring private companies and the government to both make sure that no private information is exchanged.

My home State of Georgia is home to many companies that deal with and secure sensitive data on a daily basis, and they are constantly looking for better ways to protect their networks.

After recent cyber attacks against American businesses, I have spoken to industry leaders from Georgia and

across the Nation about how we can make information sharing between the industries and the government stronger to better protect our Nation.

Cyberterrorism is the new battlefield, and adapting to this warfare is crucial to eliminating these threats. By allowing American businesses to alert other companies and the government of specific threats, and only the threats, the Protecting Cyber Networks Act can help shut down the cybercriminals from stealing sensitive information or causing devastating damage to our networks.

The Protecting Cyber Networks Act is a bipartisan step forward in protecting businesses and citizens from being the next victim of a cyber attack. This bill helps devastating cyber attacks from going unnoticed or only being shared months after the attack.

Madam Chairman, I would like to thank Chairman NUNES; Ranking Member SCHIFF; the ranking member on the subcommittee, Mr. HIMES; and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER for all the work that he has put into this, as well as former Chairman Rogers. I ask for a "yea" vote on this.

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Chair, it is a pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RUPPERSBERGER), the former ranking member of the Intelligence Committee.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of the bipartisan Protecting Cyber Networks Act and want to thank the members of the House Intelligence Committee for continuing to prioritize our Nation's security over partisan rhetoric. I do want to say this: I want to thank Chairman NUNES and also Ranking Member SCHIFF for acknowledging Chairman Rogers and me, but I want to remind you that it was a team approach, and you two were very active in helping to bring this bill here today as we did before. So thank you for your leadership. It is well worth it, and it is refreshing to see this bipartisanship.

Mr. NUNES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. NUNES. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thanked you in my opening statement, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, but without your leadership and former Chairman Rogers' leadership on this bill, we would not be here today. I am encouraged not only by your past support, but then your taking the time to come down here to speak on this bill I think says a lot about you and your commitment to our national security and the security of our cyber networks. So thank you.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Thank you, again, and thank you for your leadership. Now, this legislation is very similar to the bill that Chairman Rogers and I introduced to promote information sharing between the private and public sectors, which is the single most important thing we can do to combat increasingly aggressive cyber attacks.

Experts believe these attacks are costing American corporations billions of dollars each year. Target, Home Depot, and CareFirst are only the beginning. With Sony, we saw the first destructive attack in our country. It is only a matter of time before our critical infrastructure is targeted. What would happen if someone were to take out our electrical grid or 911 call centers or air traffic control? It goes on and on.

Voluntary information sharing among companies helps our companies defend themselves. Voluntary, two-way information sharing with the Federal Government helps improve our ability to protect America against foreign cyber threats by getting out more and better information faster.

There are some concerns I have, as anyone has in any bill, between the bill and the bill Chairman Rogers and I introduced which passed the House.

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. FOXX). The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. However, I feel it is important to reach consensus and move this issue forward now. Our country continues to be cyber attacked. We are under attack as I speak. To do nothing is not an option.

I want to thank again the leadership of Chairman NUNES and Ranking Member SCHIFF for their leadership and for the entire committee coming together for this bill, and I ask my colleagues to support it.

Mr. NUNES. Madam Chair, at this time I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL), the chairman of the Homeland Security Committee, who, without his strong leadership and support, we wouldn't be at this juncture today getting a bill passed today and tomorrow that will hopefully become law.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Chair, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1560, the Protecting Cyber Networks Act. I would like to first thank Chairman NUNES for his great leadership and collaboration with my committee and Judiciary on this bill, and also the ranking member, ADAM SCHIFF, a good friend as well, for his great work in the direction that this bill has gone. I think it has gone in the right direction. Also I know former Ranking Member DUTCH RUPPERSBERGER was here. I want to thank him for his leadership over the many years on this important issue of cybersecurity.

Madam Chair, this legislation comes at a critical time of rising cyber threats and attacks on our digital networks. Cyber breaches and attacks are affecting Americans' privacy, security, and prosperity. Individuals are having their most private information compromised. Businesses are seeing their intellectual property stolen and their networks damaged.

The Federal Government's sensitive information is being targeted. The country's critical infrastructure is being probed by foreign enemies.

Detecting and defending against these digital assaults requires timely and robust information sharing between the public and private sectors. This exchange of data is crucial to connecting the dots, identifying cyber attacks, and shutting them down.

The Protecting Cyber Networks Act will enable private companies to share cyber threat information on a voluntary basis with the Federal Government. This bill provides essential liability protection for sharing cyber threat indicators through trusted civilian agency portals.

Again, Madam Chair, I commend Chairman NUNES for his important work on this bill and thank him for his great partnership in working together to have these two complementary bills, as tomorrow I will bring to the floor a pro-security, pro-privacy bill, the National Cybersecurity Protection Advancement Act of 2015, which further reinforces the role of the Department of Homeland Security's National Cybersecurity and Communications Integration Center as the hub for cyber threat information sharing.

Chairman NUNES and I have worked in lockstep to remove obstacles preventing greater cyber threat information sharing across the private and public sectors. I commend the staff on both sides of the aisle, who have operated in tandem as we crafted these cybersecurity bills. I would also like to acknowledge Chairman GOODLATTE for devising the House's standard liability exemption language for this week's cybersecurity bill.

These bills represent a unified front in the House for strengthening cybersecurity while ensuring Americans' privacy, and I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Chair, it gives me great pleasure to yield 3 minutes to Mr. HIMES, one of our subcommittee ranking members on the Intelligence Committee and the Representative from Connecticut.

Mr. HIMES. Madam Chairwoman, I would like to thank my friend from California for yielding time and start by saying that I am thrilled to be standing here to urge support for the Protecting Cyber Networks Act. I would like to thank and congratulate Chairman NUNES, Ranking Member SCHIFF, and the chairman of the subcommittee on which I serve as ranking member, Mr. WESTMORELAND, for coming together at a time when this Congress is accused, often rightly so, of being dysfunctional to take a very substantial step to secure the networks on which so much of our lives today depend.

As ranking member of the Cybersecurity Subcommittee, my daily travels every single day expose me to people who say the single most important thing we as a Congress can do today to advance the security of our networks, to protect Americans, their financial records, their health records and, of course, even more ominously, to protect them against potential attack

against our utilities and any sort of thing that our antagonists around the world would seek to do to us, the single most important thing we can do is to do what we are doing today, which is to set up a rubric whereby the very good people within the private sector who focus on this day in and day out can communicate threats to each other and communicate with the experts within the United States Government to work as a team to counter very, very serious threats. This rubric has been set up with ample attention and good attention to the very legitimate privacy claims and the liberties that we all take so seriously.

The stakes are high. We saw what happened at Sony. We saw what happened at Anthem. We know all the attacks that have been leveled internationally that destroyed computers. This is the reality that we live with, and this is a very big step, an information-sharing protocol that will counter those who wish us ill.

I would note that the privacy protections in this bill are considerably better, as the chairman and ranking member have pointed out, than those that were in the bill of the last Congress. The objections of those who are focused on privacy have been dealt with point by point. And while I won't say that the bill is perfect, this bill does what it needs to do to protect the privacy of the American people by obligating everyone to work hard to scrub personally identifiable information from any code, any information that is exchanged.

I have learned in my 6 years here that we don't produce perfection, and it is my hope that as this bill proceeds through the legislative path that we will work even harder to make sure we are very clear about definitions and, in fact, are protecting the privacy rights of Americans as best as we can. But in the meantime we have taken a very big step forward in a bipartisan fashion in a way that will make America, its people, and its networks more secure. For that, I am grateful to the leadership and urge support of the Protecting Cyber Networks Act.

Mr. NUNES. Madam Chair, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SWALWELL), another of our ranking members on the Intelligence Committee and a colleague from California.

□ 1500

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Madam Chair, I want to thank our ranking member and also the chair for bringing forward this bipartisan and necessary legislation.

As we speak right now, Americans are under attack, and these attacks are not coming in the form of anything that we have been used to before. People are not kicking down front doors of homes and businesses; instead, they are

attacking us through our networks. Our bank accounts, our health care records, our social media accounts, our cell phones, all are being hacked every day.

CNN reported that, in 2014, half of the Nation's adults were hacked. The examples are voluminous: 70 million Target customers were hacked; 56 million Home Depot customers were hacked; 4.6 million Snapchat users were hacked. This is Snapchat, which is supposed to be an impenetrable account that allows data to come in and disappear. They were hacked. Hackings are happening every day. Our privacy is under attack.

The problem, today, there is virtually zero relationship between private industry and government—private industry, which has about 85 percent of the networks, and government, which has about 15 percent of the networks but has vast resources that can help protect individuals against attacks.

Our government has a duty, a responsibility, to protect the American people, and that is what this bill seeks to do. It does it in a number of ways.

First and foremost, this is a voluntary program that is being created. No business is required to turn over their breach or hack information to the government; instead, there is a format, a procedure, that is now in place that will incentivize them to work with the government to identify in a way that strips out, through a number of protections, personal identifying information.

The first way that it is stripped out is, when the business that has been hacked reports to a civilian agency, they must scrub the personal identifying information; but that is not the only way that that information is scrubbed.

Once the government agency receives this personal identifying information, again, before it can be used or forwarded anywhere else in the government, it, again, must be scrubbed—two protections against personal identifying information being used.

Now, should any personal identifying information be passed along to the government, this bill provides a right of action, civil recourse for any individual who is wronged to sue the government. There is also an oversight committee, a biannual inspector general report that must be presented to Congress that would report on any privacy violations that occur.

Madam Chair, the American people, day after day, are either learning that they have been hacked or someone they know has been hacked. This will continue to have a devastating effect on our economy and, as my colleague from Connecticut alluded to, perhaps our public utilities if we do not act.

I urge support of this for my colleagues, and I thank the chairman and the ranking member for the hard work they have done.

Mr. NUNES. Madam Chair, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL), another one of the ranking members on the Intelligence Committee and a great Member.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Madam Chair, I would like to thank Ranking Member ADAM SCHIFF, as well as our chair, Chairman NUNES, for your leadership on this matter.

Today, I rise in support of H.R. 1560, the Protecting Cyber Networks Act, a bill that I am proud to be an original cosponsor, a bill that was unanimously voted out of our committee, the Intel Committee.

Again, I want to commend both the chairman and the ranking member for their leadership. It is an honor to serve on that committee where we really try, on a daily basis, to be bipartisan in our efforts to protect the homeland and to secure our national security.

This critical bill is bipartisan legislation, which encourages the private sector to share cyber threat information, which will ultimately help prevent future attacks. It seems like we are always hearing about another company being hit with cyber attacks.

These attacks cost our economy billions of dollars each year, and it threatens our national security and jeopardizes every American's sensitive, personal, and financial information.

This bill takes a very important step towards addressing this emerging national security threat without compromising the privacy of American citizens.

Fostering an environment where companies can voluntarily share information with each other helps American businesses defend themselves against harmful cyber attacks and helps them protect consumer information and privacy.

Additionally, two-way information sharing with the Federal Government helps improve the Federal Government's ability to protect all Americans against foreign cyber threats by disseminating vital information in a more timely and efficient manner.

I know some continue to criticize this cyber bill and all cyber bills as violating privacy, but I must assure you, Madam Chair, that this bill is a vast improvement over the CISA bill that was entered and passed this House last term.

This bill includes many more privacy protections that weren't in the original bill, the most important of which is the requirement for two scrubs of private information, one by the private sector before sharing that information and one by the government before sharing it further.

There is also now a civilian portal—no direct sharing with NSA—a very narrow set of government use provisions, and a clear and legislative prohibition against such surveillance. Let me repeat: no provision of this bill provides any surveillance authorities.

I am encouraged by the strong showing of bipartisanship as we work together to address the emerging threats

to our national security. I urge my colleagues to join those of us who are members of the Intel Committee, as well as this administration has said that it also encourages a vote in support of this bill.

I urge my colleagues to support the efforts and vote "yes" on H.R. 1560.

Mr. NUNES. Madam Chair, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. TROTT).

Mr. TROTT. Madam Chair, I want to thank the gentleman from California for allowing me to speak in support of this bill.

Today, I rise concerned about the need for stronger cybersecurity efforts in our country. We live in a world where personal data flows through the Internet with great speed and data about people is gathered in an instant. The use of social media has opened up our lives to anyone with a computing device, and this is the same world where hackers steal millions of personal records from people in our districts.

I would venture to guess that most Members of Congress have been affected by hackers. Internet criminals pose dire threats to our governments on the local, State, and Federal level. The Federal Government has extensive resources to put up a fight, but our local governments and municipalities do not.

In response, five southeast Michigan counties—Livingston, Monroe, Oakland, Washtenaw, and Wayne—and the State of Michigan came together to build the Cyber Security Assessment for Everyone. CySAFE, as it is known, provides a strong point for governments to begin assessing their cybersecurity needs and taking steps to respond to attacks. The assessment is a simple Excel download located at www.g2gmarket.com.

Madam Chair, I commend these local Michigan governments for committing the resources to develop such a tool. I encourage all of my colleagues to promote the use of CySAFE and to work together to find the right solutions to fight cyber crime, starting with passing H.R. 1560.

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Chair, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN), who is a former member of the Intelligence Committee and one of the Congress' leading experts on cyber matters.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chair, this has been a long time in coming. When I served on the Intelligence Committee the past two Congresses, I worked very closely with Chairman Rogers and Ranking Member RUPPERSBERGER on CISPA, and their legacy is very evident in this fine bill.

I would, however, like to commend Chairman NUNES and Ranking Member SCHIFF for rising to the challenge as the new leaders of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and producing an even better product,

particularly with regard to privacy protections.

PCNA, as it is known, also provides statutory authorization for the CTIIC, an important new center the President has created to provide comprehensive assessments of cyber threats.

This bill before us certainly isn't perfect. The liability protections, while generally narrow, could still be construed to project a company's failure to act on threat indicators. It is important that my friends in this Chamber understand that information sharing is not a silver bullet.

There will still be important work to be done to improve our Nation's cyber defenses, but I can say, with great confidence, passing an information-sharing bill will get us significantly closer to being much more secure in cyberspace than where we are right now, particularly when it comes to protecting critical infrastructure.

However, after studying this issue for the better part of a decade, I can firmly say that this bill marks a meaningful step forward.

Let me, again, congratulate the chairman and the ranking member for continuing with this bipartisan spirit that has long animated the Intelligence Committee's cybersecurity work.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. NUNES. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Every moment we wait equals another Social Security number stolen, another checking account hacked, another invaluable trade secret pilfered, and another job lost. This is certain. We see it every day.

Many of us and our constituents, both individuals and businesses, have been the victim of a cyber crime. Whether it is identity theft, the hacking of our email or Facebook accounts, or the loss of our privacy, when our health insurance company is breached, we have our privacy invaded.

All of us are certainly paying higher fees to compensate for the billions of dollars our businesses lose to cyber hacking and to the costs of preventing future cyber attacks. The problem is only getting worse. As our cars, our phones, our home security systems, our Internet banking, our electronic health records, our web-based baby monitors all get smarter, they also get more vulnerable.

This isn't speculation. This is happening today. It is happening right now. On the time that we have been on the floor discussing this cyber bill, billions of additional hacking attempts have been made.

Here, we have the opportunity to help stop this scourge of cyber hacking. We need to encourage cyber threat information sharing by passing the Protecting Cyber Networks Act today and then not resting until it improves on its way to the President's desk for signature.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this important measure. It is a bill that will help protect America's most valuable and private information, while itself protecting privacy and civil liberties to a degree far in advance of where prior legislation has gone. I and my colleagues have made sure of that, and we will continue to do so as the bill advances.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I will close by just taking a few moments to thank my ranking member and colleague from California (Mr. SCHIFF) for his fine work on this product.

I also would be remiss not to thank, on both sides of the aisle, the staff that have worked hours and hours and hours to make the legislation from last Congress even better and then, as Mr. MCCAUL said, to work with the Judiciary Committee and the Homeland Security Committee so that we have a product that I think is much better than the product that we have had in the past.

We have been in consultations with the United States Senate. They have passed their bill out of committee. We look forward to, hopefully, their passing a bill off the Senate floor so that we can get to a conference.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Chair, I rise today to oppose to H.R. 1560, the Protecting Cyber Network Act (PCNA). While I commend Chairman NUNES and Ranking Member SCHIFF for crafting a bill that improves upon the cybersecurity legislation this body has previously voted on, I cannot support it in its current form.

Despite addressing many of the reservations I had when we voted on the Cyber Intelligence Sharing and Protection Act (CISPA) last Congress, I have concerns about the ambiguous liability provisions in this legislation. While companies should have some legal protection, this bill gives liability protections to companies so long as they share or receive information "in accordance with the Act." It would grant immunity to companies for simply putting forth a "good faith" effort when reporting security threats and sharing consumer data with the government and other companies. For example, companies would receive liability protection even if they fail to act on threat information in a timely manner. The unintended effect of these murky liability provisions is that companies would not have the same incentive to report security threats and protect their consumers' privacy. I was disappointed that Republicans did not allow a vote on two amendments offered by Rep. RICHMOND that would have addressed these overbroad liability provisions.

Our country faces cyber-network attacks each day which threaten our national security and our economy. I strongly believe that we must take steps to protect against these cyber threats while not sacrificing our privacy and civil liberties. Should this bill pass the House,

I hope that many of the loopholes can be resolved with the Senate, but as it stands today I cannot support it.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

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

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 recommended by the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

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

H.R. 1560

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the “Protecting Cyber Networks Act”.

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. Sharing of cyber threat indicators and defensive measures by the Federal Government with non-Federal entities.

Sec. 3. Authorizations for preventing, detecting, analyzing, and mitigating cybersecurity threats.

Sec. 4. Sharing of cyber threat indicators and defensive measures with appropriate Federal entities other than the Department of Defense or the National Security Agency.

Sec. 5. Federal Government liability for violations of privacy or civil liberties.

Sec. 6. Protection from liability.

Sec. 7. Oversight of Government activities.

Sec. 8. Report on cybersecurity threats.

Sec. 9. Construction and preemption.

Sec. 10. Conforming amendments.

Sec. 11. Definitions.

SEC. 2. SHARING OF CYBER THREAT INDICATORS AND DEFENSIVE MEASURES BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT WITH NON-FEDERAL ENTITIES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Title I of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3021 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 110 (50 U.S.C. 3045) the following new section:

“SEC. 111. SHARING OF CYBER THREAT INDICATORS AND DEFENSIVE MEASURES BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT WITH NON-FEDERAL ENTITIES.

“(a) **SHARING BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Consistent with the protection of classified information, intelligence sources and methods, and privacy and civil liberties, the Director of National Intelligence, in consultation with the heads of the other appropriate Federal entities, shall develop and promulgate procedures to facilitate and promote—

“(A) the timely sharing of classified cyber threat indicators in the possession of the Federal Government with representatives of relevant non-Federal entities with appropriate security clearances;

“(B) the timely sharing with relevant non-Federal entities of cyber threat indicators in the possession of the Federal Government that may be declassified and shared at an unclassified level; and

“(C) the sharing with non-Federal entities, if appropriate, of information in the possession of the Federal Government about imminent or on-

going cybersecurity threats to such entities to prevent or mitigate adverse impacts from such cybersecurity threats.

“(2) **DEVELOPMENT OF PROCEDURES.**—The procedures developed and promulgated under paragraph (1) shall—

“(A) ensure the Federal Government has and maintains the capability to share cyber threat indicators in real time consistent with the protection of classified information;

“(B) incorporate, to the greatest extent practicable, existing processes and existing roles and responsibilities of Federal and non-Federal entities for information sharing by the Federal Government, including sector-specific information sharing and analysis centers;

“(C) include procedures for notifying non-Federal entities that have received a cyber threat indicator from a Federal entity in accordance with this Act that is known or determined to be in error or in contravention of the requirements of this section, the Protecting Cyber Networks Act, or the amendments made by such Act or another provision of Federal law or policy of such error or contravention;

“(D) include requirements for Federal entities receiving a cyber threat indicator or defensive measure to implement appropriate security controls to protect against unauthorized access to, or acquisition of, such cyber threat indicator or defensive measure;

“(E) include procedures that require Federal entities, prior to the sharing of a cyber threat indicator, to—

“(i) review such cyber threat indicator to assess whether such cyber threat indicator, in contravention of the requirement under section 3(d)(2) of the Protecting Cyber Networks Act, contains any information that such Federal entity knows at the time of sharing to be personal information of or information identifying a specific person not directly related to a cybersecurity threat and remove such information; or

“(ii) implement a technical capability configured to remove or exclude any personal information of or information identifying a specific person not directly related to a cybersecurity threat; and

“(F) include procedures to promote the efficient granting of security clearances to appropriate representatives of non-Federal entities.

“(b) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section, the terms ‘appropriate Federal entities’, ‘cyber threat indicator’, ‘defensive measure’, ‘Federal entity’, and ‘non-Federal entity’ have the meaning given such terms in section 11 of the Protecting Cyber Networks Act.”

(b) **SUBMITTAL TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence, in consultation with the heads of the other appropriate Federal entities, shall submit to Congress the procedures required by section 111(a) of the National Security Act of 1947, as inserted by subsection (a) of this section.

(c) **TABLE OF CONTENTS AMENDMENT.**—The table of contents in the first section of the National Security Act of 1947 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 110 the following new item:

“Sec. 111. Sharing of cyber threat indicators and defensive measures by the Federal Government with non-Federal entities.”

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATIONS FOR PREVENTING, DETECTING, ANALYZING, AND MITIGATING CYBERSECURITY THREATS.

(a) **AUTHORIZATION FOR PRIVATE-SECTOR DEFENSIVE MONITORING.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a private entity may, for a cybersecurity purpose, monitor—

(A) an information system of such private entity;

(B) an information system of a non-Federal entity or a Federal entity, upon the written authorization of such non-Federal entity or such Federal entity; and

(C) information that is stored on, processed by, or transiting an information system monitored by the private entity under this paragraph.

(2) **CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to—

(A) authorize the monitoring of an information system, or the use of any information obtained through such monitoring, other than as provided in this Act;

(B) authorize the Federal Government to conduct surveillance of any person; or

(C) limit otherwise lawful activity.

(b) **AUTHORIZATION FOR OPERATION OF DEFENSIVE MEASURES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2) and notwithstanding any other provision of law, a private entity may, for a cybersecurity purpose, operate a defensive measure that is operated on and is limited to—

(A) an information system of such private entity to protect the rights or property of the private entity; and

(B) an information system of a non-Federal entity or a Federal entity upon written authorization of such non-Federal entity or such Federal entity for operation of such defensive measure to protect the rights or property of such private entity, such non-Federal entity, or such Federal entity.

(2) **LIMITATION.**—The authority provided in paragraph (1) does not include the intentional or reckless operation of any defensive measure that destroys, renders unusable or inaccessible (in whole or in part), substantially harms, or initiates a new action, process, or procedure on an information system or information stored on, processed by, or transiting such information system not owned by—

(A) the private entity operating such defensive measure; or

(B) a non-Federal entity or a Federal entity that has provided written authorization to that private entity for operation of such defensive measure on the information system or information of the entity in accordance with this subsection.

(3) **CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed—

(A) to authorize the use of a defensive measure other than as provided in this subsection; or

(B) to limit otherwise lawful activity.

(c) **AUTHORIZATION FOR SHARING OR RECEIVING CYBER THREAT INDICATORS OR DEFENSIVE MEASURES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2) and notwithstanding any other provision of law, a non-Federal entity may, for a cybersecurity purpose and consistent with the requirement under subsection (d)(2) to remove personal information of or information identifying a specific person not directly related to a cybersecurity threat and the protection of classified information—

(A) share a lawfully obtained cyber threat indicator or defensive measure with any other non-Federal entity or an appropriate Federal entity (other than the Department of Defense or any component of the Department, including the National Security Agency); and

(B) receive a cyber threat indicator or defensive measure from any other non-Federal entity or an appropriate Federal entity.

(2) **LAWFUL RESTRICTION.**—A non-Federal entity receiving a cyber threat indicator or defensive measure from another non-Federal entity or a Federal entity shall comply with otherwise lawful restrictions placed on the sharing or use of such cyber threat indicator or defensive measure by the sharing non-Federal entity or Federal entity.

(3) **CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to—

(A) authorize the sharing or receiving of a cyber threat indicator or defensive measure other than as provided in this subsection;

(B) authorize the sharing or receiving of classified information by or with any person not authorized to access such classified information;

(C) prohibit any Federal entity from engaging in formal or informal technical discussion regarding cyber threat indicators or defensive measures with a non-Federal entity or from providing technical assistance to address vulnerabilities or mitigate threats at the request of such an entity;

(D) limit otherwise lawful activity;

(E) prohibit a non-Federal entity, if authorized by applicable law or regulation other than this Act, from sharing a cyber threat indicator or defensive measure with the Department of Defense or any component of the Department, including the National Security Agency; or

(F) authorize the Federal Government to conduct surveillance of any person.

(d) PROTECTION AND USE OF INFORMATION.—

(1) SECURITY OF INFORMATION.—A non-Federal entity monitoring an information system, operating a defensive measure, or providing or receiving a cyber threat indicator or defensive measure under this section shall implement an appropriate security control to protect against unauthorized access to, or acquisition of, such cyber threat indicator or defensive measure.

(2) REMOVAL OF CERTAIN PERSONAL INFORMATION.—A non-Federal entity sharing a cyber threat indicator pursuant to this Act shall, prior to such sharing, take reasonable efforts to—

(A) review such cyber threat indicator to assess whether such cyber threat indicator contains any information that the non-Federal entity reasonably believes at the time of sharing to be personal information of or information identifying a specific person not directly related to a cybersecurity threat and remove such information; or

(B) implement a technical capability configured to remove any information contained within such indicator that the non-Federal entity reasonably believes at the time of sharing to be personal information of or information identifying a specific person not directly related to a cybersecurity threat.

(3) USE OF CYBER THREAT INDICATORS AND DEFENSIVE MEASURES BY NON-FEDERAL ENTITIES.—A non-Federal entity may, for a cybersecurity purpose—

(A) use a cyber threat indicator or defensive measure shared or received under this section to monitor or operate a defensive measure on—

(i) an information system of such non-Federal entity; or

(ii) an information system of another non-Federal entity or a Federal entity upon the written authorization of that other non-Federal entity or that Federal entity; and

(B) otherwise use, retain, and further share such cyber threat indicator or defensive measure subject to—

(i) an otherwise lawful restriction placed by the sharing non-Federal entity or Federal entity on such cyber threat indicator or defensive measure; or

(ii) an otherwise applicable provision of law.

(4) USE OF CYBER THREAT INDICATORS BY STATE, TRIBAL, OR LOCAL GOVERNMENT.—

(A) LAW ENFORCEMENT USE.—A State, tribal, or local government may use a cyber threat indicator shared with such State, tribal, or local government for the purposes described in clauses (i), (ii), and (iii) of section 4(d)(5)(A).

(B) EXEMPTION FROM DISCLOSURE.—A cyber threat indicator shared with a State, tribal, or local government under this section shall be—

(i) deemed voluntarily shared information; and

(ii) exempt from disclosure under any State, tribal, or local law requiring disclosure of information or records, except as otherwise required by applicable State, tribal, or local law requiring disclosure in any criminal prosecution.

(e) NO RIGHT OR BENEFIT.—The sharing of a cyber threat indicator with a non-Federal entity under this Act shall not create a right or benefit to similar information by such non-Federal entity or any other non-Federal entity.

SEC. 4. SHARING OF CYBER THREAT INDICATORS AND DEFENSIVE MEASURES WITH APPROPRIATE FEDERAL ENTITIES OTHER THAN THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE OR THE NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY.

(a) REQUIREMENT FOR POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 111 of the National Security Act of 1947, as inserted by section 2 of this Act, is amended—

(A) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c); and

(B) by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsection:

“(b) POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR SHARING WITH THE APPROPRIATE FEDERAL ENTITIES OTHER THAN THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE OR THE NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The President shall develop and submit to Congress policies and procedures relating to the receipt of cyber threat indicators and defensive measures by the Federal Government.

“(2) REQUIREMENTS CONCERNING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.—The policies and procedures required under paragraph (1) shall—

“(A) be developed in accordance with the privacy and civil liberties guidelines required under section 4(b) of the Protecting Cyber Networks Act;

“(B) ensure that—

“(i) a cyber threat indicator shared by a non-Federal entity with an appropriate Federal entity (other than the Department of Defense or any component of the Department, including the National Security Agency) pursuant to section 3 of such Act is shared in real-time with all of the appropriate Federal entities (including all relevant components thereof);

“(ii) the sharing of such cyber threat indicator with appropriate Federal entities is not subject to any delay, modification, or any other action without good cause that could impede receipt by all of the appropriate Federal entities; and

“(iii) such cyber threat indicator is provided to each other Federal entity to which such cyber threat indicator is relevant; and

“(C) ensure there—

“(i) is an audit capability; and

“(ii) are appropriate sanctions in place for officers, employees, or agents of a Federal entity who knowingly and willfully use a cyber threat indicator or defense measure shared with the Federal Government by a non-Federal entity under the Protecting Cyber Networks Act other than in accordance with this section and such Act.”.

(2) SUBMISSION.—The President shall submit to Congress—

(A) not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, interim policies and procedures required under section 111(b)(1) of the National Security Act of 1947, as inserted by paragraph (1) of this section; and

(B) not later than 180 days after such date, final policies and procedures required under such section 111(b)(1).

(b) PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES.—

(1) GUIDELINES OF ATTORNEY GENERAL.—The Attorney General, in consultation with the heads of the other appropriate Federal agencies and with officers designated under section 1062 of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 2000ee-1), shall develop and periodically review guidelines relating to privacy and civil liberties that govern the receipt, retention, use, and dissemination of cyber threat indicators by a Federal entity obtained in accordance with this Act and the amendments made by this Act.

(2) CONTENT.—The guidelines developed and reviewed under paragraph (1) shall, consistent with the need to protect information systems from cybersecurity threats and mitigate cybersecurity threats—

(A) limit the impact on privacy and civil liberties of activities by the Federal Government

under this Act, including guidelines to ensure that personal information of or information identifying specific persons is properly removed from information received, retained, used, or disseminated by a Federal entity in accordance with this Act or the amendments made by this Act;

(B) limit the receipt, retention, use, and dissemination of cyber threat indicators containing personal information of or information identifying specific persons, including by establishing—

(i) a process for the prompt destruction of such information that is known not to be directly related to a use for a cybersecurity purpose;

(ii) specific limitations on the length of any period in which a cyber threat indicator may be retained; and

(iii) a process to inform recipients that such indicators may only be used for a cybersecurity purpose;

(C) include requirements to safeguard cyber threat indicators containing personal information of or identifying specific persons from unauthorized access or acquisition, including appropriate sanctions for activities by officers, employees, or agents of the Federal Government in contravention of such guidelines;

(D) include procedures for notifying non-Federal entities and Federal entities if information received pursuant to this section is known or determined by a Federal entity receiving such information not to constitute a cyber threat indicator;

(E) be consistent with any other applicable provisions of law and the fair information practice principles set forth in appendix A of the document entitled “National Strategy for Trusted Identities in Cyberspace” and published by the President in April, 2011; and

(F) include steps that may be needed so that dissemination of cyber threat indicators is consistent with the protection of classified information and other sensitive national security information.

(3) SUBMISSION.—The Attorney General shall submit to Congress—

(A) not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, interim guidelines required under paragraph (1); and

(B) not later than 180 days after such date, final guidelines required under such paragraph.

(c) NATIONAL CYBER THREAT INTELLIGENCE INTEGRATION CENTER.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—Title I of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3021 et seq.), as amended by section 2 of this Act, is further amended—

(A) by redesignating section 119B as section 119C; and

(B) by inserting after section 119A the following new section:

“SEC. 119B. CYBER THREAT INTELLIGENCE INTEGRATION CENTER.

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is within the Office of the Director of National Intelligence a Cyber Threat Intelligence Integration Center.

“(b) DIRECTOR.—There is a Director of the Cyber Threat Intelligence Integration Center, who shall be the head of the Cyber Threat Intelligence Integration Center, and who shall be appointed by the Director of National Intelligence.

“(c) PRIMARY MISSIONS.—The Cyber Threat Intelligence Integration Center shall—

“(1) serve as the primary organization within the Federal Government for analyzing and integrating all intelligence possessed or acquired by the United States pertaining to cyber threats;

“(2) ensure that appropriate departments and agencies have full access to and receive all-source intelligence support needed to execute the cyber threat intelligence activities of such agencies and to perform independent, alternative analyses;

“(3) disseminate cyber threat analysis to the President, the appropriate departments and agencies of the Federal Government, and the appropriate committees of Congress;

“(4) coordinate cyber threat intelligence activities of the departments and agencies of the Federal Government; and

“(5) conduct strategic cyber threat intelligence planning for the Federal Government.

“(d) LIMITATIONS.—The Cyber Threat Intelligence Integration Center shall—

“(1) have not more than 50 permanent positions;

“(2) in carrying out the primary missions of the Center described in subsection (c), may not augment staffing through detailees, assignees, or core contractor personnel or enter into any personal services contracts to exceed the limitation under paragraph (1); and

“(3) be located in a building owned or operated by an element of the intelligence community as of the date of the enactment of this section.”

(2) TABLE OF CONTENTS AMENDMENTS.—The table of contents in the first section of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended by section 2 of this Act, is further amended by striking the item relating to section 119B and inserting the following new items:

“Sec. 119B. Cyber Threat Intelligence Integration Center.

“Sec. 119C. National intelligence centers.”

(d) INFORMATION SHARED WITH OR PROVIDED TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.—

(1) NO WAIVER OF PRIVILEGE OR PROTECTION.—The provision of a cyber threat indicator or defensive measure to the Federal Government under this Act shall not constitute a waiver of any applicable privilege or protection provided by law, including trade secret protection.

(2) PROPRIETARY INFORMATION.—Consistent with section 3(c)(2), a cyber threat indicator or defensive measure provided by a non-Federal entity to the Federal Government under this Act shall be considered the commercial, financial, and proprietary information of the non-Federal entity that is the originator of such cyber threat indicator or defensive measure when so designated by such non-Federal entity or a non-Federal entity acting in accordance with the written authorization of the non-Federal entity that is the originator of such cyber threat indicator or defensive measure.

(3) EXEMPTION FROM DISCLOSURE.—A cyber threat indicator or defensive measure provided to the Federal Government under this Act shall be—

(A) deemed voluntarily shared information and exempt from disclosure under section 552 of title 5, United States Code, and any State, tribal, or local law requiring disclosure of information or records; and

(B) withheld, without discretion, from the public under section 552(b)(3)(B) of title 5, United States Code, and any State, tribal, or local provision of law requiring disclosure of information or records, except as otherwise required by applicable Federal, State, tribal, or local law requiring disclosure in any criminal prosecution.

(4) EX PARTE COMMUNICATIONS.—The provision of a cyber threat indicator or defensive measure to the Federal Government under this Act shall not be subject to a rule of any Federal department or agency or any judicial doctrine regarding ex parte communications with a decision-making official.

(5) DISCLOSURE, RETENTION, AND USE.—

(A) AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES.—A cyber threat indicator or defensive measure provided to the Federal Government under this Act may be disclosed to, retained by, and used by, consistent with otherwise applicable provisions of Federal law, any department, agency, component, officer, employee, or agent of the Federal Government solely for—

(i) a cybersecurity purpose;

(ii) the purpose of responding to, prosecuting, or otherwise preventing or mitigating a threat of death or serious bodily harm or an offense arising out of such a threat;

(iii) the purpose of responding to, or otherwise preventing or mitigating, a serious threat to a minor, including sexual exploitation and threats to physical safety; or

(iv) the purpose of preventing, investigating, disrupting, or prosecuting any of the offenses listed in sections 1028, 1029, 1030, and 3559(c)(2)(F) and chapters 37 and 90 of title 18, United States Code.

(B) PROHIBITED ACTIVITIES.—A cyber threat indicator or defensive measure provided to the Federal Government under this Act shall not be disclosed to, retained by, or used by any Federal department or agency for any use not permitted under subparagraph (A).

(C) PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES.—A cyber threat indicator or defensive measure provided to the Federal Government under this Act shall be retained, used, and disseminated by the Federal Government in accordance with—

(i) the policies and procedures relating to the receipt of cyber threat indicators and defensive measures by the Federal Government required by subsection (b) of section 111 of the National Security Act of 1947, as added by subsection (a) of this section; and

(ii) the privacy and civil liberties guidelines required by subsection (b).

SEC. 5. FEDERAL GOVERNMENT LIABILITY FOR VIOLATIONS OF PRIVACY OR CIVIL LIBERTIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—If a department or agency of the Federal Government intentionally or willfully violates the privacy and civil liberties guidelines issued by the Attorney General under section 4(b), the United States shall be liable to a person injured by such violation in an amount equal to the sum of—

(1) the actual damages sustained by the person as a result of the violation or \$1,000, whichever is greater; and

(2) reasonable attorney fees as determined by the court and other litigation costs reasonably incurred in any case under this subsection in which the complainant has substantially prevailed.

(b) VENUE.—An action to enforce liability created under this section may be brought in the district court of the United States in—

(1) the district in which the complainant resides;

(2) the district in which the principal place of business of the complainant is located;

(3) the district in which the department or agency of the Federal Government that violated such privacy and civil liberties guidelines is located; or

(4) the District of Columbia.

(c) 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 the privacy and civil liberties guidelines issued by the Attorney General under section 4(b) that is the basis for the action.

(d) 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 by a department or agency of the Federal Government under this Act.

SEC. 6. PROTECTION FROM LIABILITY.

(a) MONITORING OF INFORMATION SYSTEMS.—No cause of action shall lie or be maintained in any court against any private entity, and such action shall be promptly dismissed, for the monitoring of an information system and information under section 3(a) that is conducted in good faith in accordance with this Act and the amendments made by this Act.

(b) SHARING OR RECEIPT OF CYBER THREAT INDICATORS.—No cause of action shall lie or be maintained in any court against any non-Federal entity, and such action shall be promptly dismissed, for the sharing or receipt of a cyber threat indicator or defensive measure under section 3(c), or a good faith failure to act based on such sharing or receipt, if such sharing or receipt is conducted in good faith in accordance with this Act and the amendments made by this Act.

(c) WILLFUL MISCONDUCT.—

(1) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed—

(A) to require dismissal of a cause of action against a non-Federal entity (including a private entity) that has engaged in willful misconduct in the course of conducting activities authorized by this Act or the amendments made by this Act; or

(B) to undermine or limit the availability of otherwise applicable common law or statutory defenses.

(2) PROOF OF WILLFUL MISCONDUCT.—In any action claiming that subsection (a) or (b) does not apply due to willful misconduct described in paragraph (1), the plaintiff shall have the burden of proving by clear and convincing evidence the willful misconduct by each non-Federal entity subject to such claim and that such willful misconduct proximately caused injury to the plaintiff.

(3) WILLFUL MISCONDUCT DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term “willful misconduct” means an act or omission that is taken—

(A) intentionally to achieve a wrongful purpose;

(B) knowingly without legal or factual justification; and

(C) in disregard of a known or obvious risk that is so great as to make it highly probable that the harm will outweigh the benefit.

SEC. 7. OVERSIGHT OF GOVERNMENT ACTIVITIES.

(a) BIENNIAL REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 111 of the National Security Act of 1947, as added by section 2(a) and amended by section 4(a) of this Act, is further amended—

(A) by redesignating subsection (c) (as redesignated by such section 4(a)) as subsection (d); and

(B) by inserting after subsection (b) (as inserted by such section 4(a)) the following new subsection:

“(c) BIENNIAL REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not less frequently than once every two years, the Director of National Intelligence, in consultation with the heads of the other appropriate Federal entities, shall submit to Congress a report concerning the implementation of this section and the Protecting Cyber Networks Act.

“(2) CONTENTS.—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

“(A) An assessment of the sufficiency of the policies, procedures, and guidelines required by this section and section 4 of the Protecting Cyber Networks Act in ensuring that cyber threat indicators are shared effectively and responsibly within the Federal Government.

“(B) An assessment of whether the procedures developed under section 3 of such Act comply with the goals described in subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of subsection (a)(1).

“(C) An assessment of whether cyber threat indicators have been properly classified and an accounting of the number of security clearances authorized by the Federal Government for the purposes of this section and such Act.

“(D) A review of the type of cyber threat indicators shared with the Federal Government under this section and such Act, including the following:

“(i) The degree to which such information may impact the privacy and civil liberties of specific persons.

“(ii) A quantitative and qualitative assessment of the impact of the sharing of such cyber threat indicators with the Federal Government on privacy and civil liberties of specific persons.

“(iii) The adequacy of any steps taken by the Federal Government to reduce such impact.

“(E) A review of actions taken by the Federal Government based on cyber threat indicators shared with the Federal Government under this

section or such Act, including the appropriate-ness of any subsequent use or dissemination of such cyber threat indicators by a Federal entity under this section or section 4 of such Act.

“(F) A description of any significant viola-tions of the requirements of this section or such Act by the Federal Government—

“(i) an assessment of all reports of officers, employees, and agents of the Federal Govern-ment misusing information provided to the Fed-eral Government under the Protecting Cyber Networks Act or this section, without regard to whether the misuse was knowing or wilful; and

“(ii) an assessment of all disciplinary actions taken against such officers, employees, and agents.

“(G) A summary of the number and type of non-Federal entities that received classified cyber threat indicators from the Federal Govern-ment under this section or such Act and an evaluation of the risks and benefits of sharing such cyber threat indicators.

“(H) An assessment of any personal informa-tion of or information identifying a specific per-son not directly related to a cybersecurity threat that—

“(i) was shared by a non-Federal entity with the Federal Government under this Act in con-travention of section 3(d)(2); or

“(ii) was shared within the Federal Govern-ment under this Act in contravention of the guidelines required by section 4(b).

“(3) RECOMMENDATIONS.—Each report sub-mitted under paragraph (1) may include such recommendations as the heads of the appro-priate Federal entities may have for improve-ments or modifications to the authorities and processes under this section or such Act.

“(4) FORM OF REPORT.—Each report required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassi-fied form, but may include a classified annex.

“(5) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF REPORTS.—The Director of National Intelligence shall make publicly available the unclassified portion of each report required by paragraph (1).”

(2) INITIAL REPORT.—The first report required under subsection (c) of section 111 of the Na-tional Security Act of 1947, as inserted by para-graph (1) of this subsection, shall be submitted not later than one year after the date of the en-actment of this Act.

(b) REPORTS ON PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIB-ERTIES.—

(1) BIENNIAL REPORT FROM PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES OVERSIGHT BOARD.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 1061(e) of the Intel-ligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 2000ee(e)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) BIENNIAL REPORT ON CERTAIN CYBER AC-TIVITIES.—

“(A) REPORT REQUIRED.—The Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board shall biennially submit to Congress and the President a report containing—

“(i) an assessment of the privacy and civil lib-erties impact of the activities carried out under the Protecting Cyber Networks Act and the amendments made by such Act; and

“(ii) an assessment of the sufficiency of the policies, procedures, and guidelines established pursuant to section 4 of the Protecting Cyber Networks Act and the amendments made by such section 4 in addressing privacy and civil liberties concerns.

“(B) RECOMMENDATIONS.—Each report sub-mitted under this paragraph may include such recommendations as the Privacy and Civil Lib-erties Oversight Board may have for improve-ments or modifications to the authorities under the Protecting Cyber Networks Act or the amendments made by such Act.

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

“(D) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF REPORTS.—The Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board shall make publicly available the unclassified

portion of each report required by subparagraph (A).”

(B) INITIAL REPORT.—The first report required under paragraph (3) of section 1061(e) of the Intel-ligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 2000ee(e)), as added by sub-paragraph (A) of this paragraph, shall be sub-mitted not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) BIENNIAL REPORT OF INSPECTORS GEN-ERAL.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act and not less frequently than once every 2 years there-after, the Inspector General of the Department of Homeland Security, the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community, the Inspector Gen-eral of the Department of Justice, and the In-spector General of the Department of Defense, in consultation with the Council of Inspectors General on Financial Oversight, shall jointly submit to Congress a report on the receipt, use, and dissemination of cyber threat indicators and defensive measures that have been shared with Federal entities under this Act and the amendments made by this Act.

(B) CONTENTS.—Each report submitted under subparagraph (A) shall include the following:

(i) A review of the types of cyber threat indi-cators shared with Federal entities.

(ii) A review of the actions taken by Federal entities as a result of the receipt of such cyber threat indicators.

(iii) A list of Federal entities receiving such cyber threat indicators.

(iv) A review of the sharing of such cyber threat indicators among Federal entities to iden-tify inappropriate barriers to sharing informa-tion.

(C) RECOMMENDATIONS.—Each report sub-mitted under this paragraph may include such recommendations as the Inspectors General re-ferred to in subparagraph (A) may have for im-provements or modifications to the authorities under this Act or the amendments made by this Act.

(D) FORM.—Each report required under this paragraph shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(E) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF REPORTS.—The Inspector General of the Department of Home-land Security, the Inspector General of the Intel-ligence Community, the Inspector General of the Department of Justice, and the Inspector General of the Department of Defense shall make publicly available the unclassified portion of each report required under subparagraph (A).

SEC. 8. REPORT ON CYBERSECURITY THREATS.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence, in con-sultation with the heads of other appropriate elements of the intelligence community, shall submit to the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives a report on cybersecurity threats, including cyber attacks, theft, and data breaches.

(b) CONTENTS.—The report required by sub-section (a) shall include the following:

(1) An assessment of—

(A) the current intelligence sharing and co-operation relationships of the United States with other countries regarding cybersecurity threats (including cyber attacks, theft, and data breaches) directed against the United States that threaten the United States national secu-rity interests, economy, and intellectual prop-erty; and

(B) the relative utility of such relationships, which elements of the intelligence community participate in such relationships, and whether and how such relationships could be improved.

(2) A list and an assessment of the countries and non-state actors that are the primary threats of carrying out a cybersecurity threat (including a cyber attack, theft, or data breach)

against the United States and that threaten the United States national security, economy, and intellectual property.

(3) A description of the extent to which the capabilities of the United States Government to respond to or prevent cybersecurity threats (in-cluding cyber attacks, theft, or data breaches) directed against the United States private sector are degraded by a delay in the prompt notifica-tion by private entities of such threats or cyber attacks, theft, and breaches.

(4) An assessment of additional technologies or capabilities that would enhance the ability of the United States to prevent and to respond to cybersecurity threats (including cyber attacks, theft, and data breaches).

(5) An assessment of any technologies or prac-tices utilized by the private sector that could be rapidly fielded to assist the intelligence commu-nity in preventing and responding to cybersecu-rity threats.

(c) FORM OF REPORT.—The report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(d) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF REPORT.—The Director of National Intelligence shall make publicly available the unclassified portion of the report required by subsection (a).

(e) INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY DEFINED.—In this section, the term “intelligence community” has the meaning given that term in section 3 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003).

SEC. 9. CONSTRUCTION AND PREEMPTION.

(a) PROHIBITION OF SURVEILLANCE.—Nothing in this Act or the amendments made by this Act shall be construed to authorize the Department of Defense or the National Security Agency or any other element of the intelligence community to target a person for surveillance.

(b) OTHERWISE LAWFUL DISCLOSURES.—Noth-ing in this Act or the amendments made by this Act shall be construed to limit or prohibit—

(1) otherwise lawful disclosures of communica-tions, records, or other information, including reporting of known or suspected criminal activ-ity, by a non-Federal entity to any other non-Federal entity or the Federal Government; or

(2) any otherwise lawful use of such disclo-sures by any entity of the Federal government, without regard to whether such otherwise law-ful disclosures duplicate or replicate disclosures made under this Act.

(c) WHISTLE BLOWER PROTECTIONS.—Nothing in this Act or the amendments made by this Act shall be construed to prohibit or limit the disclo-sure of information protected under section 2302(b)(8) of title 5, United States Code (gov-erning disclosures of illegality, waste, fraud, abuse, or public health or safety threats), sec-tion 7211 of title 5, United States Code (gov-erning disclosures to Congress), section 1034 of title 10, United States Code (governing disclo-sure to Congress by members of the military), or any similar provision of Federal or State law..

(d) PROTECTION OF SOURCES AND METHODS.—Nothing in this Act or the amendments made by this Act shall be construed—

(1) as creating any immunity against, or oth-erwise affecting, any action brought by the Fed-eral Government, or any department or agency thereof, to enforce any law, executive order, or procedure governing the appropriate handling, disclosure, or use of classified information;

(2) to affect the conduct of authorized law en-forcement or intelligence activities; or

(3) to modify the authority of the President or a department or agency of the Federal Govern-ment to protect and control the dissemination of classified information, intelligence sources and methods, and the national security of the United States.

(e) RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER LAWS.—Nothing in this Act or the amendments made by this Act shall be construed to affect any requirement under any other provision of law for a non-Fed-eral entity to provide information to the Federal Government.

(f) **INFORMATION SHARING RELATIONSHIPS.**—Nothing in this Act or the amendments made by this Act shall be construed—

(1) to limit or modify an existing information-sharing relationship;

(2) to prohibit a new information-sharing relationship; or

(3) to require a new information-sharing relationship between any non-Federal entity and the Federal Government.

(g) **PRESERVATION OF CONTRACTUAL OBLIGATIONS AND RIGHTS.**—Nothing in this Act or the amendments made by this Act shall be construed—

(1) to amend, repeal, or supersede any current or future contractual agreement, terms of service agreement, or other contractual relationship between any non-Federal entities, or between any non-Federal entity and a Federal entity; or

(2) to abrogate trade secret or intellectual property rights of any non-Federal entity or Federal entity.

(h) **ANTI-TASKING RESTRICTION.**—Nothing in this Act or the amendments made by this Act shall be construed to permit the Federal Government—

(1) to require a non-Federal entity to provide information to the Federal Government;

(2) to condition the sharing of a cyber threat indicator with a non-Federal entity on such non-Federal entity's provision of a cyber threat indicator to the Federal Government; or

(3) to condition the award of any Federal grant, contract, or purchase on the provision of a cyber threat indicator to a Federal entity.

(i) **NO LIABILITY FOR NON-PARTICIPATION.**—Nothing in this Act or the amendments made by this Act shall be construed to subject any non-Federal entity to liability for choosing not to engage in a voluntary activity authorized in this Act and the amendments made by this Act.

(j) **USE AND RETENTION OF INFORMATION.**—Nothing in this Act or the amendments made by this Act shall be construed to authorize, or to modify any existing authority of, a department or agency of the Federal Government to retain or use any information shared under this Act or the amendments made by this Act for any use other than permitted in this Act or the amendments made by this Act.

(k) **FEDERAL PREEMPTION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—This Act and the amendments made by this Act supersede any statute or other provision of law of a State or political subdivision of a State that restricts or otherwise expressly regulates an activity authorized under this Act or the amendments made by this Act.

(2) **STATE LAW ENFORCEMENT.**—Nothing in this Act or the amendments made by this Act shall be construed to supersede any statute or other provision of law of a State or political subdivision of a State concerning the use of authorized law enforcement practices and procedures.

(l) **REGULATORY AUTHORITY.**—Nothing in this Act or the amendments made by this Act shall be construed—

(1) to authorize the promulgation of any regulations not specifically authorized by this Act or the amendments made by this Act;

(2) to establish any regulatory authority not specifically established under this Act or the amendments made by this Act; or

(3) to authorize regulatory actions that would duplicate or conflict with regulatory requirements, mandatory standards, or related processes under another provision of Federal law.

SEC. 10. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

Section 552(b) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (8), by striking “or” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (9), by striking “wells.” and inserting “wells; or”; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (9) the following:

“(10) information shared with or provided to the Federal Government pursuant to the Pro-

tecting Cyber Networks Act or the amendments made by such Act.”.

SEC. 11. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **AGENCY.**—The term “agency” has the meaning given the term in section 3502 of title 44, United States Code.

(2) **APPROPRIATE FEDERAL ENTITIES.**—The term “appropriate Federal entities” means the following:

(A) The Department of Commerce.

(B) The Department of Defense.

(C) The Department of Energy.

(D) The Department of Homeland Security.

(E) The Department of Justice.

(F) The Department of the Treasury.

(G) The Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

(3) **CYBERSECURITY PURPOSE.**—The term “cybersecurity purpose” means the purpose of protecting (including through the use of a defensive measure) an information system or information that is stored on, processed by, or transiting an information system from a cybersecurity threat or security vulnerability or identifying the source of a cybersecurity threat.

(4) **CYBERSECURITY THREAT.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the term “cybersecurity threat” means an action, not protected by the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States, on or through an information system that may result in an unauthorized effort to adversely impact the security, confidentiality, integrity, or availability of an information system or information that is stored on, processed by, or transiting an information system.

(B) **EXCLUSION.**—The term “cybersecurity threat” does not include any action that solely involves a violation of a consumer term of service or a consumer licensing agreement.

(5) **CYBER THREAT INDICATOR.**—The term “cyber threat indicator” means information or a physical object that is necessary to describe or identify—

(A) malicious reconnaissance, including anomalous patterns of communications that appear to be transmitted for the purpose of gathering technical information related to a cybersecurity threat or security vulnerability;

(B) a method of defeating a security control or exploitation of a security vulnerability;

(C) a security vulnerability, including anomalous activity that appears to indicate the existence of a security vulnerability;

(D) a method of causing a user with legitimate access to an information system or information that is stored on, processed by, or transiting an information system to unwittingly enable the defeat of a security control or exploitation of a security vulnerability;

(E) malicious cyber command and control;

(F) the actual or potential harm caused by an incident, including a description of the information exfiltrated as a result of a particular cybersecurity threat; or

(G) any other attribute of a cybersecurity threat, if disclosure of such attribute is not otherwise prohibited by law.

(6) **DEFENSIVE MEASURE.**—The term “defensive measure” means an action, device, procedure, technique, or other measure executed on an information system or information that is stored on, processed by, or transiting an information system that prevents or mitigates a known or suspected cybersecurity threat or security vulnerability.

(7) **FEDERAL ENTITY.**—The term “Federal entity” means a department or agency of the United States or any component of such department or agency.

(8) **INFORMATION SYSTEM.**—The term “information system”—

(A) has the meaning given the term in section 3502 of title 44, United States Code; and

(B) includes industrial control systems, such as supervisory control and data acquisition sys-

tems, distributed control systems, and programmable logic controllers.

(9) **LOCAL GOVERNMENT.**—The term “local government” means any borough, city, county, parish, town, township, village, or other political subdivision of a State.

(10) **MALICIOUS CYBER COMMAND AND CONTROL.**—The term “malicious cyber command and control” means a method for unauthorized remote identification of, access to, or use of, an information system or information that is stored on, processed by, or transiting an information system.

(11) **MALICIOUS RECONNAISSANCE.**—The term “malicious reconnaissance” means a method for actively probing or passively monitoring an information system for the purpose of discerning security vulnerabilities of the information system, if such method is associated with a known or suspected cybersecurity threat.

(12) **MONITOR.**—The term “monitor” means to acquire, identify, scan, or otherwise possess information that is stored on, processed by, or transiting an information system.

(13) **NON-FEDERAL ENTITY.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as otherwise provided in this paragraph, the term “non-Federal entity” means any private entity, non-Federal government department or agency, or State, tribal, or local government (including a political subdivision, department, officer, employee, or agent thereof).

(B) **INCLUSIONS.**—The term “non-Federal entity” includes a government department or agency (including an officer, employee, or agent thereof) of the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Northern Mariana Islands, and any other territory or possession of the United States.

(C) **EXCLUSION.**—The term “non-Federal entity” does not include a foreign power or known agent of a foreign power, as both terms are defined in section 101 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801).

(14) **PRIVATE ENTITY.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as otherwise provided in this paragraph, the term “private entity” means any person or private group, organization, proprietorship, partnership, trust, cooperative, corporation, or other commercial or nonprofit entity, including an officer, employee, or agent thereof.

(B) **INCLUSION.**—The term “private entity” includes a component of a State, tribal, or local government performing electric utility services.

(C) **EXCLUSION.**—The term “private entity” does not include a foreign power as defined in section 101 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801).

(15) **REAL TIME; REAL-TIME.**—The terms “real time” and “real-time” mean a process by which an automated, machine-to-machine system processes cyber threat indicators such that the time in which the occurrence of an event and the reporting or recording of it are as simultaneous as technologically and operationally practicable.

(16) **SECURITY CONTROL.**—The term “security control” means the management, operational, and technical controls used to protect against an unauthorized effort to adversely impact the security, confidentiality, integrity, and availability of an information system or its information.

(17) **SECURITY VULNERABILITY.**—The term “security vulnerability” means any attribute of hardware, software, process, or procedure that could enable or facilitate the defeat of a security control.

(18) **TRIBAL.**—The term “tribal” has the meaning given the term “Indian tribe” in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b).

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part A of House

Report 114–88. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered 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.

□ 1515

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. NUNES

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part A of House Report 114–88.

Mr. NUNES. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 5, beginning line 16, strike “in accordance with” and insert “under”.

Page 9, line 2, strike “and is limited to”.

Page 9, beginning line 14, strike “the intentional or reckless operation of any” and insert “a”.

Page 9, beginning line 17, strike “substantially harms, or initiates a new action, process, or procedure on” and insert “, or substantially harms”.

Page 12, beginning line 2, strike “a non-Federal entity, if authorized by applicable law or regulation other than this Act, from sharing” and insert “otherwise lawful sharing by a non-Federal entity of”.

Page 14, line 18, insert “or defensive measure” before “shared”.

Page 23, line 19, strike “section 3(c)(2)” and insert “this Act”.

Page 24, line 15, strike “section 552(b)(3)(B)” and insert “section 552(b)(3)”.

Page 25, line 13, insert “investigating,” after “to.”

Page 25, line 18, insert “investigating, prosecuting,” after “to.”

Page 27, line 23, strike “subsection” and insert “section”.

Page 27, beginning line 24, strike “of the violation” and all that follows through the period on page 28, line 2, and insert the following: “on which the cause of action arises.”

Page 28, line 4, strike “subsection” and insert “section”.

Page 28, line 14, strike “in good faith”.

Page 28, beginning line 22, strike “in good faith”.

Page 33, line 16, insert “of such Act” before the semicolon.

Page 33, line 19, insert “of such Act” before the period.

Page 38, line 20, strike “threats,” and insert the following: “threats to the national security and economy of the United States.”

Page 44, line 2, strike “activity” and insert “activity”.

Page 44, after line 23, insert the following:

(3) STATE REGULATION OF UTILITIES.—Except as provided by section 3(d)(4)(B), nothing in this Act or the amendments made by this Act shall be construed to supersede any statute, regulation, or other provision of law of a State or political subdivision of a State relating to the regulation of a private entity performing utility services, except to the extent such statute, regulation, or other provision of law restricts activity authorized under this Act or the amendments made by this Act.

Strike section 10.

Page 51, line 13, strike “electric”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 212, the gentleman

from California (Mr. NUNES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. NUNES. Madam Chair, I offer this amendment to make certain technical changes to the bill. These changes will align several sections of the bill, including the authorization for the use of defensive measures and the liability protections, with the Committee on Homeland Security’s bill, H.R. 1731.

The amendment also removes a direct amendment to the Freedom of Information Act because the bill already contains a strong exemption of cyber threat information and defensive measures from disclosure. The change does not have a substantive effect on the exemption of cyber threat information from disclosure laws.

The changes also reflect feedback we have received from our minority, from the executive branch, from outside groups, and from other committees of Congress. We want to make sure that the bill establishes a workable system for companies and the government to share cyber threat information and defensive measures.

I urge Members to support this technical and clarifying amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the gentleman’s amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Chair, the manager’s amendment makes mostly technical edits to the bill which advanced out of the Intelligence Committee unanimously. These strong edits came from our close and continuing consultations with outside groups and with the White House.

There is still work that remains to be done. In particular, we are going to work, as the bill moves forward, on the liability section. In order to benefit from the liability protection under the current language, it is necessary for companies to strictly comply with the act, which means sharing information only for a cybersecurity purpose and taking reasonable efforts to remove private information before sharing it.

I would support making further changes to the bill to make this requirement even more clear. In particular, I think it would be advantageous to strike what is, in my view, an unnecessary section on the rule of construction pertaining to willful misconduct.

Striking the rule of construction will help further clarify the intent of the bill, which is that liability protection is only available if a company or other non-Federal entity shares cyber threat information, for a cybersecurity purpose, and only after it takes reasonable steps to remove private information

not directly related to the cybersecurity threat.

That is the intention of the bill, and I think striking that section will make it more clear. If a company acts unreasonably—let alone recklessly or willfully—in following these requirements, it does not get liability protection, nor should it.

That is the right result, and we have to be careful not to create any confusion about there being any immunity for people or for companies acting willfully, recklessly, or even unreasonably in disregarding private information or the requirement that it be extricated.

The manager’s amendment makes positive technical changes. There are further changes that I would like to see as the bill moves forward. Confusion in any section of the bill, particularly as it pertains to liability, means litigation, and litigation means costs, so I think there is further work for us to do to make it even more clear.

In sum, I support the technical and substantive changes made in the manager’s amendment, and I urge my colleagues to do the same. I join the chairman in urging support for the manager’s amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NUNES. Madam Chair, as I have no other speakers, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. NUNES).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. CÁRDENAS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part A of House Report 114–88.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Madam Chair, I am here to present my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 15, after line 7, insert the following:

(f) SMALL BUSINESS PARTICIPATION.—

(1) ASSISTANCE.—The Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall provide assistance to small businesses and small financial institutions to monitor information and information systems, operate defensive measures, and share and receive cyber threat indicators and defensive measures under this section

(2) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall submit to the President a report on the degree to which small businesses and small financial institutions are able to engage in cyber threat information sharing under this section. Such report shall include the recommendations of the Administrator for improving the ability of such businesses and institutions to engage in cyber threat information sharing and to use shared information to defend their networks.

(3) OUTREACH.—The Federal Government shall conduct outreach to small businesses and small financial institutions to encourage such businesses and institutions to exercise their authority under this section.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 212, the gentleman

from California (Mr. CÁRDENAS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Madam Chair, I rise today to speak in support of my amendment to H.R. 1560.

I applaud the managers of this legislation for all of their hard work. I understand the difficult balance that must be struck in this important debate, and I thank the committee for the opportunity to have my amendment considered today.

Madam Chair, this amendment will protect national security by starting from the ground up in protecting our smallest of businesses.

Cyber attacks are a real threat to our economy and national security. Hackers will look for the most vulnerable in the supply chain to exploit their security. This is why we must make sure any legislation related to cybersecurity places small businesses at the forefront of our security planning.

By doing this, we will be protecting customers and businesses up and down the supply chain, which will defend our economy, as a whole, from being attacked.

The amendment will ensure that the SBA will assist small businesses and small financial institutions in participating in the programs under this bill, and it will make sure the Federal Government performs outreach to small businesses and to small financial institutions.

This is a commonsense provision that addresses the issues that are critical to ensuring the security of our cyberspace and of our economic well-being now and into the future.

Small businesses are increasingly becoming the target of cyber criminals as larger companies increase their protections, so we need to arm them with the information and technical assistance they need to create effective plans to thwart these attacks and intrusions.

On a personal note, I once owned a small business myself. I left my bigger, corporate job to start a small business in my local community and employ people I grew up with. Washington is a faraway place for many small businesses in our country. The laws here can seem disconnected. The issues can be brushed off as someone else's problem.

That is why it is essential that, today and moving forward on all of these cybersecurity debates, that we make sure we have programs in place to work with and to educate our small businesses and that we understand that, every time one of these small businesses is successfully attacked and breached, it is a possibility that it could go under, losing those local jobs. I think this is a commonsense amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NUNES. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. NUNES. Madam Chair, I want to thank the gentleman from California for bringing forward this thoughtful amendment. He worked closely with the committee to ensure that the language did not disrupt the intent of the bill. I am prepared to accept the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Madam Chair, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

Mr. SCHIFF. I thank the gentleman, my colleague, for yielding.

Madam Chair, for a large business, a cyber attack can be costly and damaging. For a small business, a cyber attack can be fatal, wiping out a family's dream or a lifetime of work in a few clicks of a mouse.

Small businesses and small financial institutions also don't have the large legal shops that are sometimes necessary to keep up with the latest changes or regulations coming from Washington.

That is why I am so pleased that my California colleague offered this important amendment. While I don't expect that any sharing mechanism will ultimately be costly to maintain or to access, there will be some costs, especially in the early stages of implementation, and there will be some new procedures to navigate.

This amendment will help put the reach and authority of the Small Business Administration in the service of cybersecurity by having the agency assist in the rollout of cyber threat information sharing.

It is an important addition to the bill. I thank the gentleman for raising the issue, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CÁRDENAS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. CARSON OF INDIANA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part A of House Report 114-88.

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 37, after line 16, insert the following new clause:

(v) A review of the current procedures pertaining to the sharing of information, removal procedures for personal information or information identifying a specific person, and any incidents pertaining to the improper treatment of such information.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 212, the gentleman

from Indiana (Mr. CARSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Madam Chair, I proudly supported this bill when we marked it in the Intelligence Committee. I am only bringing up this amendment today to address a basic transparency concern raised by my constituents after the markup, that the cybersecurity threat posed to our government, to our businesses, and to our personal information is massive and is growing every day.

This bill provides important tools to ensure that the lessons learned from a breach of one company can help strengthen the security of others. As a result, your Social Security and credit card numbers will be better protected.

Madam Chair, as someone who opposed CISPA last year, I feel like this iteration is a major first step forward in privacy protection and transparency. I am particularly happy with the robust protections of personally identifiable information.

Unlike past iterations, this bill mandates that cyber threat information is scanned and that personal information is removed not once, but twice, before it can be transmitted to other Federal agencies.

I am pleased, Madam Chair, that companies will share their cyber threat information with a civilian agency and not directly with the intelligence community. I am also happy that additional limitations are placed on the ways that cyber threat information can be utilized.

For all of the benefits of this bill, the American people still—rightfully so—expect oversight that is consistent and comprehensive. That is what this amendment is all about. It strengthens the oversight of the inspector general's monitoring of this kind of information sharing.

Now, with this amendment, the inspector general will oversee and report on the process for information-sharing procedures, for removing personal information, and any incidence in which this information was treated improperly.

It will ensure Congress and the public that sharing is happening properly and that the public is being protected. I hope that my good Republican colleagues will support this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NUNES. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. NUNES. Madam Chair, I want to thank the gentleman. He is a member of the Intelligence Committee and has played a very productive and constructive role. As he said, his constituents have brought these concerns to him. He worked with the ranking member and

me, and we are prepared to accept the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1530

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF), my good friend.

Mr. SCHIFF. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chair, this is Mr. CARSON's first year on the committee, and I appreciate his dedicated service and the interest he has taken in oversight of the intelligence community. He brings a background in law enforcement, which is a very welcome addition to our committee, and joins other colleagues with a very similar background.

He has worked closely with us to make privacy improvements throughout the process. I support his efforts here again to make a good bill even better. Mr. CARSON's amendment would include a requirement to make sure the critical dual privacy scrub is working the way it should. This is very important. It is at the core of our bill and at the core of our efforts to protect privacy. So we must monitor how these requirements are working and support transparent reporting to make sure that they are working as intended.

I support the amendment and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. I thank Chairman NUNES and Ranking Member SCHIFF once again for their support in helping to keep our communities safer, but I still want to thank my Republican colleagues for supporting this amendment, and I thank them for their friendship. As a new member of the committee, Madam Chair, I have greatly appreciated the guidance—bipartisan guidance, if you will.

Every Member of this House, Madam Chair, has heard from constituents who are concerned about government surveillance and overreach. After everything we have heard about bulk collection over the last few years, the American people are right to be concerned about new authorities to collect data.

As the text plainly and repeatedly states, this is not a surveillance bill. We have protections in place to ensure that the intelligence community cannot collect and utilize your personal data. This amendment simply ensures that Congress and the public get to see this sharing process and see how it works if these protections happen to fail. I urge support for this amendment and the underlying bill.

I yield back the balance of my time, Madam Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. CARSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. MULVANEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part A of House Report 114-88.

Mr. MULVANEY. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end the following new section:
SEC. 12. SUNSET.

This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall terminate on the date that is seven years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 212, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. MULVANEY. Madam Chair, I thank the chairman of the committee for the opportunity to present the amendment here today.

Very briefly, I will talk about the genesis of this amendment, which is very simple, by the way. It adds a 7-year sunset to all the provisions of the bill.

Madam Chair, in going through the review of this bill, it occurred to me that this was a really close call. There were folks whom I respect with a great deal of credibility who reached out to me and said: Look, here are the difficulties with this bill and why we should defeat this bill. At the same time, there are a lot of folks for whom I have a great deal of respect and have a great deal of credibility in the industry who also reached out to me and said: Look, this is a very serious problem. Here are the good things in the bill, and here is why you should support it.

It is probably not unusual that we have that circumstance before us where it is a close call. We are balancing two very critical things: security—specifically, cybersecurity—on one hand, and privacy, liberty interests, on the other. It is a balancing act that we are called on to do many, many times here in Washington, D.C.

As I was going through the bill, taking input from both sides of the argument, it occurred to me: All right, what if we have got it wrong? What if we have the balancing act wrong? Sure, we can go back in and fix it at some point in the future, some indeterminate time in the future; but face it, this is a busy place, with a lot of bills demanding attention on any given day in Congress.

Wouldn't it be nice to have something hardwired into the bill that would force Congress at some point in the future to come back and say: Okay. A couple years back, here is what we did on cybersecurity. Is it working? Did we get it right? Is the balance between security and privacy one that is serving both of those very important interests correctly?

We sat down to talk amongst some of my colleagues about the amount of time that was necessary. Madam Chair, 7 years is a long time to have a sunset provision in a bill. It came to my attention, though, given the complex-

ities, the complexities of the systems necessary to be put in place in order to implement the programs in the bill, that 7 years was the appropriate level of time.

I am glad that we have sunset provisions in other pieces of legislation. I doubt very seriously we would be having serious discussions right now about things as important as the PATRIOT Act if a sunset provision was not hardwired into the bill. Maybe we should consider adding these to every single piece of legislation for just the same reason: to force us from time to time to see if what we thought we were doing several years ago was really as good an idea as we thought it was several years ago. So that was the intention.

That is the genesis of this amendment—again, very simple, a 7-year sunset provision. I hope my colleagues will see fit to support it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NUNES. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment, although I appreciate my colleague's concern.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NUNES. Madam Chair, my friend from South Carolina, I think, is very thoughtful in his approach in wanting sunset provisions in many laws that pass this body, and I think that is correct on major pieces of legislation, especially involving government bureaucracies, the creation of government bureaucracies, and the implementation of regulation.

I would just make a few important points that I think this bill is very different because this is a voluntary bill. It is also legislation that, because of the liability protections that are in this bill, if you have a sunset clause in it—and part of the reason why the other amendments that were made out of order and this one was made in order, because it was the longest time, with the 7 years, as the gentleman said—it is tough for a company to design, build, get in the process of preparing how they are going to share this information company to company, and I am afraid that even though this is 7 years, will companies make the investment terms of being willing to actually share? Then, if this expires, what happens with the trial lawyers that would then come after the fact when the Congress doesn't act with information that is sitting out there that no longer has the protections?

This is actually why, back when the last version of this legislation was up last Congress, we made several changes since then, and we have many more supporters since that time because of the changes we have made to make sure that we have scrubbed private data, to make sure this doesn't go to any government agency, to make sure that it is voluntary, all of the steps that we have taken. But because of the trial lawyer component and the liability being left open, this is why groups

like Heritage, in the last Congress, opposed an amendment just like this.

We would like to work with the gentleman and his colleagues on this, but I would ask if he would be willing to maybe work with us in a potential conference or possibly down the road, if it might be appropriate. I hate to oppose this amendment because he is my good friend, but I want to try to see if he might be willing to withdraw and work with us when we get to a conference on a reasonable solution to this.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MULVANEY. I will respond in a couple of different ways.

Under ordinary circumstances, Madam Chair, I might consider withdrawing the amendment, but I think we are here today under a somewhat extraordinary rule. I do appreciate the chairman's genuineness in his request because we have worked very closely together on other matters in the past. I look forward to working with him on other matters in the future. I consider him to be a good friend and colleague. But because of the nature of the joint rule, if this bill passes and the bill that is being offered by the Homeland Security Committee tomorrow passes as well, my understanding is those two bills will then be merged. I have a similar amendment, Madam Chair, tomorrow to Mr. MCCAUL's bill, so I am not really sure if even withdrawing at this point would accomplish the necessary end that you seek. I will politely decline your request, and respectfully so.

I will point out, my good friend does mention an interesting part of my history here in Washington, D.C. When I offered a similar amendment to, I believe, the PATRIOT Act a couple years back, The Heritage Foundation did oppose it. It always makes me smile, Madam Chair, when I remember going through that conversation with my friends over at The Heritage Foundation, and I had to send them a copy of Ed Feulner's own book. Ed, of course, is one of the founding members of The Heritage Foundation, and the last chapter is an exhortation to please include a sunset provision in every single piece of Federal legislation. Again, that just sort of makes me smile.

With all due respect due to the chairman, both as the chair of the committee and a Member of this body and a friend of mine, I will politely decline his request.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NUNES. I now yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD).

Mr. FARENTHOLD. I appreciate the chairman yielding time to me, even though I am in support of this amendment.

Madam Chair, we need this legislation because our companies, our industries, our government, and even our individual citizens are under attack by foreign cyber hackers, under attack from criminals. We need the cooperation between the government and the private sector, but unfortunately we

have seen that well-meaning folks in the government sometimes get a little overzealous in their data collection we don't always see.

For instance, section 215 of the PATRIOT Act, we saw in the Snowden revelations that every bit of metadata on phones was being collected. We didn't know that when we passed the PATRIOT Act. Now we have an opportunity to put a backstop in place where we can take a look a few years down the road and make sure this isn't being misinterpreted, not in line with congressional intent, and not in line with the Constitution. This backstop, this sunset, is a critical piece of the bill. The bill is not perfect, but this makes it a whole lot better and gives us a second bite at the apple should things be going wrong.

I appreciate your yielding.

Mr. NUNES. Madam Chair, I am prepared to close.

I would just say that I hate to have to oppose this amendment because I think my colleagues are offering it in good faith, with good intentions. However, it is a voluntary program. As I said, cybersecurity is going to continue to be an ever-increasing problem and challenge, and the last thing we want to do is put a backstop in to where companies or private citizens are afraid to share the information with each other because they are afraid of being sued by some trial lawyer down the road.

Like I said, I hate to oppose the amendment, but I will have to oppose the amendment and urge my colleagues to vote "no."

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. MULVANEY. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in part A of House Report 114-88.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end the following:

SEC. 12. COMPTROLLER GENERAL REPORT ON REMOVAL OF PERSONAL IDENTIFYING INFORMATION.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than three years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report on the actions taken by the Federal Government to remove personal information from cyber threat indicators pursuant to section 4(b).

(b) FORM.—The report under subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 212, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

□ 1545

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Chair, I thank the manager and the chairman and ranking member of the House Intelligence Committee for their service and leadership.

I offer this amendment that I believe will answer a question that has been raised by many Members but really has bipartisan support.

This amendment is offered as a Jackson Lee-Polis amendment, and the specifics of it say:

"Not later than three years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report on the actions taken by the Federal Government to remove personal information from cyber threat indicators pursuant to section 4(b)."

Again, this relates to the concern that many of us will hear over and over again from our constituents.

In the world of hacking and mistakes and misdirection and unfairness and terrorism, it is important to secure this Nation and to be able to have the right information.

As I serve as a member of the Homeland Security Committee, I believe we have to have information to thwart terrorist acts and protect the homeland.

But there is a public benefit to my amendment. This amendment will provide the public assurance from a reliable and trustworthy source that their privacy and civil liberties are not being compromised.

We are a State and a Nation born out of the existence of the Bill of Rights. Along with the Constitution, it has framed a democracy, but it has also framed the preciousness of individual rights and privacy. I offer this amendment, again, to emphasize the importance of privacy that is so very important.

The Jackson Lee-Polis amendment provides, again, for a Government Accountability Act report to Congress on the actions taken by the Federal Government to remove personal information from data shared through the programs established by this statute.

The intent of the report, as indicated, is to provide Congress with information regarding the effectiveness of protecting the privacy of Americans.

Again, this amendment would result in the sole external report on the privacy and civil liberties impact of the programs created under this bill.

Privacy is of great concern to the American people. I know that because, as we were doing the Patriot Act in the

shadow of the heinous acts of 9/11, I will tell you that large voices were raised, particularly out of the Judiciary Committee and in working with the Intelligence Committee, about the issues of privacy. Americans understand that.

Privacy is of great concern to the American public. Privacy involves the handling and protection of personal information. And as well, when personal information is improperly accessed, used, or abused, it can cause financial and personal harm to those whose data is involved.

Madam Chair, may I ask how much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Texas has 2 minutes remaining.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Chair, I ask my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF), the distinguished ranking member.

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Chair, I thank the gentlewoman from Texas and the gentleman from Colorado for their amendment, and I am happy to support it.

We create a lot of law in this body, and it is absolutely necessary that we establish reporting mechanisms that allow us to measure the effectiveness of the work that we do here. This is an amendment that will do just that.

By requiring regular reports on the operation of the sharing mechanism that we are creating today, we can determine whether it is working as intended or whether it needs to be tweaked or changed to be more effective. We must always ensure that the government is fulfilling its obligation under this bill to remove personal information.

Again, I want to thank SHEILA JACKSON LEE, as well as the gentleman from Colorado, for their efforts. I support the amendment.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Chair, how much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Texas has 45 seconds remaining.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Let me quickly say that a report on consumer views on the privacy issue published by the Pew Center found that a majority of adults surveyed felt that their privacy is being challenged along such core dimensions as the security of their personal information and their ability to retain confidentiality.

It is for this reason that I believe the Jackson Lee amendment, in conjunction with the underlying legislation, H.R. 1560, will be an added asset to ensure that the personal data, privacy, and civil liberties of Americans are protected.

Madam Chair, I offer my thanks to Chairman NUNES, and Ranking Member SCHIFF for their leadership and work on H.R. 1560.

The bipartisan work done by the House Select Committee on Intelligence resulted in H.R. 1560 being brought before the House for consideration.

I offer acknowledgement to Congressman POLIS in joining me in sponsoring this amendment.

The Jackson Lee-Polis Amendment to H.R. 1560 is simple and would improve the bill.

Jackson Lee Amendment designated #5 on the list of amendments approved for H.R. 1560:

The Jackson Lee-Polis Amendment provides for a Government Accountability Office (GAO) report to Congress on the actions taken by the Federal Government to remove personal information from data shared through the programs established by this statute.

The intent of the report is to provide Congress with information regarding the effectiveness of protecting the privacy of Americans.

This amendment would result in the sole external report on the privacy and civil liberties impact of the programs created under this bill.

Privacy is of great concern to the American public.

Privacy involves the handling and protection of personal information that individuals provide in the course of everyday commercial transactions.

When personal information is improperly accessed, used, or abused it can cause financial and personal harm to the people whose data is involved.

A report on consumer views on their privacy published by the Pew Center found that a majority of adults surveyed felt that their privacy is being challenged along such core dimensions as the security of their personal information and their ability to retain confidentiality.

For this reason, the Jackson Lee amendment providing an independent report to the public on how their privacy and civil liberties are treated under the implementation of this bill is important.

I ask that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle support this amendment.

I ask that the amendment be supported, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. MULVANEY

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, the unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 313, noes 110, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 168]

AYES—313

Adams	Ashford	Beatty
Aguilar	Babin	Becerra
Allen	Barton	Bera
Amash	Bass	Beyer

Bilirakis	Goodlatte	Mulvaney
Bishop (GA)	Gosar	Nadler
Bishop (UT)	Gowdy	Napolitano
Black	Graham	Neal
Blum	Granger	Neugebauer
Blumenauer	Graves (GA)	Noem
Bonamici	Graves (LA)	Nolan
Bost	Grayson	Norcross
Boyle, Brendan F.	Green, Al	Nugent
Brady (PA)	Green, Gene	O'Rourke
Brat	Griffith	Palazzo
Bridenstine	Grijalva	Pallone
Brooks (AL)	Grothman	Palmer
Brown (FL)	Guinta	Pascarell
Brownley (CA)	Gutiérrez	Paulsen
Buchanan	Hahn	Payne
Buck	Hanna	Pearce
Burgess	Harris	Pelosi
Bustos	Heck (WA)	Perlmutter
Butterfield	Hensarling	Perry
Byrne	Herrera Beutler	Peters
Capps	Hice, Jody B.	Peterson
Capuano	Higgins	Pingree
Cárdenas	Himes	Pitts
Carney	Hinojosa	Pocan
Carson (IN)	Honda	Poe (TX)
Carter (GA)	Hoyer	Polis
Cartwright	Huelskamp	Posey
Castor (FL)	Huffman	Price (NC)
Castro (TX)	Huizenga (MI)	Price, Tom
Chabot	Hultgren	Quigley
Chaffetz	Hunter	Rangel
Chu, Judy	Hurt (VA)	Ribble
Cicilline	Issa	Rice (NY)
Clark (MA)	Jackson Lee	Rice (SC)
Clarke (NY)	Jeffries	Richmond
Clawson (FL)	Johnson (GA)	Rigell
Clay	Johnson (OH)	Roe (TN)
Cleaver	Johnson, E. B.	Rohrabacher
Clyburn	Jolly	Rokita
Cohen	Jones	Ross
Cole	Jordan	Rothfus
Collins (GA)	Joyce	Rouzer
Connolly	Kaptur	Roybal-Allard
Conyers	Keating	Ruiz
Cooper	Kelly (IL)	Rush
Costa	Kennedy	Russell
Courtney	Kildee	Salmon
Cramer	Kilmer	Sánchez, Linda T.
Crowley	Kind	Sanchez, Loretta
Cummings	King (IA)	Sanford
Davis (CA)	Kiame	Sarbanes
DeFazio	Kuster	Scalise
DeGette	Labrador	Schakowsky
Delaney	LaMalfa	Schiff
DeLauro	Lamborn	Schrader
DelBene	Langevin	Schweikert
Denham	Larsen (WA)	Scott (VA)
DeSantis	Larson (CT)	Scott, Austin
DeSaulnier	Latta	Scott, David
DesJarlais	Lawrence	Serrano
Deutch	Lee	Sessions
Dingell	Levin	Sewell (AL)
Doggett	Lewis	Sherman
Doyle, Michael F.	Lieu, Ted	Sires
Duckworth	Lipinski	Slaughter
Duffy	Loeb sack	Smith (MO)
Duncan (SC)	Lofgren	Smith (NE)
Duncan (TN)	Loudermilk	Smith (NJ)
Edwards	Love	Smith (TX)
Ellison	Lowenthal	Speier
Ellmers (NC)	Lowey	Stefanik
Emmer (MN)	Lucas	Stutzman
Engel	Luetkemeyer	Swalwell (CA)
Eshoo	Lujan Grisham	Takai
Esty	(NM)	Takano
Farenthold	Luján, Ben Ray	Thompson (CA)
Farr	(NM)	Thompson (MS)
Fattah	Lummis	Thompson (PA)
Fitzpatrick	Lynch	Tipton
Fleischmann	Maloney, Sean	Titus
Fleming	Marchant	Tonko
Flores	Massie	Torres
Forbes	Matsui	Tsongas
Fortenberry	McClintock	Van Hollen
Foster	McCollum	Vargas
Fox	McDermott	Veasey
Frankel (FL)	McGovern	Vela
Franks (AZ)	McMorris	Velázquez
Fudge	Rodgers	Visclosky
Gabbard	McNerney	Walker
Gallego	Meadows	Walorski
Garamendi	Meeks	Walz
Garrett	Meng	Waters, Maxine
Gibbs	Miller (FL)	Watson Coleman
Gibson	Mooney (WV)	Weber (TX)
Gohmert	Moore	Webster (FL)
	Moulton	Welch
	Mullin	

Westerman	Wittman	Zeldin
Williams	Yarmuth	Zinke
Wilson (FL)	Yoder	
Wilson (SC)	Yoho	

NOES—110

Abraham	Hudson	Reichert
Aderholt	Hurd (TX)	Renacci
Amodei	Israel	Roby
Barletta	Jenkins (KS)	Rogers (AL)
Barr	Jenkins (WV)	Rogers (KY)
Benishkek	Johnson, Sam	Rooney (FL)
Bishop (MI)	Katko	Ros-Lehtinen
Blackburn	Kelly (PA)	Roskam
Boustany	King (NY)	Royce
Brooks (IN)	Kinzinger (IL)	Ruppersberger
Bucshon	Kirkpatrick	Ryan (OH)
Calvert	Knight	Ryan (WI)
Carter (TX)	Lance	Sensenbrenner
Coffman	LoBiondo	Shimkus
Collins (NY)	Long	Shuster
Comstock	MacArthur	Simpson
Conaway	Maloney,	Sinema
Cook	Carolyn	Stewart
Costello (PA)	Marino	Stivers
Crawford	McCarthy	Thornberry
Crenshaw	McCaul	Tiberi
Cuellar	McHenry	Trott
Culberson	McKinley	Turner
Davis, Danny	McSally	Upton
Davis, Rodney	Meehan	Valadao
Dent	Messer	Wagner
Diaz-Balart	Mica	Walberg
Dold	Miller (MI)	Walden
Fincher	Moolenaar	Walters, Mimi
Frelinghuysen	Murphy (PA)	Wenstrup
Guthrie	Newhouse	Westmoreland
Hardy	Nunes	Whitfield
Harper	Pittenger	Womack
Hartzler	Poliquin	Woodall
Heck (NV)	Pompeo	Young (AK)
Hill	Ratcliffe	Young (IA)
Holding	Reed	Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—8

Brady (TX)	Hastings	Smith (WA)
Curbelo (FL)	Murphy (FL)	Wasserman
Graves (MO)	Olson	Schultz

□ 1620

Messrs. ISRAEL, FINCHER, CALVERT, RYAN of Wisconsin, TURNER, SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Messrs. ABRAHAM, and RUPPERSBERGER changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Ms. ADAMS, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Ms. PELOSI, Meses. EDWARDS, LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Messrs. ROHRBACHER, CARNEY, ZELDIN, ROSS, RICHMOND, Meses. MATSUI, STEFANIK, Messrs. SIRES, CROWLEY, Meses. SCHAKOWSKY, DeGETTE, TITUS, Messrs. JOYCE, SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, VEASEY, Meses. BROWNLEY of California, LEE, and Mr. PETERSON changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania). The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN) having assumed the chair, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, 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. 1560) to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced shar-

ing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 212, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Miss RICE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Miss RICE of New York. I am opposed to it in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Miss Rice of New York moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1560 to the Select Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select) with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Page 22, line 14, strike “and”.

Page 22, line 16, strike the period and insert a semicolon.

Page 22, after line 16, insert the following:

“(6) to prevent a terrorist attack against the United States, ensure that the appropriate departments and agencies of the Federal Government prioritize the sharing of cyber threat indicators regarding known terrorist organizations (including the Islamic State, al Qaeda, al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula, and Boko Haram) with respect to—

“(A) cyberattacks;

“(B) the recruitment of homegrown terrorists by such terrorist organizations; and

“(C) travel by persons to and from foreign countries in which such terrorist organizations are based or provide training (including Syria, Iraq, Yemen, Afghanistan, and Nigeria); and

“(7) to prevent the intelligence and military capability of the United States from being improperly transferred to any foreign country, terrorist organization, or state sponsor of terrorism, ensure that the appropriate departments and agencies of the Federal Government prioritize the sharing of cyber threat indicators regarding attempts to steal the military technology of the United States by state-sponsored computer hackers from the People’s Republic of China and other foreign countries.”.

Mr. NUNES (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman is

recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Miss RICE of New York. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, the most important job we have is to protect the American homeland and the American people. The threats against our country are ceaseless and constantly evolving, and we too must evolve and adapt in our efforts to maintain the domestic security that the American people have entrusted us to uphold.

Passing H.R. 1560 will be a significant step forward in that effort. Our Nation’s cyber infrastructure is under attack every single day from hackers, from foreign nations, and from terrorists. I believe H.R. 1560 will strengthen our government’s ability to coordinate with companies in the private sector, share intelligence, and respond to these threats, but I also believe the legislation should be stronger.

We know that foreign nations and terrorist organizations are actively seeking to steal American military intelligence and technology, and we know that terrorists are using the Internet to spread their poisonous ideology, recruit American citizens to join their ranks, and encourage attacks here in America. Just this week, six Minnesota men were arrested after trying to travel to Syria to join the Islamic State. Last week, authorities arrested an Ohio man who actually trained with a terrorist group in Syria and returned to the U.S., intent on carrying out an attack on our soil. Earlier this month, two women in my home State of New York were arrested for planning to detonate a bomb in New York City.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment will help prevent a domestic terror attack by allowing Federal agencies to coordinate and prioritize the sharing of cyber threat intelligence regarding known terrorist organizations like the Islamic State, Boko Haram, al Shabaab, and al Qaeda and its affiliates, groups that use the Internet and social media as a weapon in their efforts to attack the United States and the American people. Likewise, this amendment will direct Federal agencies to prioritize the sharing of intelligence regarding attempts by terrorists and foreign nations to steal American military technology.

This amendment will help protect our Nation and the people we serve. I have no doubt that that is the highest priority for my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, so we must also make it a priority to neutralize these threats and do all that we can to thwart the violent ambitions of those who want to do us harm.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I believe H.R. 1560 is important legislation that deserves bipartisan support, but I believe this amendment deserves the same. It

will make the legislation stronger, make the American people safer, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to give it their full support.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, this motion to recommit is nothing more than a poison pill designed to destroy the years of work that have gone into crafting this legislation.

The bill already does exactly what the motion to recommit purposes. It helps the American people defend themselves against hackers from countries like China, Russia, Iran, North Korea, and other terrorist groups.

While we stand here and continue to debate this problem, our country is under attack from hackers who steal our intellectual property, pilfer our personal information, and target our national security interests.

I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the motion to recommit and “yes” on final passage.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Miss RICE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the passage of the bill, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 183, noes 239, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 169]

AYES—183

Adams	Clark (MA)	Edwards
Aguiar	Clarke (NY)	Ellison
Ashford	Clay	Engel
Bass	Cleaver	Eshoo
Beatty	Clyburn	Esty
Becerra	Cohen	Farr
Bera	Cannolly	Fattah
Beyer	Conyers	Foster
Bishop (GA)	Cooper	Frankel (FL)
Blumenauer	Costa	Fudge
Bonamici	Courtney	Gabbard
Boyle, Brendan	Crowley	Galleo
F.	Cuellar	Garamendi
Brady (PA)	Cummings	Graham
Brown (FL)	Davis (CA)	Grayson
Brownley (CA)	Davis, Danny	Green, Al
Bustos	DeFazio	Green, Gene
Butterfield	DeGette	Grijalva
Capps	Delaney	Gutiérrez
Capuano	DeLauro	Hahn
Cárdenas	DelBene	Heck (WA)
Carney	DeSaulnier	Higgins
Carson (IN)	Deuth	Himes
Cartwright	Dingell	Hinojosa
Castor (FL)	Doggett	Honda
Castro (TX)	Fitzpatrick	Hoyer
Chu, Judy	F.	Huffman
Ciциline	Duckworth	Israel

Jackson Lee	McCollum	Sanchez, Loretta
Jeffries	McDermott	Sarbanes
Johnson (GA)	McGovern	Schakowsky
Johnson, E. B.	McNerney	Schiff
Kaptur	Meeks	Schrader
Keating	Meng	Scott (VA)
Kelly (IL)	Moore	Scott, David
Kennedy	Moulton	Serrano
Kildee	Nadler	Sewell (AL)
Kilmer	Napolitano	Sherman
Kind	Neal	Sinema
Kirkpatrick	Nolan	Sires
Kuster	Norcross	Slaughter
Langevin	O'Rourke	Speier
Larsen (WA)	Pallone	Swalwell (CA)
Larson (CT)	Pascrell	Takai
Lawrence	Payne	Takano
Lee	Pelosi	Thompson (CA)
Levin	Perlmutter	Thompson (MS)
Lewis	Peters	Titus
Lieu, Ted	Pingree	Tonko
Lipinski	Pocan	Torres
Loeb sack	Polis	Tsongas
Lofgren	Price (NC)	Van Hollen
Lowenthal	Quigley	Vargas
Lowey	Rangel	Veasey
Lujan Grisham	Rice (NY)	Vela
(NM)	Richmond	Velázquez
Luján, Ben Ray	Roybal-Allard	Visclosky
(NM)	Ruiz	Walz
Lynch	Ruppersberger	Waters, Maxine
Maloney,	Rush	Watson Coleman
Carolyn	Ryan (OH)	Welch
Maloney, Sean	Sánchez, Linda	Wilson (FL)
Matsui	T.	Yarmuth

NOES—239

Abraham	Flores	Lucas
Aderholt	Forbes	Luetkemeyer
Allen	Fortenberry	Lummis
Amash	Fox	MacArthur
Amodei	Franks (AZ)	Marchant
Babin	Frelinghuysen	Marino
Barletta	Garrett	Massie
Barr	Gibbs	McCarthy
Barton	Gibson	McCaul
Benishek	Gohmert	McClintock
Bilirakis	Goodlatte	McHenry
Bishop (MI)	Gosar	McKinley
Bishop (UT)	Gowdy	McMorris
Black	Granger	Rodgers
Blackburn	Graves (GA)	McSally
Blum	Graves (LA)	Meadows
Bost	Griffith	Meehan
Boustany	Grothman	Messer
Brat	Guinta	Mica
Bridenstine	Guthrie	Miller (FL)
Brooks (AL)	Hanna	Miller (MI)
Brooks (IN)	Hardy	Moolenaar
Buchanan	Harper	Mooney (WV)
Buck	Harris	Mullin
Bucshon	Hartzler	Mulvaney
Burgess	Heck (NV)	Murphy (PA)
Byrne	Hensarling	Neugebauer
Calvert	Herrera Beutler	Newhouse
Carter (GA)	Hice, Jody B.	Noem
Carter (TX)	Hill	Nugent
Chabot	Holding	Nunes
Chaffetz	Hudson	Palazzo
Clawson (FL)	Huelskamp	Palmer
Coffman	Huizenga (MI)	Paulsen
Cole	Hultgren	Pearce
Collins (GA)	Hunter	Perry
Collins (NY)	Hurd (TX)	Peterson
Comstock	Hurt (VA)	Pittenger
Conaway	Issa	Pitts
Cook	Jenkins (KS)	Poe (TX)
Costello (PA)	Jenkins (WV)	Poliquin
Cramer	Johnson (OH)	Pompeo
Crawford	Johnson, Sam	Posey
Crenshaw	Jolly	Price, Tom
Culberson	Jones	Ratcliffe
Davis, Rodney	Jordan	Reed
Denham	Joyce	Reichert
Dent	Katko	Renacci
DeSantis	Kelly (PA)	Ribble
DesJarlais	King (IA)	Rice (SC)
Diaz-Balart	King (NY)	Rigell
Dold	Kinzinger (IL)	Roby
Duffy	Kline	Roe (TN)
Duncan (SC)	Knight	Rogers (AL)
Duncan (TN)	Labrador	Rogers (KY)
Ellmers (NC)	Lamborn	Rohrabacher
Emmer (MN)	Lance	Rokita
Farenthold	Latta	Rooney (FL)
Fincher	LoBiondo	Ros-Lehtinen
Fitzpatrick	Long	Roskam
Fleischmann	Loudermilk	Ross
Fleming	Love	Rothfus

Rouzer	Stefanik	Weber (TX)
Royce	Stewart	Webster (FL)
Russell	Stivers	Wenstrup
Ryan (WI)	Stutzman	Westerman
Salmon	Thompson (PA)	Westmoreland
Sanford	Thornberry	Whitfield
Scalise	Tiberi	Williams
Schweikert	Tipton	Wilson (SC)
Scott, Austin	Trott	Wittman
Sensenbrenner	Turner	Womack
Sessions	Upton	Woodall
Shimkus	Valadao	Yoder
Shuster	Wagner	Yoho
Simpson	Walberg	Young (AK)
Smith (MO)	Walden	Young (IA)
Smith (NE)	Walker	Young (IN)
Smith (NJ)	Walorski	Zeldin
Smith (TX)	Walters, Mimi	Zinke

NOT VOTING—9

Brady (TX)	LaMalfa	Wasserman
Curbelo (FL)	Murphy (FL)	Schultz
Graves (MO)	Olson	
Hastings	Smith (WA)	

□ 1635

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 307, noes 116, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 170]

AYES—307

Abraham	Clay	Frankel (FL)
Adams	Cleaver	Franks (AZ)
Aderholt	Clyburn	Frelinghuysen
Aguilar	Coffman	Fudge
Allen	Cole	Galleo
Amodei	Collins (GA)	Garamendi
Ashford	Collins (NY)	Gibbs
Babin	Comstock	Goodlatte
Barletta	Conaway	Gowdy
Barr	Connolly	Graham
Beatty	Cook	Granger
Benishek	Cooper	Graves (GA)
Bera	Costa	Green, Gene
Beyer	Costello (PA)	Guthrie
Bilirakis	Cramer	Gutiérrez
Bishop (GA)	Crawford	Hanna
Bishop (MI)	Crenshaw	Hardy
Bishop (UT)	Crowley	Harper
Black	Cuellar	Hartzler
Blackburn	Culberson	Heck (NV)
Blum	Davis (CA)	Heck (WA)
Bost	Davis, Rodney	Hensarling
Boustany	Delaney	Herrera Beutler
Boyle, Brendan	Denham	Higgins
F.	Dent	Hill
Brooks (AL)	DeSantis	Himes
Brooks (IN)	DeSaulnier	Hinojosa
Brown (FL)	Diaz-Balart	Holding
Brownley (CA)	Dingell	Hoyer
Buck	Dold	Hudson
Bucshon	Duckworth	Huizenga (MI)
Burgess	Duffy	Hultgren
Bustos	Duncan (TN)	Hunter
Butterfield	Ellmers (NC)	Hurd (TX)
Byrne	Emmer (MN)	Hurt (VA)
Calvert	Engel	Israel
Cárdenas	Farenthold	Jackson Lee
Carney	Farr	Jeffries
Carson (IN)	Fincher	Jenkins (KS)
Carter (GA)	Fitzpatrick	Jenkins (WV)
Carter (TX)	Fleischmann	Johnson (OH)
Castor (FL)	Flores	Johnson, Sam
Castro (TX)	Forbes	Jolly
Chabot	Fortenberry	Joyce
Chaffetz	Foster	Kaptur
Clarke (NY)	Fox	Katko

Keating	Mullin	Sensenbrenner
Kelly (IL)	Mulvaney	Sessions
Kelly (PA)	Murphy (PA)	Sewell (AL)
Kennedy	Neal	Shimkus
Kilmer	Neugebauer	Shuster
Kind	Newhouse	Simpson
King (IA)	Noem	Sinema
King (NY)	Norcross	Sires
Kinzinger (IL)	Nugent	Smith (MO)
Kirkpatrick	Nunes	Smith (NE)
Kline	Palazzo	Smith (NJ)
Knight	Palmer	Smith (TX)
Kuster	Pascrell	Speier
LaMalfa	Paulsen	Stefanik
Lamborn	Payne	Stewart
Lance	Pearce	Stivers
Langevin	Pelosi	Swalwell (CA)
Larsen (WA)	Perlmutter	Takai
Latta	Peters	Thompson (CA)
Lawrence	Peterson	Thompson (MS)
Levin	Pittenger	Thompson (PA)
Lipinski	Pitts	Thornberry
LoBiondo	Poliquin	Tiberi
Loeback	Pompeo	Tipton
Long	Price (NC)	Titus
Love	Price, Tom	Torres
Lowe	Quigley	Trott
Lucas	Ratchliffe	Turner
Luetkemeyer	Reed	Upton
Lujan Grisham	Reichert	Valadao
(NM)	Renacci	Vargas
Luján, Ben Ray	Rice (NY)	Veasey
(NM)	Rice (SC)	Visclosky
MacArthur	Richmond	Wagner
Maloney,	Rigell	Walberg
Carolyn	Roby	Walden
Maloney, Sean	Roe (TN)	Walker
Marchant	Rogers (AL)	Walorski
Marino	Rogers (KY)	Walters, Mimi
McCarthy	Rohrabacher	Weber (TX)
McCaul	Rokita	Webster (FL)
McHenry	Rooney (FL)	Wenstrup
McKinley	Ros-Lehtinen	Westerman
McMorris	Roskam	Westmoreland
Rodgers	Ross	Whitfield
McNerney	Rothfus	Williams
McSally	Rouzer	Wilson (FL)
Meadows	Royce	Wilson (SC)
Meehan	Ruiz	Wittman
Meeks	Ruppersberger	Womack
Meng	Russell	Woodall
Messer	Ryan (WI)	Yoder
Mica	Sanchez, Loretta	Yoho
Miller (FL)	Scalise	Young (AK)
Miller (MI)	Schiff	Young (IA)
Moolenaar	Schrader	Young (IN)
Moore	Scott, Austin	Zeldin
Moulton	Scott, David	Zinke

NOES—116

Amash	Gabbard	McDermott
Barton	Garrett	McGovern
Bass	Gibson	Mooney (WV)
Becerra	Gohmert	Nadler
Blumenauer	Gosar	Napolitano
Bonamici	Graves (LA)	Nolan
Brady (PA)	Grayson	O'Rourke
Brat	Green, Al	Pallone
Bridenstine	Griffith	Perry
Buchanan	Grijalva	Pingree
Capps	Grothman	Pocan
Capuano	Guinta	Poe (TX)
Cartwright	Hahn	Polis
Chu, Judy	Harris	Posey
Cicilline	Hice, Jody B.	Rangel
Clark (MA)	Honda	Ribble
Clawson (FL)	Huelskamp	Roybal-Allard
Cohen	Huffman	Rush
Conyers	Issa	Ryan (OH)
Courtney	Johnson (GA)	Salmon
Cummings	Johnson, E. B.	Sanchez, Linda
Davis, Danny	Jones	T.
DeFazio	Jordan	Sanford
DeGette	Kildee	Sarbanes
DeLauro	Labrador	Schakowsky
DelBene	Larson (CT)	Schweikert
DesJarlais	Lee	Scott (VA)
Deutch	Lewis	Serrano
Doggett	Lieu, Ted	Sherman
Doyle, Michael	Lofgren	Slaughter
F.	Loudermilk	Stutzman
Duncan (SC)	Lowenthal	Takano
Edwards	Lummis	Tonko
Ellison	Lynch	Tsongas
Eshoo	Massie	Van Hollen
Esty	Matsui	Vela
Fattah	McClintock	
Fleming	McCollum	

Velázquez	Waters, Maxine	Welch
Walz	Watson Coleman	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—8

□ 1642

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOOR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

MOMENT OF SILENCE COMMEMORATING 100-YEAR ANNIVERSARY OF FIRST USE OF POISON GAS

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

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, today represents the 100-year anniversary of the first use of poison gas on Earth. On April 22, 1915, chlorine gas was sent crawling in favorable winds over Flanders Fields from German positions into positions held by the French. This sowed terror and agony for the first time.

I would like for everyone present and everyone listening to pause for a moment to think of everyone who has died in the last 100 years from poison gas, including everyone who is dying today in Syria.

Mr. Speaker, many people in America were horrified at the "60 Minutes" presentation of the sarin attacks and the footage that that included. It is horrifying to think that chlorine is also being used in that war today.

There is a reason that we put chemical weapons in a separate category, never to be used by any nation in any war. Let us just pause and think for a moment and rededicate ourselves to ridding the entire world of chemical weapons forever.

□ 1645

TRIBUTE TO ED MEAD

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

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, last month, our world bid farewell to Ed Mead, a former president, copublisher, editor, columnist, and all-around legend of the Erie Times-News in Erie, Pennsylvania, a paper founded by his grandfather in 1888.

Mr. Mead leaves behind an extraordinary legacy in the newspaper busi-

ness and in the community of Erie, the city where he was born and spent so much of his life devoted to connecting with people.

Mr. Mead was often referred to as "the voice of Erie," leading a long and distinguished career that included more than 14,000 features for his "Odds and Ends" column, one that appealed to so many people throughout our region.

Mr. Mead was so committed to serving his family's newspaper that, after graduating from Princeton University in 1949, he turned down a contract to play professional football in the National Football League's Detroit Lions club; instead, he decided to return to work in Erie for the next 63 years at the Erie Times.

Although Mr. Mead's passing will long be felt at the Erie Times Publishing Company and in the entire city of Erie and in the entire community, we know he now rests in heaven.

As is true of all legends, Ed Mead may be gone, but he will surely never be forgotten.

**PINELLAS PARK POLICE CHIEF
DORENE THOMAS**

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

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize someone who has been described as a trailblazer, a pioneer, and a woman of firsts: Pinellas Park Police Chief Dorene Thomas who, on this Friday, will retire after four decades of public service.

Thomas became the first sworn female police officer at the Pinellas Park Police Department in 1980. In fact, when she started, the evidence room was located in the men's locker room, something she would eventually change.

In 2000, Thomas became the department's first female police chief, but she often said she would simply prefer to be known as a good police chief rather than a female police chief.

Five years ago, she was elected president of the Florida Police Chiefs Association, another first for women. She has also started intensive crisis intervention training, which teaches officers how to work with people with behavioral or mental health challenges.

Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to recognize a person who has helped keep our citizens safe, to honor a person who has led with courage, kindness, grace, and understanding.

I urge my colleagues to join me in thanking Chief Thomas for her selfless years of service. Thank you for making Pinellas County a safer place, and thank you to all the men and women who, today, serve on the front lines of law enforcement.

Chief Thomas, enjoy your retirement. You have very well earned it.

PRESIDENT OBAMA'S REQUEST TO WRITE RULES FOR THE WORLD'S ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALLEN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, at his State of the Union Address, President Obama asked us in Congress to grant us fast-track Trade Promotion Authority, so he can "write rules for the world's economy."

I sat alarmed for America's future should we expand this President's authority, given how he has extended executive overreach, fumbled our foreign policy, debilitated our defense, and diminished our domestic tranquility. At least this time, the President asked to bypass Congress.

Regardless of the merits of trade partnership or the tactics of their negotiation, two fundamental questions loom: Why do we trust this President, given his track record in foreign affairs? And what serious harm would come to the Nation by waiting 21 months?

Trade Promotion Authority, or TPA, would prevent Congress from amending as much as one word of the rules he writes, a sweeping agreement the White House has been working toward for the past 6 years. Even if parameters were set beforehand, violations would be subject to an up-or-down vote with no amending permitted. Unlike a treaty, a simple majority is all that would be needed to pass.

For Congress to cede oversight on such a sweeping agreement could have grave implications. The American people must be at the table, and they can be, through their elected representatives in Congress.

In a balanced process, the full range of congressional committees would hold hearings with experts, establish clear objectives, set the terms of negotiation, and be regularly informed throughout the negotiating process.

This would ensure trade deals are in the best national interest for the long haul, not designed to please some small groups of well-connected insiders for some tempting short-term benefit.

While trade is vital in securing economic freedom and in strengthening our values and friendships, we must approach any partnership with a comprehensive view of its strategic impact. Advocates have stated that a Trans-Pacific Partnership will open trade involving 40 percent of global economic activity.

This is a misrepresentation when one considers that 6 of the 11 nations proposed for the partnership already have strong trade agreements with the United States and many of the remainder enjoy excellent trade relations, such as with Japan.

The President also claims a trade surplus without delineating this improvement will come from services

such as financial, insurance, and computing, not from manufacturing, as he purports. Given Obama's scathing treatment of financial and insurance investment overseas, one wonders if there is not some other hidden motivation.

Alarming, Mr. Obama uses containment language with regard to China as a major premise for obtaining fast-track authority. While we employ economic instruments of our national power with regard to an ascendant China, we must ensure in tandem efforts with diplomatic and informational instruments as well. Strategically, these are lacking.

Further, should a trade dispute result in an impasse, nations historically have lashed back with their last remaining option, their military. I have been on the receiving end of many of those strategic implications. Ours must be prepared—our military—as we explore these new frontiers.

I have heard no serious discussion from anyone in Congress or the White House thinking comprehensively and strategically in this manner, that our military and our diplomatic efforts must also be resourced and reinforced as we move economically in this pivot to Asia.

When John Hay opened trade with China more than a century ago as a hedge on an ascendant Japan to balance European concerns, the achievement was widely heralded. Japanese society had rapidly embraced Western science and technology since the days of Commodore Perry. A vibrant economy blossomed. Western ideas in manufacturing, banking, business, and even military doctrine quickly transformed Japan into a formidable power. This was not without political consequence.

Japan had transformed her society, fought as an ally in a world war with the West, imported goods to a demanding public, built ships together with the West, and signed treaties. Their rapid transformation alarmed the Japanese Diet hardliners, who used this anti-Western sentiment to wedge political power.

Within a 15-year span, the lengthy embrace of the West gave way to competition for resources, distrust, the fall of Japanese Government, and the doctrine of their Greater East Asia Co-Prospersity Sphere.

In only a couple of more years, what was embraced in the West was now widely disrespected in Japan. Despised, they were deliberately attacked; few ever saw it coming. That Japan and the United States are such strong allies and friends today is a testament of our mutual commitment to the repairing of human diplomatic and economic tragedies.

We cannot allow President Obama to rush willy-nilly into a fast-track Chinese hegemony without regard to strategic thinking. Given his dismal foreign policy record, it comes as no revelation, but it does come with consequences. What serious harm will

come to our Nation by waiting 21 months when we have an administration that actually could achieve foreign policy successes, instead of one foreign policy defeat after another?

A dog may lap up antifreeze because it seems good to the taste and pleasant to the eye, but it does so with consequence. We should not be lured by the appeal to our natural senses for trade and economic growth.

Patience now may prevent horrific consequences in a major war in the future. We do that by advancing our national instruments of power with diplomatic effort, military readiness, and preparedness in tandem with our economic effort.

What serious harm can come by waiting 21 months? As Abraham Lincoln famously said:

Nothing good can be frustrated by time.

We do not need to give the President this authority. We need to wait, have the patience, lay the strategic foundation so that we can do what is best for our country, and move into a trade agreement that will have a long-lasting foundation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

100TH ANNIVERSARY OF ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, on April 24, we will mark the 100th anniversary of the Armenian genocide. 100 years ago, 1.5 million Armenians, along with the Syrians and Greeks, were slaughtered by the Ottoman Empire in the first genocide of the 20th century.

The sheer scale of genocide thwarts our capacity to comprehend it: 1.5 million Armenians killed, 6 million Jews killed in the Holocaust, 1 million Tutsis. The numbers become abstractions sanitized by their enormity. It is only when we consider each of those lives individually that the full horror comes into focus.

□ 1700

The victims of genocide are more than victims—they are human beings. The Armenians massacred from 1915 to 1923 were men, women, and children who were targeted in what was then an unprecedented campaign to wipe out an entire people.

It is our duty in the modern day to remember those lost and to bear witness that the campaign to destroy the Armenian people failed. We do so by speaking the truth, and we do so by speaking the names of those 1.5 million and by keeping both the way they lived and the way they died alive in our memory.

Earlier this month, I asked my thousands of Armenian constituents and millions of Armenians around the

country and the world to submit the names and stories of their family members who were killed 100 years ago. The response was overwhelming. Thousands of people sent the names and stories of ancestors killed in the genocide—the names of infants and toddlers ripped from their mother's arms, the names of children and the elderly dying of exhaustion and starvation on a forced march to Deir ez-Zor, the names of women and girls raped and brutalized and killed, the names of clergy tortured and burned alive in their own churches, the names of men robbed of their possessions, of their homes, and of their lives.

Each victim has a name and a story. From Glendale, to Yerevan, to Jordan, and every corner of the world where Armenian diaspora lives, families sent me those names and those stories. It is my honor to read some of those names this hour, knowing that it would take more than 1,000 hours, more than 50 days, to read all of them.

Turkey may deny the genocide. Our administration may lack the courage to recognize the genocide. Our Congress may lack the courage to recognize the genocide. But no one can deny the humanity of its victims, and no one can deny our right to speak the truth.

One hundred years ago, 1.5 million Armenians were killed in the Armenian genocide. These are their names:

George Tutunjian
Harutsun Minasian
Samuel Kadiyan
Dikran Karakashian
Manoug Tenkerian
Mary Tenkerian
Hagop Artinian
Makrouhie Tenkerian
Mihran Tenkerian
Sarkis Tenkerian
Tagouhi Hounanian
Gevork Vasilyan
Hovnan Hounanian
Siranush Tatulyan
Shooshan Hounanian
Lusadzin Boghikian
Karapet Orudzhyan
Zorig Hounanian
Elias Hovsepien
Grace Totigian-Klanian
Simon Klanian
Azniv Totigian
Mariam Minasian
Tamam Kouyoumjian
Hovhannes Kouyoumjian
Isgouhi Kademian
Khachig Kademian
Arakel Gayserian
Karapet Orudzhyan
Vahan Avetikyan
Hakop Semerdjian
Hagop Yeniguveiyian
Hagop Yeniguveiyian
Garabed Kulhanjian
Vahan Jihanian
Assadour Shekherdmian
Khachik Danelian
Gadarineh Danelian
Makrouhi Chavdarian
Garabed Jihanian
Hovsep Sarkissian
Matteos Sarkissian

Bedros Torosian
Aram Achekbashian
Kegham Vanigian
Mourad Zakarian
Yervant Topuzian
Hagop Basmajian
Smpat Kelejian
Roupen Garabedian
Armenag Hampartsoumian
Apraham Mouradian
Hrand Yegavian
Karnig Boyajian
Hovhannes Ghazarian
Mgrdich Yeretsian
Yeremia Manoukian
Tovmas Tovmasian
Karekin Boghosian
Minas Keshishian
Boghos Boghosian
Hampartsum Boyajian
Janet Tufenkjioglu
Daniel Mkitharian
Takouhi Tufenkjioglu
Ripsime Bedoian and Margaret Bedoian were sisters, aged 8 and 10. They were taken forcefully by Turkish soldiers from their home in Harpoot. Ransom was demanded, but the family was poor and could not pay. They were never seen again.

Dikran Kalousdian
Khatun Kalousdian
Mardiros Gevoglani
Adrineh Ghazelian
Abraham Bilalian
Nazareth Torosyan
Agavne Jurukian
Avak Giurlakian
Harout Avagyan
Lilit Abrahamyan
Avag Avagyan
Bagdasar Jurukian
Vahan Eloyan
Hambardzoum Avagyan
Khachatour Avagyan
Hovsep Sarkissian
Khatchadour Jingirian
Alex Petrosyan
Sarkis Jingirian
Khachadur Petrosyan
Petros Petrosyan
Hovhanes Petrosyan
Hagop Chaghastpanian
Garabet Petrosyan
Shushat Petrosyan
Megerdich Saakian
Yeranui Shurjyan
Panos Shurjyan
Hovhannes Hovhannisyan
Garabet Hovhannisyan
Hovsep Hadjyan
Sarkis Hadjyan
Ohan Hadjyan
Khachadur Petrosyan
Petros Petrosyan
Sylva Portoian
Hagop Karanfilian
Gadar Karanfilian
Dikran Vartanyan
Kerop Vartanyan
Manuel Tanielian
Robert Vartanyan
Barkev Vartanyan
Haykaz Vartanyan
Levon Vartanyan
Alice Malconian
Yervand Margaryan
Manoushag Chakalian

Mgrdich Salian
Gulsima Polatian
Kevork Der Markarian
Dilber Der Markarian
Araksiya Nadjarian
Ohanes Kahkejian
Bertha Tanielian
Harout Aydinian
Khachig Kerbabian
Sarkis Dadoyan
Siragan Abrahamian
Bishop Ignatius Maloyan
Nerses Zeytoonian
Karnig Seferian
Garabed Amirkhanian
Ohan Khodzhabashian
Mariam Amirkhanian
Victoria Sergenian drowned her two children and herself to end their suffering as they were forced to march hundreds of miles through the desert.

Iskandar Ohanissian
Touren Krikorian
Apraham Krikorian
Touren Krikorian
Bedo Seremjian
Hachik Madilian
Zakar Pstikyan
Sirvart Dembekjian
Mariam Donikian
Andon Donikian
Sedrak Barighyan
Mihran Chookaszian
Aznif Gulazian
Simpad Gulazian
Vahan Manusadjian
Souren Azirian
Matyos Karachayirlian
Mihran Khayan
Levon Karachayirlian
Abrahm Kasparian
Artin Benlian
Voski Ghazarian
Lucie Mahserejian
Hagop Mahserejian
Solomon Khachaturian
Almakdisi Jubrail Chad
Hairabed Hairabedian
Hripsime Semizian
Hripsime Semizian
Hagop Semizian
Yervant Semizian
Hovaness Arslanian
Nevart Arslanian
Manual Arslanian
Khosrof Arslanian
Garabed Jihanian
Hovsep Sarkissian
Souren Azirian
Mihran Khayan
Archpriest Hoosik Kachouni
Nishan Nishanian
Toros Balian
Bayzar Balian
Garabed Mekjian
Sarkis Sevian
Hagop Sevian
Prapion Sagherian
Hovhannes Sagherian
Nazaret Chalian
Garabed Kulhanjian
Bedros Der Sarkissian
Haroutune Der Bedrossian
Nahabed Kasabian
Thadeus Derdarian
Agavne Pamboukian
Hourig Barsoumian
Sarkis Barsoumian

Khachadur Higobian
 Hitoon Higobian
 Ohin Higobian
 Ani Arkelian
 Sarkis Arkelian
 Higop Arkelian
 Ohines Arkelian
 Movses Kochgerian
 Arsidakes Varjabedian tried to prevent Turkish soldiers from raping his 15-year-old sister in Nevsehir. He was shot to death.

Mariam Kochgerian
 Mari Iskandarian
 Asadoor Daghlian
 Elizabeth Daghlian
 Gabriel Khalaf
 Simon Issa
 Astghik Doola
 Manel Jamgotchian
 Moushegh Jamgotchian
 Gernelios Jamgotchian
 Vahan Jamgotchian
 Levon Jamgotchian
 Kegham Djemdjemian

□ 1715

Mesrob Djemdjemian
 Chouhar Djemdjemian
 Mariam Jamgotchian
 Dikranouhi Jamgotchian
 Anna Jamgotchian
 Karekin Hekimian
 Zabel Hekimian
 Avedis Hachadourian
 Zabel Hachadourian
 Khatchadour Hachadourian
 Zarouhi Paghtikian
 Levon Yapoujian
 Mary Yapoujian
 Artin Budakian
 Daniel Varten Kondakjian
 Markar Zoornajian
 Sarkis Krikorian
 Hagop Kinadjian
 Lucia Chaderchian
 Ashod Kinadjian
 Khoren Kinadjian
 Shahmihram Kinadjian
 Vahharam Kinadjian
 Kaspar Santourian
 Maretthza Hamalian
 Victoria Kotchakian
 Giragos Kotchakian
 Hambartzum Nersesian
 Nubar Nersesian
 Rehan Nersesian
 Abraham Ghazarian
 Mooshegh Ghazarian
 Samson Ghazarian
 Peprone Ghazarian
 Nounig Hotoian
 Mariam Torisyan
 Nazig Torisyan
 Nersess Der Babian
 Toros Mekhsian
 Rahel Mekhsian
 Apraham Mekhsian
 Hrant Mekhsian
 Mariam Kulekesayan
 Haig Arakelian
 Armenak Garabedian
 Dikran Garabed
 Nevart Najarian
 Grikor Surenian
 Dareh Surenian
 Garegin Surenian
 Aghavni Surenian

Faris Surenian
 Mardiros Fermanian
 Kaspar Jeboghlian
 Hagop Jamgotchian
 Hovhaness Jamgotchian
 Hrant Shenlooguan
 Dikran Shenlooguan
 Krikor Shenlooguan
 Nishon Jivelegian
 Surpoohi Jivelegian
 Byzar Jivelegian
 Lusintak Amirkhanian
 Simon Sheshetian
 Sarkis Mouradian
 Eva Mahseredjian was 10 years old. Her village was occupied by Turkish troops. Two soldiers fought over her to settle their dispute. Their commanding officer cut Eva in half with a sword.

Elize Mouradian
 Garabed Kljian
 Hagop Madaghjian
 Khachig Kasabian
 Kohar Kasabian
 Garabed Kasabian
 Osanna Keullian
 Movses Keullian
 Ghazar Jivalagian
 Elizabeth Arakelian
 Kaloost Meldonian
 Sarkis Meldonian
 Hovagheem Hovsepien
 Elbis Hovsepien
 Hagopig Hovsepien
 Elizabeth Yaghdjian
 Sarkis Yaghdjian
 Krikor Yaghdjian
 Hajno Jardarabed Haji Martros
 Mardiros Deovletian
 Asniv Yaghdjian
 Sara Yaghdjian
 Mourad Sarkissian
 Zemroukht Sarkissian
 Artin Boyamian
 Avedis Boyamian
 Kevork Mkhitarian
 Lucine Mkhitarian
 Arousiag Shirinian
 Garabed Shirinian
 Yaghut Markosyants
 Martiros Markosyants
 Nikoghos Zarobyan
 Bedros Bedrosian
 Khachadour Buchaklian
 Levon Maxoudian
 Hagop Yeramian
 Skandare Kalousdian
 Elizabeth Sirounian
 Reverend Father Kevork Nalbandian
 Kevork Belekian
 Vartan Belekian
 Nerses Belekian
 Yosef Belekian
 Hagob Belekian
 Vartish Belekian
 George Vartarian
 Tigran Nargizian
 Zarouhi Zeitounzian Nargizian
 Avedis Ainilian
 Hovannes Mugrdichian
 Hornig Mugrdichian
 Roupen Kapikian
 Haiganoush Kapikian
 Veronica Elmasian
 Apik Elmasian
 Satenig Kapikian
 Vartouhe Kaimian
 Toumass Kaimian

Lucine Manougian
 Ohanness Avedis Jalakian
 David Muradian
 Sara Muradian
 Loucine Zarougian
 Bedros Zarougian
 Tateos Der Avedisian
 Maritza Kurkjian Der Avedisian
 Arshavir Der Avedisian
 Hrant Der Avedisian
 Maritza Basmajian
 Vartouhi Basmajian
 Hagop Chavooshian
 Boghos Zarougian
 Bishop Kevork Nalbandian
 Dickronouhi Nigoghsonian
 Armenouhi Nigoghsonian
 Barooyr Nigoghsonian
 Sarkis Nigoghsonian
 Vartivar Berberian
 Anna Berberian
 Iskouhi Kalfayan
 Jivan Kalfayan
 Parsekh Balian
 Valentine Balian
 Garabed Berberian
 Panos Berberian
 Migirdich Salian
 Haroutioun Apkarian
 Sara Apkarian
 Hripsime Apkarian
 Mariam Kouyoumjian was taken by the Turks in April 1915 and never seen again. Her daughter was orphaned as an 11 year old, but she was rescued by the Near East Relief Foundation, an unprecedented humanitarian effort undertaken by the U.S. Government and concerned Americans with support worldwide.
 Guiragos Kojakian
 Hagopjan Kojakian
 Levon Kojakian
 Harutiun Ansurian
 Artashes Solakian
 Hovhaness Kussajukian
 Hagopig Kussajukian
 Maria Kussajukian
 Makrouhi Kussajukian
 Anoush Sarmanian
 Anna Sarmanian
 Yurapet Karapetyan
 Ephrem Karapetyan
 Hamparsum Borzakian
 Aghajan Tepoyan
 Haiganoush Kilerciyan
 Yeranig Alexanyan
 Artin DerSimonian
 Rebecca DerSimonian
 Hovnan Doursounian
 Shoushan Doursounian
 Simon DerSimonian
 Nargiz DerSimonian
 Avedis Kevorkian
 Hampartsoom Belejian
 Roupen Racoubian
 Sarkis Gureghian
 Aram Demerjian
 Michael Frengulian
 Kevork Dashebeukian
 Nishan Avedikian
 Toros Kurkjian
 Senecherin Kalionjian
 Tomas Khanzedian
 Mihran Chamian
 Mergerios Tashjian
 Antranig Beshgeturian
 Yervant Gabashian

Levon Racoubian
 Barour Kapigian
 Yervant Frengulian
 Musbeg Demirjian
 Kaprial Chordikian
 Serop Srabian
 Movses Avedikian
 Mourad Abrahamian
 Siran Khachigian
 Souren Yavruian
 Levon Gevorgian
 Garabed Tahmizian
 Magaros Dabanian
 Khoren Tossounian
 Charles Atamian
 Rose Atamian
 Varduhi Hayzavakyan
 Grikor Xazaryan
 Trtat Podrumyan
 Abraham Ashikyan
 Mariam Ashikyan
 Sahak Ashikyan
 Manuk Ashikyan
 Sarah Ashikyan
 Haykuhi Ashikyan
 Heripsime Ashikyan
 Gevorg Ashikyan

Hovannes Knajian was a well-known and respected doctor. Turkish soldiers came to his door at 3 a.m. and told him his help was needed for a 9-year-old girl. He went with them and was never seen again.

Byuzant Ashikyan
 Harutyun Arabyan
 Abraham Arabyan
 Karapet Arabyan
 Shnavon Arabyan
 Setrak Arabyan
 Merkset Arabyan
 Haji Arabyan
 Lucine Arabyan
 Yervand Arabyan
 Mariam Arabyan
 Sargis Hambartsumyan
 Hambar Djxalyan
 Arak Djxalyan
 Manor Djxalyan
 Hagop Gulyunyan
 Gulyustan Gulyunyan
 Gabriel Gulyunyan
 Avetis Gulyunyan
 Zakar Gulyunyan

□ 1730

Aghajan Tepoyan
 Ossana Kalajian
 Penyamin Vartivarian
 Marta Kehyaian
 Avedis Vosbikian
 Haroutoun Tcholakian
 Mariam Tcholakian
 Krikor Dakessian
 Dirouhi Dakessian
 Maritza Achihisian
 Araxi Barsamian
 Donik Chilingirian
 Yuhaper Chilingirian
 Ovanes Chilingirian
 Hazaros Bandoian
 Harutyun Minasyan
 Iskuhi Minasyan
 Reverend Father Nerces Nercesian
 Yeretsgin Alpessa Der Nercesian
 Haroutun Haroutunian
 Luso Melkonyan
 Sanam Melkonyan
 Levon Hakhoyan

Mavo Hakhoyan
 Sedrak Avedissyan
 Zumrogh Mikaelian
 Dikran Mekhtarentz
 Afram Hadouband
 Kegham Mardikian
 Megerdich Saroyan
 Harutyun Parlakyan
 Hagob Simonian
 Thaguhi Ashchyan
 Gohar Parlakyan
 Manouk Pahlevan Keoseyan
 Martiros Keoseyan
 Onnig Khachaduryan
 Knel Tourajikian
 Sirarpy Tourajikian
 Arusiag Tourajikian
 Papken Tourajikian
 Levon Tourajikian
 Hermig Tourajikian
 Ossanna Basmajian
 Mihran Barzakyan
 Anna Barzagyan
 Awanes Kramian
 Aslan Kadoyan
 Tatos Kadoyan
 Harry Dalalian
 Aram Chamkertian
 Garabet Chobanian
 Serpouhi Adjemian Momjian
 Kalousd Daghlarian
 Serob Qosyan
 Hossep Melkisetian
 Khatchig Doudaklian
 Avedis Mikaelian
 Mesrob Der Mesrobian was burned alive in his church with his wife and his daughter.

Yeva Kevorkian
 Stepan Khachigian
 Garabeth Havoudjian
 Sima Havoudjian
 Sarkis Mahseredjian
 Nishan Mahakian
 Hagop Donikian
 Garabed Daghlarian
 Armenag Bilezikjian
 Hovhaness Khrlakian
 Eugenie Daghlarian
 Macrouhie Lepejian
 Azniv Lepejian
 Mirzo Melkon Kalostyan
 Hagop Alemian
 Hovhannes Alemian
 Manoug Kelerjian
 Hovanes Derstepanian
 Balasan Elbakyan
 Sahak Elbakyan
 Anush Elbakyan
 Tokhman Hagop
 Sirvart Tufenjioglu
 Ovsanna Jamgotsian
 Hovsep Chatoian
 Kaspar Jamgotsian
 Setrag Sahakian
 Kevork Roumian
 Nigoghos Tertsakian
 Marie Tertsakian
 Hovsep Vehuni
 Avedis Giragosian
 Garabed Sohigian
 Hampardzum Khanamerian
 Mariam Tatoian
 Panos Cobanoglu
 Kohar Cobanoglu
 Panos Arslanoglu
 Margrit Arslanoglu
 Neshan Stepanian

Marie Mesrobian Kalpakian
 Sarkis Postallian
 Mary Postallian
 Turfanda Minasian
 Marian Minasian
 Minas Minasian
 Zaruhi Artin Nidelian
 Tanzouf Artin Nidilian
 Azaduhi Artin Nidelian
 Apraham Koumruian
 Khatchik Khacherian
 Haiguhi Hagopian

Yetvart Jamgochian was 4 years old. He was with his sisters, hiding from shelling outside his village, when they were found by Turkish soldiers. They cut a cross into his face, and they killed him.

Eghiazar Melkonian
 Sarkis Melikyan
 Garabed Kulhanjian
 Margaret Baronian
 Hovanness Baronian
 Marta Bilazarian
 Sarkis Bilazarian
 Bedros Der Sarkisian
 Bedros Papazian
 Haroutioun Aydabirian
 Gabriel Handjian
 Hagop Kouyoumdjian
 Kevork Keshishian
 Mariam Keshishian
 Sarkis Ourfalian
 Nevart Ourfalian
 Salome Proodian
 Raffi Proodian
 Vartkes Proodian
 Khatoon Proodian
 Mugurditch Gulazian
 Marderos Dadourian
 Dr. Onnig Mardirossian
 Artin Der-Azarian
 Vartuhi Der-Azarian
 Sarkis Samsatlian
 Kevork Samsatlian
 Kevork Adiyamanian
 Vartivar Kourouyan
 Mariam Kourouyan
 Sarkis Dadoyan
 Tamar Gulbankian
 Zakary Mooradian
 Antranig Agopian
 Andreas Kelekian
 Armenak Malkhasyan
 Vartouhi Topian
 Ardashes Topian
 Hovannes Topian
 Aristakes Topian
 Madiam Topian
 Nazanee Topian
 Mariam Topian
 Mikael Topian
 Arshalouis Topian
 Mary Vezirian
 Hagop Havatian
 Taniel Muftikian
 Krikor Muftikian
 Zacharia Melkonian
 Shookry Grigoryan
 Vartouhi Chakmanian

Armenouhi Toutikian was 7 years old. She died of dehydration and hunger on a march through the desert. Her father had to leave her body there in the sand.

Krikor Krikorian

Hovannes Krikorian
 Vartanush Krikorian
 Araksi Krikorian
 Sarkis Muradian
 Aris Krikorian
 Hakop Alemian
 Manouk Keshishian
 Agapi Dardakhanian
 Columbus Keshishian
 Arakel Boghossian
 Takvor Andonian
 Siragan Andonian
 Filor Atanesyan
 Parsegh Gumushian
 Haroutiun Gumushian
 Veronica Gumushian
 Haroutioun Andonian
 Garabed Soovajian
 Sisag Arpajian
 Misak Arpajian
 Krikor Orchanian
 Anna Khouljanian
 Harutyun Pogosyan
 Pogos Sahakyan-Mirzayan
 Eva Kevorkian
 Garabed Kevorkian
 Hovanes Aprahamian
 Ashod Nishanian
 Manvel Manukian
 Khachig Khanzatian
 Haroutyoon Bronozian
 Mariam Zeibari
 Boghos Avedian
 Nazenik Avedian
 Knarig Avedian
 Shoushanig Avedian
 Hagop Jomlekian
 Azniv Jomlekian
 Onnig Jomlekian
 Aghavni Jomlekian
 Megerditch Ayvazian
 Markar Der Hovanessian
 Hamparsoum Garabed Shehranian
 Nishan Atamian
 Nazaret DerTavitian
 Zarouhi Andonian
 Khachadour Paloulian
 Sahag (Hagopian) Chakheian
 Hagop (Avedissian) Chakheyan
 Chakhe (Avedissian) Chakheyan
 Serop Dzeroon Kizirian
 Sarkis Amirghanian was thrown into a well with his family and burned alive. The only survivor was his 13-year-old brother, who would recall unto his death many years later the smell of smoke.

Arpineh Kizirian
 Avedis Kabaklian
 Paylak Sarkisants
 Aramig Kitabjian
 Siranush Kitabjian
 Garabed Kitabjian
 Setrak Kitabjian
 Mariam Ter-Mkrtchyan
 Movses Abajian
 Alexan Keishian
 Sahag Momdjian
 Beatrice Momdjian
 Garabed Momdjian
 Armenag Momdjian
 Joe Kahraman
 Zaghig Seradarian
 Megerdich Seradarian
 Ohan Ohanian
 Sirpouhi Ohanian
 Sarkiss Mushetsi Baloian
 Smbat Sargisi Sargsyan

Hranoosh Nalbandian Berberian
 Asatur Soghomonian
 Martiros and Aghavni Kotikian
 Armenak Bahadorian
 Hovannes Ananian
 Nazareth Boujoulian
 Harutiun Ansurian
 Artashes Solakhian
 Igit Nurbekyants
 Miriam Sarkissian
 Margarita Kaphian
 Siroun Jilizian
 Serop Jilizian
 Minas Jilizian
 Khatoun Jilizian
 Hampartsum Torian
 Hagop Torian
 Dikran Torian
 Dikran Dikranian
 Araxi Dikranian

□ 1745

Lucine Torian
 Abraham Dikranian
 Vartuhi Dikranian
 Ohanes Ohanian
 Mihran Mozian
 Haygazouhi Mozian
 Juhar Ohanian
 Juhar Ohanian
 Hambarcum Chekichyan
 Andranik Chekichyan
 Hakop Chekichyan
 Mariam Mardayan
 Khachadour Vartanian
 Zabelle Vartanian
 Karabet Garsevanian
 Simon Garsevanian
 Sima Pamboukian
 Shukri Pamboukian
 Gevork Chilian
 Margarit Pamboukian
 Zarouhie Mekjian
 Kevork Mekjian
 Kirakos Lazarian
 Pambock Lazarian
 Haygaz Mitilian froze to his death on his father's shoulders in a snowstorm as they fled during the French retreat from Marash in 1920. He was 8 years old.

Garabed Baghamian
 Aram Baghamian
 Vahan Baghamian
 Tzaghigh Baghamian
 Salpi Yengibaryan
 Mary Manuelian
 Sarkis Doudakian
 Asadour Najarian
 Terfanda Najarian
 Garabed Tashjian
 Hampartsoum Kenderian
 Takouhy Kenderian
 Mariam boghossian
 Hripsime Kechichian
 Sarkis Keshishian
 Haroutioun Kourbanjian
 Martiros Hovhannisyan
 Nemzur Koubandjian
 Grigor Mouradyan
 Sahag Karajaian
 Nemzur Karajaian
 Harutune Dadourian
 Hunazant Alexanian
 Hovaness Azatyan
 Mariam Azatyan
 Hakop Laxoyan
 Mari Laxoyan

Aharon Piloyan
 Hagop Piloyan
 Khachadour Piloyan
 Hagop Kepenekian
 Zaruhi Chitjian Khatunagian
 Marinos Chitjian
 Mardiros Chitjian
 Vartouhi Chitjian
 Yeranouhi Chitjian
 Nishan Chitjian
 Ludwig Madenlian
 Vergeen Madenlian
 Melkon Medzikian
 Elmasd Medzikian
 Hagop DerBedrossian
 Yester DerBedrossian
 Hambardzum Khulyan
 Karapet Khulyan
 Khachadour Boyajian
 Ipek Momdjian
 Abraham Hayrikyan
 Sahak Abrahamyan
 Zaruhi Abrahamyan
 Loosaper Balian
 Avedis Nahabedian
 Haig Nahabedian
 Haigouhi Sare-Kechichian
 Vahram DerManuelian
 Chukajian Nurijian
 Mariam Moughamian
 Krikor Moughamian
 Hovhannes Keshishian
 Azniv Keshishian
 Galust Avetisian
 Andon Ahmaranian
 Vartouhi Sarajian
 Mariam Sarajian
 Mardiros Kachian

Azatouhi Trdatyan was 3 years old. She was murdered, along with her parents, in front of her 13-year-old brother. Her brother survived but would never forget the trauma.

Petros Trdatyan
 Dikran Menayan
 Mariam Trdatyan
 Anania Nalbandian
 Sema Nalbandian
 Nishan Totigian
 Makrouhi Totigian
 Sahag Karajaian
 Nemzur Koubandjian
 Haroutioun Kourbanjian
 Yeghishe Bargamian
 Jirair Bargamian
 Agavni Norigian
 Kohar Jokhajian
 Zartoohe Karapiloian
 Nshan DerBedrossian
 Yeghisapet DerBedrossian
 Aghajan DerBedrossian
 Krikor DerBedrossian
 Khanem DerBedrossian
 Mariam DerBedrossian
 Kevork DerBedrossian
 Kayane DerBedrossian
 Azniv DerBedrossian
 Dickran Akmakjian
 Maghak DerBedrossian
 Hovsep DerBedrossian
 Elise DerBedrossian
 Zarouhi DerBedrossian
 Noyemzar DerBedrossian
 Vartouhi DerBedrossian
 Aram Baghamian
 Vahan Baghamian
 Ara Aroian
 Tzaghigh Baghamian

Mariam Roubinian
 Sylva Roubinian
 Armenag Hokhikian
 Martiros Mirakhorian
 Zaghik Mardirosian
 Andranik Tsarukyan
 Margret Saroyan
 Hovsep Saroyan
 Akchan Mkhitarian
 Grigor Mkhitarian
 Nahabit Epikian
 Yeghisabet Demirdjian
 Haroution Demirdjian
 Khachadour Cholakian
 Mariam Agajanian
 Hagop Der Nikoghosian
 Der Ashot Avedian
 Dikran Khanjian
 Armenag Diradourian
 Garabed Kenoian
 Moushegh Boyajian
 Easaya Kenoian
 Elizabeth Boyajian Kenoian
 Peter Boyajian
 Garabed Baghamian
 Sarkis Elmassian
 Tzagheeg Baghamian
 Adam Baghamian
 Vahan Baghamian
 Mugerditch Ohnikian
 Malaka Soghomonian died from a forced march through the Der Zor Desert while she was pregnant. She left behind four living children, the oldest of whom was only 9.
 Aghavnee Ohnikian
 Haratyun Ohnikian
 Ludwig Ohnikian
 Hovsep Ohnikian
 Annig Ohnikian
 Mardig Kebabjian
 Avedis Mardiros Gertmenian
 Miriam Gertmenian Rejabian
 Toros Chaglassian
 Jivan Dedian
 Armenag Baghdassarian
 Kevork Aslanian
 Nvard Ter-Stepanyan
 Tzaghigh Baghamian
 Manush Pananian
 Taguhi Doganyan
 Hayrapet Doganyan
 Hakop Karoyan
 Petros Keheyian
 Nazeli Keheyian
 Abraham Hairbedian
 Khanem DerTavitian
 Levon Hissarian
 Myram Kazarian
 Siranoush Arakelian
 Kazar Arakelian
 Armenag Metchikian
 Garabed Varjabedian
 Boghos Asharjian
 Boghos Asharjian
 Mena Ashajian
 Barkev Asharjian
 Dikran Asharjian
 Vartan Demoorjian
 Aharon Der Melkon
 Nazley Sarookeshian
 Fedan Shokeyian
 Krikor Shalelengian
 Manoog Shokeyian
 Sarkis Sarookeshishian
 Markarid Ounanian Shalelengian
 Osgehan Shalelengian
 Sirma Shalalengian

Avedis Shalelengian
 Bedros Tekian
 Krikor Dulgarian
 Pilbos Der Avedisian
 Anahid Oundjian
 Vardui Gasparian
 Yeghiasar Yaylayian
 Hagop Yaylayian
 Vosgan Topalian
 Antranig Hayrabed
 Maritza Onnigian
 Nerses Shabaglian
 Maritza Onnigian
 Lucie Ayyazian
 Takouhi khardalian
 Sarkis Mavilian
 Nunia Mavilian
 Nazely Sarookeshian
 Fedan Shokeyian
 Levon Hissarian
 Zarouhi Tchekrekhhjian
 Nazaret Magarian
 Zarouhi Magarian
 Rahel Demirjian
 Raffael Der-Tovmasyan
 Levon Aharonian
 Aharon Aharonian
 Altoon Aharonian
 Haygaz Simonian
 Hagop Beloian
 Hagop Beloian
 Yetvart Jamgochian
 Vergeen Tashjian
 Verone Bedrosian
 Smbat Byurat DerGhazarian
 Zumgroot DerGhazarian
 Zartar Arakelian
 Maryam Kazarian
 Hovanness Yeretian
 Marian Shekerdemian
 Vartan Yeretian
 Kevork Vichabian
 Simon Simonyan
 Zmrookht Simonyan
 Mariam Simonyan
 Haroutyun Papazian
 Zakaria Minassian
 Garabed Jingoizian
 Zakaria Minassian
 Krikor Papazian
 Baghdassar Karibian
 Mary Meuguerditchian-Apelian
 Zakar Ovoian
 Hambardzum Khulyan
 Suren Hakobyan
 Azatuhi Hakobyan
 Vostan Baghallian
 Simon Hovhannesi Achikgiozian
 Hripsime Aghvinian
 Hovhanes Aghvinian
 Ester Maghakian
 Boghos Maghakian
 Maghak Maghakian
 Mkhoyan Asatur
 Hripsime Maghakian
 Srpui Mkrthyan
 Assadour Assadourian
 Yeva Hovhannessian
 Ghazaros Medzoian
 Sargsian Tigran
 Loosatsin Medzoian
 Araxi Fundukian
 Zaven Fundukian
 Mariam Aroushian
 Sarkis Aroushian
 Gadarine Fundukian
 Anahid Fundukian
 Elmast Medzgian

Khachig Fundukian
 Hagop Fundukian
 Khassig Fundukian
 Eva Fundukian
 Melkon Medzgian
 Ludwig Medzgian
 Verjin Medzgian
 Ara Medzgian
 Hovannes Altibarmakian
 Horop Anoushian
 Zakaryan Nerses
 Grigor Zohrap
 Movses Deirmendjian
 Hovaness Toutikian
 Maritsa Kyulehyan
 Tadevos Karapetyan
 Khatchador Boyajian
 Shimavon Donoyan
 Anna Donoyan
 Avedis Chaparian
 Sirak Keshishian
 Mardiros Toutikian
 Abraham Toutikian
 Hovannes Knajian
 Armenouhi Toutikian
 Harout Knajian
 Lucy Knajian
 Christeen Ter Stepanian
 Avak Mouradian
 Papken Toumaian
 Hagop Kalbakian
 Aram Jermakyan
 Garabed Kaloustian
 Sarkis Dadoyan
 Elisabeth Partamian
 Nazareth Partamian
 Ovsanna Kayayan
 Marna Banerian
 Onnig Khachigian
 Elmonig Khachigian
 Onnig Khachaturian
 Stepan Khachigian
 Elize Avakian
 Zabel Avakian
 Arousiag Avakian
 Setrag Avakian
 Mgrditch Tashjian
 Boghos Mkhitarian
 Iskouhi Gabrielian
 Aregnaz Markaryan
 Missak Mozian
 Haroutyun Sarkissian
 Santoukht Mozian Ansoorian
 Mikael Ansoorian
 Yeghia Sarkissian
 Khazaros Charchian
 Mihran Berberian
 Haganoush Tarpinian
 Megerdich Sarafian
 George Chelabian
 Hakop Ter-Saakyan
 Tatos Moloian
 Mikael Khachetoorian
 Hamparsoum Borzakian
 Mesrob Der Mesrobian
 Marta Avakian
 Karnig Tomassian
 Gayane Kazarian
 Dikran Kazarian
 Ararat Kazarian
 Shoushanig Donegian
 Haroutune Oknayan
 Hagop Parsaghian
 Niko Zakarian
 Mariam Kouyoumjian
 Kevork Mardirossian
 Hripsime Mardirossian
 Kevork Mardirossian

Makrouhie Oknayan	Anahid Der Parseghian	Mary Kouyoumdjian
Khachik Oknayan	Zaruhi Caroglian	Vartivar Berberian
Hagop Oknayan	Asadour Daldabanian	Yaghsapet Berberian
Mihran Oknayan	Krikor Daldabanian	Hagop Pessayan
Manuk Oknayan	Arshagul Artinian	Mary Pessayan
Asvazdadour Oknayan	Krikor Artinian	Armen Dedeyan
Marie Oknayan	Vaxho Simonyan	Simon Terzian
Mousheg Khodjhumyan	Haroutyun Tatikyan	Satenik Lusparyan
Jovannes Kabbendjian	Kurken Parseghian	Hripsime Lusparyan
Krakow Ouzounian	Mihran Sabonjian	Artavazd Tumanyan
Edward Bozajian	Vahan Kazezian	Nikolaj Safrazbekyan
Manouk Gasparian	Mariam Kazezian	Levon Safrazbekyan
Gazaros Tombulyan	Yebrakseh Kazezian	Rebecca Margossian
Sarkis Gasparian	Krikor Sabonjian	Toros Margossianmy
Ibrahim Louseian	Nazar Guyujyan	Sarkis Panpalian
Ann Gasparian	Razmik Palandjian	Vartan Vartanian
Ibrahim Lousean	Mari Guyujyan	Hanna Gulian
Davit Gezalian	Krikor Gokpanossian	Haroutioun Kapralian
Yegisabet Gezalian	Panos Trashian	Ana Kapralian
Hrand Mikoyan	Goar Akopova	Flore Kapralian
Minas Chatalian	Anoush Kulafian	Baghdassar Avedikian
Mariam Chatalian	Vartouhy Kulafian	Ohaness Aslanian
Yestare Bedrossian	Ohannes Hagopian	Isgouhi Zhamgochian Derounian
Rosa Jeboghlian	Hagop Hagopian	Hagop Terzian
Marie Balian	Jirair Demirjian	Nishan Chaderjian
Mikael Tarkanian	Suqias Nuroyan	Maritza Chaderjian
Alton Derderian	Matevos Sachyan	Hagop Chaparian
Eksa. Derderian	Hnazand Sachyan	Artin Chaparian
Mihran Tarkanian	Samson Khachatryan	Hampartsoum Piligian
Vartan Dakessian	Mariam Khachatryan	Hovaness Piligian
Levon Guevoghlianian	Asadur Arabyan	Haroutune Piligian
Boghos Grikorian	Arax Arabyan	Pilig Piligian
Hovanes Minasyan	Zvart Kureghian	Kevork Chaparian
Gevorg Minasyan	Deradour Harmandayan	Movses Kavarian
Matevos Matilyan	Kveh Gasparian	Megerdich Kavarian
Simon Kelian	Gohar Kirakosian	Khatoon Kavarian
Hovannes Terterian	Vasilika Kirakosyan	Joseph Hanna
Haji Teyrekian	Zabel Kirakosian	Danho Kavarian
Ahavni Birickyan	Karapet Gasparian	Hagop Kradjian
Avetis Martirosyan	Mariam Yeritsyan	Deekran Kradjian
Ocean Movesian	Arakel Arakelyan	Nazaret Oglou
Krikor Gureghian	Makartich Ter-Hakopian	Dikran Svazlian
Paul DerBoghossian	Nicholas Chavshudian	Hagop Bodoorian
Sahag DerBoghossian	Mary Chavshudian	Garabed Chilingirian
Tigran Trchunyan	Avedis Kilisian	Toukhman Zoroghlian
Tirhouhi Kara-Sarkissian	Mari Shirinian	Touma Zoroghlian
Gevork Kara-Sarkissian	Arsen Pashgian	Garabed Zoroghlian
Armen Kara-Sarkissian	Haiganoush Mandjikian	Hovhanness Zoroghlian
Aram Kara-Sarkissian	Krikor Kaakedjian	Loucine Zoroghlian
Alexan Tavitian	Gadar Chaparian	Garabed Zoroghlian
Armine Pagoumian	Takouhi Baghoyan	Nshan Ter-Saakyan
Vartan Balikian	Ani Hidirsah	Hovhanness Tngozyan
Margaret Madoian	Haygaz Baghoyan	Karapet Grigoryan
Miriam Madoian	Parsegh Baghoyan	Parantzem Garavanian
Hatchig Madoian	Hagop Zilifian	Abkar Badalian
Pusant Madoian	Helen Manoyan	Karapet Grigoryan
Maghta Gevorgian	Boghos Manoyan	Parantzem Garavanian
Barsegh Karapetyan	Krikor Zilifian	Abkar Badalian
Osanna Madoian	Jovannes Kabbendjian	Jeyran Badalian
Atoyan Maria-Magdalena	Vahan Hakobyan	Manuk Hamamchyan
Stepan Arvanyan	Haykaz Sarkissyan	Sarhad Kocharian
Haroutune Bozghouridian	Lucia Baghdasaryan	John Hovig Yeressian
Ghazaros Baldjian	Sara Galtakian	Kerop Tsaxikyan
Sanasar Hovhannisyan	Arutyun Gelejian	Tatos Ghazazian
Eriya Amirian	Tagvor Dadurian	Yervand Urghatbashian
Armenag Zeytounsian	Araxsi Dadurian	Margaret Urghatbashian
Toros Agha Chaghlassian	Alina Dadurian	Caspar Mardirossian
Hovsep Najarian	Hmiyak Dadurian	Sinam Yeranossian
Stephen Minasian	Nishan Chaderjian	Hovakim Ahramjian
Haykandukht Mheryan	Nishan Chaderjian	Beghekia Ahramjian
Hagop Melkonian	Maritza Chaderjian	Arsen Avedikian
Christaphor Mheryhan	Martha Margossian	Acabi Avedikian
Nerses Mheryhan	Gulenia Havounjian	Zarmandought Ahramjian
Serop Manjikian	Tonapet Yeritsyan	Yevkiné Ahramjian
Sarkis Kurkdjian Senior	Hovsep Sarkissian	Arousiag Ahramjian
Tigran Zarookian	Armenuhi Balian	Khoren Aharonian
Zarouhi Alachanian	Vahram Ghiragossian	Raphael Bahde
Mardiros Djambazian	Hagop Kouyoumdjian	Joseph Moukhtar

George Moukhtar
Francis Moukhtar
George Farra
Mlcon Movsessian
Mécon Movsessian
Dr. Ovsia Hekimian
Tavit Tavitian
Antaram Hovanesian
Sarkis Hovanesian
Galust Jermakyan
Hamardzum Jermakyan
Vrej Jermakyan
Toros Jermakyan
Mania Jermakyan
Levon Jermakyan
Aram Jermakyan
Siranush Alexanian
Grigo Alexanian
Maqruih Alexanian
Maqruih Alexanian
Avak Der-Avakian
Hana Soghomonian
Malaka Soghomonian
Isahak Ekshian
Mariam Ekshian
Arsen Kostanyan
Yegish Grigoryan
Kriikor Shahinian
Khanum Nalbanian Shahinian
Anna Garabedian
Airapet Tumannyan
Lucine Maghakian Adanalian
Stepan Boyajian
Stepan Boyajian
Hossep Melkisetian
Parségh Shahbaz
Ardashes Haroutiunian
Jack Sayabalian (Paylag)
Krikor Torosian
Kégham Parséghian
Dikran Cheogurian
Shavarsh Kúrisian
Krikor Yésayan
Aris Israyélian
Mihran Tabakian
Hagop Térzian
Arisdagés Kasbarian
Haroutiun G. Jangulian
Bédros Kalfayan
Haroutiun Kalfayan
Edwar Bézazian
Yénovk Shahén
Nérsés Papazian
Nérsés Zakarian
Dr. Sdépan Miskjian
Dr. Lévon Bardizbanian
Vramshabooh Arabian
Nérsés Shahnoor
Sérovpe Noradoongian
Karékin Husian
Mardiros H. Koonadakjian
Krikor Armooni
Boghos Tanielian
Megerdich Garabédian
Apraham Hayrigian
Levon Aghababian
Kevork Terjimanian
Dikran Ashkharooni
Kevork Diratsooyan
Mihrtad Haygazn
Rosdom Rosdomian
Vramshabooh Samuelian
Arshag Khazkhazian
Mrgrrdich Sdepanian
Levon Shashian
Paroonag Feroukhan
Onnig Maghazajian
Teodor Mendzigian

Varteres Atanasian
Apig Jambaz
Vahram Altoonian
Yerchanig Aram
Nerses D. Kevorkian
Onnig Srabian
Partogh Zorian
Akrig Kerestegian
Melkon Piosian
Pilibbos Chilinguirian
Haroutiun Konialian
Vahan Jamjian
Haroutiun Kalfaian
Hovhannes Kelejian
Sdepan Kurkjian
Dikran Sarkisian
Barooyr Arzoomanian
Haig Derderian
Mirijan Artinian
Hampartsum Balasan
Vahan Kehiaian
Ardashes Ferahian
Artin Meserlian
Armenag Arakelian
Mihran Pasdúrmajian
Neshan Nahabedian
Yeghia Suzigian
Bedros Kurdian
Diran Yerganian
Asadoor Madteosian
Yervant Chavooshian
Hagop Shahbaz
Sarkis Kaligian
Garabed Reyisian
Kevork Kopooshian
Krikor Ohnigian
Aram Ohnigian
Karekin Ohnigian
Hovhannes Keoleian
Dikran Baghdigian
Hovhannes Cheogurian
Dr. Béné Torosian
Aram Achúkbashian
Kegham Vanigian
Yervant Topoozian
Roupen Garabedian
Hovhannes Der Ghazarian
Tovmas Tovmasian
Hagop Basmajian
Moorad Zakarian
Megerdich Yeretsian
Karekin Boghosian
Armenag Hampartsoumian
Yeremia Manoogian
Apraham Mooradian
Minas Keshishian
Súmpad Kúlújian
Karnig Boyajian
Herand Yegavian
Boghos Boghosian
Herand Aghajanian
Garabed Patoogian
Khoren Khorenian
Amasiatsi Krikor Kayian
Vramian Onnig Tertsagian
Ardashes Solakian
A. Proodian
Garabed Dantian
Haygag Yeremishian
Túlgadintsi
Prof. Garabed Soghigian
Prof. Megerdich Vorperian
Prof. Hovhannes Boujikianian
Prof. Nigoghos Tenekejian
Prof. Khachadour Nahigian
Prof. Donabed Lulejian
Jirair Hagopian
Hovhannes Dingilian

Hovhannes Aghanigian
Aram Srabian
Armen Onanian
Hovsep Malemezian
Kegham Samuelian
Kapriel Tanielian
Karnig Gosdanian
Hagop Dinjian
Armen Hovagimian
Asadour Jamgochian
Hovhannes Zartarian
Kevork Keleshian
Hagop Shoushanian
Setrag Dulgerian
Aram Dabaghian
Haroutiun Semerjian
Sarkis Eljanian
Mihran Isbirian
Senekerim Kalonyan
Moorad Derderian
Garabed Barsamian
Karnig Toughlajian
Manuel Dedeian
Levon Kantarian
Aram Hagopian
Khachadour Grdodian
Michael Frengulian
Roupen Rakoubian
Hampartsum Blejian
Vahan Husisian
Nazaret Husisian
Hemayag Karageozian
Israel Ozanian
Dajad Chebookjian
Levon Karageozian
Hmayag Margosian
Hmaiaig Karibian
Ardashig Boornazian
Hagop Boornazian
Arshag Kizirian
Hovhannes Boghosian
Antranig Bozajian
Aram Adrouni
Aram Shesheian
Húrach Loosparonian
Megerdich Asdourian
Tsitoghtsi Setrag Varjabed
Partogh Odabashian
Kaloosd Garabedian
Vahan Kasbarian

This evening I have had only 1 hour to pay tribute to those who were killed 100 years ago. I had hoped to get through 1,500 names, and I have still so many more to go. I will be entering all of the names that I received into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

It would take me at least another 1,000 hours, if I could, to speak the names of all 1.5 million Armenian men, women, and children who were lost. In their memory, we think of those who went before. We cherish their memory, and we have the courage to speak aloud that they perished in the first genocide of the last century. We will never forget, and we will never succumb to the coercion of complicity in silence on genocide.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1800

IRAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the

gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I do want to commend my friend from California (Mr. SCHIFF) for what he is doing. I think it is a very noble thing to do when people are killed. Whether you want to call it a genocide or not, I just appreciate very much my friend ADAM SCHIFF calling those names and giving them recognition after the hell on Earth they went through. It was a very noble endeavor.

Mr. Speaker, what I came to the floor to talk about is the so-called deal that the administration is trying in every way they can to get Iran to even just say that they are okay with. Unfortunately, the Iranians have been dragging this out for years now. I read that Valerie Jarrett had been talking before with the Iranians before the deal—the negotiations, at least—ever surfaced. And we have reports that there was an informal negotiation taking place. It was denied back originally, and it turns out there were negotiations.

So what this has done to Israel—our ally, our friends in Israel, the people that are actually our forward observers out there in the middle of the chaotic Middle East that this administration has helped make more chaotic—they are out there, and they are kind of like, as some people have referred to them, the miner's canary. When they are under attack, when they are struggling because of other countries, then we can anticipate the United States will be shortly behind it.

Here is an article from *The Wall Street Journal* dated April 17, entitled, "U.S. Suggests Compromise on Iran Sanctions," the byline, "President Obama said Tehran could receive significant economic relief immediately after concluding a deal to curb its nuclear program."

Isn't that great, though? We are now using the word "curb" their nuclear deal. At one time, it was to "dismantle" their nuclear efforts. At one time, it was going to be totally unacceptable for Iran—probably the biggest supporter of terrorism in the world. Certainly they have supported plenty of terrorism that has killed Americans. They have built and used and furnished IEDs that have killed and maimed so many thousands of Americans. But now we are down, at this point, to just curbing. If we can just curb them, apparently that will be satisfactory.

And after the last so-called mutual agreement was announced, we had the leaders of Iran saying, We didn't agree to any of that.

Now having been a former judge, having tried no telling how many cases, I know that if you have one side saying "we have an agreement" and the other side saying "we never agreed to anything," and that is before any of the terms of the agreement are ever undertaken by either side, then you don't have an agreement. They teach you it is basic contracts.

I know the President, in Chicago, was concentrating on the Constitution, but

the fact is, under contract law, one of the contract 101 things they teach you is, you have to have a mutual meeting of the minds. If one side says, "We haven't agreed to anything," and you don't have a document they signed, and you don't have a tape recording even of them saying, "Yes, we agree to those things," you don't have a deal. You don't have an agreement. There is absolutely nothing enforceable. And the interesting thing about international law is, basically, if the most powerful country in the world is not willing to enforce something that it says is an agreement, then it doesn't matter whether you have got an agreement or not.

I was very fortunate to have had, for a semester at Baylor Law School, a visiting dean of a Japanese law school who taught an international law course that I took. I did as well as you can do in that course. Our professor, the visiting dean, was such a brilliant guy. I did a paper on law of the sea and did very well with that.

I loved to sit down and visit with the dean from Japan. After the conclusion of the course, I had my grade. I said: You know, Dean, I hope this is not inappropriate to say; but having taken your course, having studied diligently for your course, it seems to me that the bottom line with international law is that, really, international law is whatever the biggest, most powerful country says it is, if they are willing to use their power. And the dean said: Well, Mr. GOHMERT, you did learn something in my course. Yes, you have got it.

In international law, if nobody is willing to stand behind a deal and force another country to abide by the deal, you don't have a deal. You might as well not even have a written agreement in international law if somebody is not willing to enforce it.

Under most people's definition of an act of war, if you would attack an embassy, then for purposes of most people's international law, you have committed an act of war. That embassy is considered to be sovereign. If you attack that embassy, you have attacked that country—it is an act of war—which is what happened in 1979 in a place called Tehran, Iran.

I was in the Army, stationed at Fort Benning at the time, so we obviously were paying close attention to an act of war against the United States. I think most people at Benning were put on alert, but nothing happened.

An act of war was committed against the United States, but our failure to do anything but basically beg the Iranians to let our hostages come home was deemed as weakness and, as I understand, still is used from time to time today as part of the recruiting effort to show that Americans have no backbone. They are not going to stand up to radical Islamists. Radical Islamists can have their will because America is a toothless tiger, unwilling to enforce anything.

Oh, sure. Somebody, to want to look tough, may send a boat to tag along behind a convoy, and we may send planes to blow up a tent or, like President Clinton did, blow up a camel from time to time. It seemed like there may have been an aspirin factory or something. Maybe there was something more serious, but that is not shock and awe, as we have shown some places before.

So when they are recruiting, of course they use the toothless, feckless United States examples. Like after the USS *Cole*, I had a servicemember that told me recently he was there and they couldn't believe that anybody could attack a United States naval ship and basically we don't do anything.

I understood from somebody in the Reagan administration that one of President Reagan's great regrets was after, I think it was, probably Iran behind the bombing of the Marine barracks in Beirut where we lost about 300 precious Marine lives, Congress made clear we are not funding anything else, and we pulled out. Another recruiting tool for radical Islamists.

And even that example from Beirut, under such a great American President as Ronald Reagan, going back to 1979 when radical Islam first committed an act of war against the United States, that was in response to President Carter—at least, it followed his pronouncement that the Ayatollah Khomeini was a man of peace. They hit our Embassy.

I know at first they were saying: Oh, the college students attacked. The college students have the hostages. And it seemed to me, as a member of the United States Army watching the news carefully from Fort Benning, that it seemed like they kept saying, you know, the students have the hostages. And I kept thinking if President Carter will just say: Okay. The students have the hostages. Then you get them back to us within 48 hours or even 72 hours; otherwise, you are going to see the entire power of the United States military coming at Iran. And heaven help you, if you harm our hostages at all, we may just wipe Tehran off the map if you do, and you as part of it.

I really felt like they would probably release the hostages and say: See? See? The students had them. We talked them into releasing them.

But rather quickly, they figured out that the Carter administration was not going to use the U.S. power and that all it was going to do was basically beg for the hostages to be released until they scaled back an effort to rescue the hostages that ended up being inadequate because the Carter administration didn't authorize enough helicopters. They needed six. General Boykin confirmed what I was told at Fort Benning, that they needed six to get to the staging area, crossing 500 miles or so of desert. Their helicopters had turbine engines. They expected that they might lose as many as 50 percent of their choppers. But they had to have six get to the staging area, meet the C-130 there and the other aircraft

and get ready and then launch, because they knew where the hostages were.

The Carter administration didn't allow enough helicopters so they could get there with six. They got there with five. And as General Boykin confirmed what I had heard before, when they got there with five, then they had to abort because they had to have a minimum of six to make it work. Perhaps the helicopter pilot got disoriented. The chopper leaned, the blades went through the C-130, and the people on the C-130 and the helicopter were killed.

But it goes back to having a Commander in Chief that is not willing to do everything he can to use our power to save American lives and to send a message around the world: Don't mess with the United States. Don't mess with our Embassy. Don't mess with our Embassy workers, because if you do, there will be a powerful price to pay.

□ 1815

Mr. Speaker, the message instead was: We got the power, but we don't have the backbone to use it. And that is being carried out. Of course, President Reagan used American power to send a message. President George H. W. Bush, after Kuwait was invaded by Iraq—I love the fact, as a former military member, that President George H. W. Bush was a former military member, and instead of trying to micromanage the freeing of Kuwait, instead of micromanaging, President Bush told the military leaders that the goal is to liberate Kuwait; you tell me what we've got to do. They told him how many people we would need in theater before we attack. You hit them hard with bombing, loosen them up, and the mission went incredibly well until Democrats in Congress started yelling, in essence, figuratively speaking, that President Bush needed to stop, stop, stop. Many in the media, stop, stop, stop, they are not fighting, they can't stand up against us, oh, please stop, you are being too brutal.

So President Bush, because of the left, was persuaded not to go all the way to Baghdad at that time. Then later he was beat up by the left in 1992 for not going ahead and taking out Saddam when he had the chance.

So it is an interesting place to work here.

Mr. Speaker, I go through that history so we understand where we stand historically with radical Islam in the Middle East. They don't see us with the kind of fear that they should.

Now, this article from The Wall Street Journal, dated April 27, by Carol E. Lee and Jay Solomon, says:

"President Barack Obama suggested on Friday that Iran could receive significant economic relief immediately after concluding a deal to curb its nuclear program, a gesture towards one of Tehran's key demands."

It is really great. Tehran makes demands, the President follows right in line, and Secretary Kerry follows right

in line as if he is going to be throwing medals over the White House fence that belonged to somebody else. It is great. They just follow right in line. Okay, Iran, please, we beg you. Do a deal with us. At least come out and announce with us we have a deal, and we will do anything you want.

That is the way it is appearing not only to the radical Islamists of the world. It sure seems that they have our President wrapped around their little finger and that they can get anything they want.

Well, Mr. Speaker, what should they think after the Taliban in Afghanistan was begged by the Obama administration to, gee, just sit down with us, we will buy you wonderful offices in Qatar, and we will give you international prominence. Heck, if you sit down, we will let murderers go of your Taliban leaders. Just sit down with us. That is all we are asking.

It sent a pretty clear message. That gets around. They understand who they are dealing with.

On page 3 of the 4-page article from The Wall Street Journal it says this:

"The Obama administration estimates Iran has between \$100 billion and \$140 billion of its oil revenue frozen in offshore accounts as a result of sanctions. U.S. officials said they expect Tehran to gain access to these funds in phases as part of a final deal. Iran could receive somewhere between \$30 billion and \$50 billion upon signing the agreement, said congressional officials briefed by the administration."

So, Mr. Speaker, that is from The Wall Street Journal. Then 2 days later, April 19, in an article by Jennifer Rubin, it says: "Washington Post: Obama is prepared to give anything and everything for a deal." Then it goes on to say:

"Just days after releasing the Iran framework, Secretary of State John F. Kerry reaffirmed that the United States would insist on phased-in sanctions relief. Iran's Ayatollah Khamenei publicly rebuked that suggestion and declared he would insist on sanctions relief up front. On Friday, the President cleared up matters by hanging Kerry out to dry, pulling the rug out from under his dwindling band of supporters and telling the world that phased negotiations were up for grabs.

"The President declared:

"With respect to the issue of sanctions coming down—I don't want to get out ahead of John Kerry and my negotiators in terms of how to craft this. I would just make a general observation and that is that how sanctions are lessened, how we snap back sanctions if there's a violation—there are a lot of different mechanisms and ways to do that. Part of John's job and part of the Iranian negotiators' job and part of the P5+1's job is to sometimes find formulas that get to our main concerns while allowing the other side to make a presentation to their body politic that is more acceptable."

So going down the article, it said:

"This is a dramatic change in the administration's position and a foolish one. We know, as former Secretaries of State Henry Kissinger and George P. Schultz have warned, snap-back sanctions are cumbersome and hugely ineffective. Sanctions once lifted are enormously difficult to reinstate after Western powers have commenced doing business. Inspections (not even of the go everywhere/anytime variety) are never foolproof and the parties contemplate a system designed for endless wrangling about whether violations have occurred.

"But wait. It gets worse. The Wall Street Journal reports: 'The Obama administration estimates Iran has between \$100 billion and \$140 billion of its oil revenue frozen in offshore accounts as a result of sanctions'... 'The monies of course will be instantly available to fund terrorist activities.'"

Well, Mr. Speaker, I guess that wouldn't be President Obama saying that because apparently he hadn't recognized that, but, okay.

The article says:

"That would be a huge boost to Iran's economy, given up front and with no evidence of compliance. The monies of course will be instantly available to fund terrorist activities and Iranian surrogates in Yemen, Syria, and elsewhere.

"'Obama is willing to grant Iran access to funds that equate to about 10 percent of its GDP'—Iran's GDP—'just for signing a deal. That percentage boost is equivalent to a \$1.7 trillion injection into the U.S. economy today (which is twice the dollar amount of the 2009 stimulus package).'"

That was explained by JINSA CEO Michael Makovsky.

"This was a terrific present to Iran for its Army Day celebration on Saturday, when the regime showed off some of its weapons to slogans of 'Death to America,' and 'Death to Israel.'" He adds, 'Equally dismaying was Obama's minimization in the same press conference of Russia's announcement to sell S-300 surface-to-air missile batteries to Iran, which will make a military strike against Iran's nuclear facilities much harder. Perhaps Obama was trying to save face by this Russian move, and/or perhaps he no longer opposes the Russian sale because it will make it harder for Israel to spoil the nuclear deal through military action.'

"If Israelis are expressing 'shock and amazement Friday night at U.S. President Barack Obama's stated openness to Iran's demand for the immediate lifting of all economic sanctions, and his defense of Russia's agreement to supply a sophisticated air defense system to Iran,' they should not be. The President will give the Iranians anything and everything to get his deal. 'It's deeply troubling that President Obama declined to publicly reject Iranian Supreme Leader Ali Khamenei's demand that all economic sanctions against Iran be lifted upon concluding a final nuclear agreement,' Senator

MARK KIRK told Right Turn. ‘The President is clearly leaving open the door for significant sanctions relief to Iran up front to secure a controversial deal that will neither significantly nor permanently dismantle Iran’s vast capabilities to make nuclear weapons.’

‘The President who once declared the framework a ‘historic’ deal has been forced to concede there is no deal. Now he is signaling the final deal will be much worse than he or his defenders ever suggested was possible. He promised to dismantle Iran’s nuclear weapons program; now he is locking it in. He once insisted on robust inspections and gradual lifting of sanctions. Those will go by the wayside too. Ultimately, Congress, the 2016 Presidential candidates, our allies and the American people will need to explain that total appeasement—which is where this is leading—will not be acceptable. They will then have to devise the means for stopping Obama or immediately reversing his ‘diplomacy,’ which is more like promising to make a ransom payment. Unfortunately for the Saudis, that likely means beginning an arms race as they seek a bomb of their own. It will be quite a legacy if Obama gets his way.’

Mr. Speaker, this President’s foreign policy in the Middle East and North Africa has created chaos.

Then April 20, there is this article from the Washington Free Beacon:

‘The State Department on Monday would not rule out giving Iran up to \$50 billion as a so-called ‘signing bonus.’ . . . ‘Experts have said this multi-million dollar ‘signing bonus’ option, which was first reported by The Wall Street Journal, could be the largest cash infusion to a terror-backing regime in recent memory.’

So they are getting access to money, the article points out.

So then, Mr. Speaker, I want to take us back to March 2 from The Blaze, where they report on President Obama saying Netanyahu has been wrong on Iran. And they have this quote in the article, and it quotes from Reuters, this is a quote from Obama, reported by Reuters:

‘Netanyahu made all sorts of claims. This was going to be a terrible deal. This was going to result in Iran getting \$50 billion worth of relief,’ Obama told Reuters in an interview Monday. ‘Iran would not abide by the agreement. None of that has come true.’

That was March 2. Now here we are on April 22, and it turns out everything Prime Minister Netanyahu said has been true. So far, Mr. Speaker, everything that he has said that we have been able to get evidence on has been true. President Obama was wrong, Prime Minister Netanyahu was right, and knowing President Obama to be the big, courteous, and wonderful man he is, I am sure he will be sending an apology to Prime Minister Netanyahu very soon since he does owe him one. On March 2 he tells Reuters that

Netanyahu was wrong on everything, and now just over a month later we find out he was right about everything. So I think that will be good news when the President admits to Israel they were right, I was wrong.

By the way, what could we do with that \$50 billion that they may let Iran have access to after all the damage, all the Americans Iran has funded killing and maiming. We could use some of that money. Wow, \$50 billion.

But one final article dated today from John Sexton, ‘Iran Says It Will Refuse Access to IAEA Inspectors Anywhere’ Nationwide.’

‘A spokesman for Iran’s nuclear agency has once again rejected calls to grant IAEA access to military sites, continuing a war of words on the issue that began Sunday.’

The bottom line, Mr. Speaker, this President is putting the world in jeopardy. He is putting Israel in jeopardy. He is putting us in jeopardy. He is putting all of Israel’s neighbors in jeopardy. It is time he woke up and smelled the baklava.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1830

FUTURE FORUM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia). Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. SWALWELL) for 30 minutes.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to report back to the Congress on the progress of the House Democratic Caucus’ newest group, Future Forum.

Future Forum is made up of 14 Members of Congress who are going across the country to talk about issues facing young Americans. We launched just last Thursday. We have gone to New York, Boston, and San Francisco, and we are just warming up.

Our goal is to listen to—not talk to—young Americans about issues ranging from student loan debt, climate change, access to entrepreneurship, and anything that is on their mind or standing in their way of achieving their dreams, hopes, and aspirations.

I encourage anyone watching tonight across America to tweet at me and to tweet at Future Forum under #futureforum, so that we can address your concerns right here on the House floor and across the country.

We started Thursday evening in New York City. I was joined by Democratic Policy and Communications chair STEVE ISRAEL; Congresswoman GRACE MENG, who represents the Queens area; and Congressman SETH MOULTON, who represents the greater Boston area.

Our first stop was at the District Cowork space in Manhattan in the Flatiron District. You see here in this photo, this was not just any rigid, stuffy townhall. We invited young en-

trepreneurs across Manhattan and asked them at District Cowork: What stands in your way from achieving your startup success?

You have in this room these young, energetic entrepreneurs. They are ready to risk it all for their big idea. They are all millennials, aged anywhere from 18 to 35; and it was a very informal, fluid session.

What we heard was not surprising, but it was very striking. For too many of them, when we asked, How many of you have student loan debt, their hands went up. For too many of them, when we asked, How much is your student loan debt, their hands stayed up when I said, Is it above \$25,000 or \$50,000 or \$100,000?

Then I asked and my colleagues asked: What would you do with that money? What would you spend it on if you weren’t spending it every month on your student loan debt?

These young, business-minded people, they didn’t say: I would go on a vacation, or I would buy a new toy or a boat or have fun for myself.

They said: I would invest it in my company. I would invest it in my company.

What do we know happens when entrepreneurs invest money in their companies? They create jobs. They create growth around their industries that put more and more Americans to work.

Future Forum members learned a lot at this visit, and what we learned was that student loan debt is a barrier—not just a barrier, it is a tall brick wall that is standing in the way of an entire generation realizing their entrepreneurial dreams.

What we heard at District Cowork in New York was not unique. In San Francisco, we went to Hive, and we visited their Impact Hub. Hive looked just like District Cowork. You have tall ceilings, nothing on the walls—they are barely painted—no carpet on the floor, just a building filled with a lot of energy, a lot of good ideas, but a lot of challenges standing in their way.

At Hive, these young entrepreneurs, just like other entrepreneurs across the country, they told us student loan debt is standing in their way. Forty-one million young Americans have a collective amount of \$1.3 trillion in student loan debt.

We heard from people at Hive that their debt was not just standing in the way of them starting their own business, but we asked the room—and at this event, I was joined by Congressman RUBEN GALLEG0 of the Phoenix area and Congressman PETE AGUILAR of the San Bernardino area in California and Congressman DEREK KILMER of the Tacoma, Washington, area—we asked the room, about 100 people: How many of you own a home? Crickets, dead silent.

How many of you have parents who own a home? Most of their hands went up.

How many of you are renters now? Most of their hands stayed up.

How many of you fear that you will not be able to ever own a home in your life? Again, these young people, full of energy, great ideas, great educations, their hands stayed up.

We asked: What is standing in the way? The hundreds of dollars a month they are paying in student loan debt.

Homeownership, one of the bedrocks of the American Dream, to have something to call your own, something that we fought during our independence as a country, that right for property, to chart your own course, have your own piece of land, now, an entire generation of millennial Americans, 80 million of them, have mounting student loan debt that is going to delay their ability to buy a home, that is going to delay their ability to start and have a family, that is going to delay their opportunity to chase their dreams.

While we were in California, we also visited Chabot College in Hayward, California, in the 15th Congressional District, which I am proud to represent. At Chabot College, we assembled over 100 community college students, and we asked them: How much student debt do you think you will have by the time you take your first postcollege job?

What we learned there, again, was very, very bewildering. Most anticipated that they would have \$25,000 to \$50,000 in student loan debt.

We did it in a very interactive way. We used text polling, so we asked the students to text in their answers. We polled the group and said: Are you able to take a full load of courses so that you can get out of community college as fast as possible and move on to a 4-year university and move on into your career field?

Most of them said that they couldn't. One student told us he worked three jobs. The jobs, they were all mostly the same. They weren't jobs that were going to put them into the area of industry they would hope and aspire to be in. They were retail and restaurant jobs.

The members of Future Forum could identify with this. Congressman KILMER talked about washing dishes in college, and Congressman GALLEGRO talked about working as a restaurant server, and I harkened back to my days in this town in Washington, D.C., as an unpaid intern and working at Tortilla Coast at the end of the day to make it work.

Things are different now. Tuition continues to go up. These students told us, during our Future Forum visit, that they are taking a number of odd jobs just to pay for the rising cost of community college.

We talked about the President's plan during the State of the Union in this very Chamber to offer free community college to anyone who was qualified and able and willing. The students were hopeful but not too optimistic. They see too many barriers and walls here in Washington to get anything done that could help them.

We also asked the students to participate in a word cloud. A word cloud is you text in an answer, and, on the screen behind us, it put different words in response to different answers. We asked the students: What would you do if you didn't have student debt every month? What would your payment money go to?

Again, no one said they were going to buy a bunch of toys or go on a bunch of fancy vacations. They said that they would probably buy a car so they didn't have to take the bus or take the BART to class; they would hope to buy their first home; they would invest—which would help the economy.

Future Forum was also at San Francisco State University, and a young girl at San Francisco State University, as we talked about solutions we could offer to address rising tuition rates for current students and the debt burden that 41 million Americans carry, one San Francisco State student told us that she had a dual challenge in her house.

She was trying to pay for her own education, make it by, not qualifying for many student loans, while her mother also had \$200,000 of her own student debt. This is a family matter—this is a family matter—not just for that young San Francisco State student, but for millions of young people across the country. This debt is beginning to pile up and affect multiple generations.

We had the honor of going to Boston, where we were hosted by Congressmen JOE KENNEDY and SETH MOULTON. We visited Thermo Fisher Scientific, and we met with young scientists, people who invested in their own future by taking student loans and going to college and getting, in many cases, graduate degrees to work in the field of science, to work in the field of therapies and devices, hoping that they could play a critical role in helping people, making the world a better place.

At Thermo Fisher, these young scientists told us exactly what we heard in San Francisco and in New York City. Their student loan debt weighs on them. It holds them down like an anchor.

Something happened at the Thermo Fisher visit that we didn't expect—because you have a room full of young entrepreneurs, young scientists, but there was a mother who showed up. She kind of confessed: Well, you know, I know this event was billed as a millennial event.

She told us she was worried about her daughter. Her daughter had gone to college, just as we had, as a society, told young people you have to do. Her daughter took out a number of student loans, and her daughter lives at home and can't find a job.

□ 1845

What we are seeing for our millennial generation and what was expressed by this mother is that we are at risk of be-

coming a permanent boomerang generation. We go out, and we study, and we attain a degree or training or technical skills; but because of the rising costs of tuition and the debt that our generation is saddled with, we boomerang back home. This mother told us it doesn't just weigh on her daughter, who has a college degree and is trying to find a job, but that it weighs on the entire household.

With 41 million young people across our country with \$1.3 trillion in student loan debt, imagine how many families are affected by this. These are typically your parents who are just starting to realize their golden years.

They worked so hard; paid into Social Security; hopefully had a pension; and they want to retire, maybe travel, maybe take up a hobby, maybe join a local club; but their hopes and dreams—their golden retirements—are being affected by children who are returning to the home and need their support. We heard this all across America on this tour. This is a family matter, the student loan debt crisis in our country.

Finally, in the Boston area, we also went to Greentown Labs, a clean tech incubator I visited with Congressmen MOULTON and KENNEDY in Somerville, Massachusetts.

Here, we heard, again, about student loan debt, but we also were asked by a number of people at this event: What is standing in the way of fixing this problem?

We actually asked the audience: What do you think? From your perspective, what do you think is standing in the way?

So many of them told us campaign finance laws—a smart, young crowd in Somerville at Greentown Labs—campaign finance laws, people in the audience told us—young entrepreneurs—and I thought they were just focused like a laser on their ideas and on raising money for their first and second rounds of funding and on trying to scale up and getting their ideas off the ground. No. These young people, they get it.

They told us exactly what the problem was. Because of unlimited amounts of money that can be spent in elections today, there is less courage in the Congress to do big things, to tackle big problems, and to help a whole country of people who need it.

They asked us about climate change. Now, this was the first laboratory we had visited on the tour, and we had met with a number of young scientists who were working in the clean tech and clean energy areas. They asked us about climate change and what we were doing in Congress to address it. I want to just go to some of the people who have tweeted in to us about Future Forum this evening and what their thoughts are.

I will first mention Hive, who has tweeted at us in San Francisco that they are excited about the ideas presented and the issues raised and "let's get to work."

I want to tell you how we are getting to work. This was not just a one-way talking-to with millennials. Through #futureforum, through medium.com, through the article we wrote and posted there, and through the information we have collected across the country, we are actually putting the ball in the court of the young entrepreneurs and students who are charting this new economy. We told them to help us crowdsource ideas that can move America forward, and they gave us some at these visits.

With student loan debt being, probably, the biggest, most pressing issue, there was a general consensus that there are two groups affected by this. The first group is of the students who are enrolled right now and paying tuition and accruing debt. The second group is of the 41 million young Americans who already have student loan debt.

The solutions that were thrown at us for the students who are in school now or who will be in school was, one, treat public education as a public good. Find a way to make sure that any qualified, capable person who wants to go to college can do so, and keep the costs as low or as next to zero as you can.

We had people who were so excited about the Future Forum who had graduated college 30, 40 years ago who came out and talked to us, and they harkened back to a time in California when, in the UC and Cal State systems, tuition was essentially free—they even threw in the yearbook—yet the return on investment was a whole generation of educated individuals who would contribute to the greatest economy in the United States: California.

Their eyes popped out when they saw how much it costs today to go to UC Berkeley: \$33,000 today is what it costs a year for a student to go to UC Berkeley. People who had attended 20, 30 years ago talked about when it was almost next to nothing. It is \$33,000 a year.

Congressman GALLEGO looked at that number—and he went to Harvard. Harvard is the Berkeley of the East. Congressman GALLEGO looked at that number, and he said: That is about what I paid when I graduated from Harvard in the early 2000s, \$33,000 a year.

Treat education as a public good. Keep interest rates as low as possible. The consensus among people who met with us—these current students and entrepreneurs—was that the government should make no money on interest rates on loans that it gives to students.

What about the 41 million young Americans who have the \$1.3 trillion in debt? There was a general consensus that those debtholders should be able to refinance their student loans. You can refinance an auto loan. You can refinance your home loan, but for the 86 percent of loans that are the Federal loans of those 41 million Americans, you can't refinance them.

Congressman JOE COURTNEY, a colleague of mine from Connecticut, has a

bill that would allow just that. Our Future Forum members are on that bill, and we are hoping that it gets a vote in this Congress because this should be a bipartisan issue.

Those 41 million Americans are not Democrats—they are not all Democrats, and they are not all Republicans. They are hopeful, aspirational young people who should benefit from the same refinancing laws that you can use with your home mortgage or with your auto loan.

There were other big ideas, and no idea was too big or small for this crowd. There was the proposal to have a jubilee for all of the federally funded student loans—to take every borrower, return that money to those borrowers, to put them at zero, and watch where the money would go.

The hypothesis was, if these students did not have to pay anywhere from \$100 to \$1,000 every month, they are not going to pocket the money; they are going to put the money back in the economy, and it would essentially be a stimulus.

I encourage everyone across the country—every young person, every parent of a young person, every grandparent of a young person—to give us your ideas. Future Forum is just getting started. We already are working with our colleague Congresswoman DEBBIE DINGELL, who is excited and eager to host us in Michigan, and with other colleagues who want to bring us to their States to talk to young people.

Give us your ideas. You can tweet them at #futureforum. Put it on Instagram. You can find us on Facebook. Tweet. Facebook. Instagram. Use social media, #futureforum. Give us your ideas because the goal is for us to listen to you and then to work here in a bipartisan way to act on your behalf.

This conversation will continue. Our work will go on until we have lifted the burden that stands in the way of young, aspirational entrepreneurs.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

INTERNATIONAL CORPORATIONS DESTROYING THE PATENT RIGHTS OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to draw the attention of the American people and my colleagues to an issue that is rapidly coming to the floor of the House, and it is an issue that is coming so rapidly that some people might not notice the overwhelming magnitude of this issue.

In fact, it is an issue that most people are bored with. They don't like to discuss it. They think it is so complicated that they don't pay any attention. Unfortunately, the fact that little

attention is being paid to this issue may result in there being major damage to the well-being of the American people.

What I am trying to say is there is legislation that will cause great harm to the American people, to our security, and to our prosperity. It is something that is coming to a vote, and we could well lose unless the American people mobilize and the people in this Hall pay attention to the interests of the American people as a whole and not to major international corporations that have been manipulating this issue.

What am I talking about? I am talking about an issue that has over the years been taken for granted, that America would be the preeminent technology power in the world. In fact, it has been our technology superiority that has led to the prosperity of average Americans, to the standard of living that we have, and also to our safety and security as a nation.

It isn't that Americans have worked so hard—and we have worked hard—but we have coupled work with technology. In fact, people work hard all over the world, but they have not had the patent protection, the protection for the intellectual rights of ownership in the development of new technology. The people around the world haven't had this; thus, they have had standards of living very low for ordinary people and then, of course, the rich at the top.

What we have had in our country is a protection of intellectual property rights by inventors. It is actually written into our Constitution. In fact, the word "right" is only used once in the body of the Constitution. There are the Bill of Rights in the latter part, but the word "right" is only related to the right that the Constitution declares for those who are writers and inventors who have created something, and they have the right to control it and to own it for a given period of time.

This has worked so well for the United States. We have made sure that our people were competitive with the overseas populations, that our people produced the wealth that was necessary for high-paying jobs, produced the wealth that was necessary for standards of living. It comes back to the fact that we have recognized, as a right of ownership, the creativity genius of our own people.

Over the last two decades, most people have not understood that there has been a concealed effort to destroy the patent rights of the American people.

Let me repeat that. For the last two decades, we have been fighting quietly—people haven't even noticed it—against large international corporations, multinationals, who would destroy the patent rights of the American people.

□ 1900

Why did they want to do that? Because they want to steal the creation of our own inventors without having to

pay for that right. This is the ultimate little guy versus big guy, David and Goliath fight that I have ever seen in Washington, D.C., but it is also one of the quietest and one that people have tried their best to keep out of the public eye.

So how is it that Congress could even conceive of this, where you have big corporations coming to say let's neuter the rights of the little guy or of little Americans? How would this happen? How could anyone imagine that a representative body like the House of Representatives would do anything like that?

Well, of course, they are not coming to this body—and they are not going to the committee of jurisdiction, which is the Committee on the Judiciary—claiming that they want to steal from little guys and that they want to take people's ideas and use them without paying compensation for them. No, they don't say that.

They have had to create what I call the straw man argument. Now, that is a traditional way of debate. It is in the debate books. If you can't beat your opponent in a debate, create a straw man, create an image that you are actually attacking this guy, the straw man, when in reality you are attacking somebody else. Somebody else is going to suffer the pain.

So this man's arguments, the straw man arguments, you can handle them. You can say how horrible that straw man is and his arguments mean nothing, well, because that is not really the guy who is being attacked. It is the other man and woman down there, the small inventors. They are the ones who are going to feel it. But yet you don't hear that from those proponents of the legislation that, as I am warning people, is on the way to the House floor.

This straw man argumentation was first used 20 years ago when I got here. They were trying to suggest that we have to make major changes in our patent law because there are these heinous submarine patents. Over and over and over again, the submarine patents were having such a horrible impact on business because they would come up and charge people for patents that the business didn't even know existed.

Well, submarine patents, that went away. They no longer talk about submarine patents. Now the boogeyman that is helping them create a straw man argument that will result in the massive theft of intellectual property rights from America's most creative people, the boogeyman now is called the patent troll. That is it: the patent troll. These huge corporations have spent millions—tens of millions, if not hundreds of millions—of dollars over these last few years trying to promote this image that there is a patent troll out there—that sounds sinister, doesn't it?—that has to be defeated. They have proposed legislation in the name of defeating a patent troll, because that sounds very sinister, rather than legislation that permits large corporations

to get away with stealing the patent rights from small inventors in the United States.

Well, how did this “troll” word come about? It is a relatively new word. As I say, when I first got here, they were calling them “submarine patents,” that is the evil force. Well, “troll” came about—I had a businessman who was an executive of a major company who has actually now changed sides, and he has decided, my gosh, no, he can't go along with this destruction of Americans' rights to own what they have created. He told me about how it was decided.

He was in a room with senior executives, mainly from the electronics industry. They went around the room saying, now, what is the most sinister-sounding word that we can come up with in order to divert the attention of the people away from the fact that our real target is these small inventors, because everybody has a soft spot in their heart for small inventors, so they are going to create a false image some way. What can we do? What word can we use to fool the American people into thinking that this is an evil force that we are trying to stop when, in reality, they are trying to beat down small inventors?

Well, they went around the room, the guy was telling me, and he said: I actually suggested that they use the word “patent pirate,” the “patent pirate.” That is how horrible it is. But, no, by the time they got around to the end of the group, to the last part of the group, they had all heard “patent troll,” which is even worse than “patent pirate.” So they all agreed that this would be the word that we will use to deceive the American people. That is what it was all about. This businessman was very upfront with me about the cynical nature of this type of manipulation.

Well, obviously no one could come here and say, “We want to eliminate the rights of the American people to sue for damages,” and we can't eliminate the rights of small inventors to actually try to get their money for something that they have invented and spent their whole lifetime trying to create, but what they can do is try to get legislation that will eliminate the ability of patent trolls to function.

Well, unfortunately, every single item that is being presented as a means to control patent trolls actually does what? It hurts every single one of them, does damage to little guys trying to protect their patent rights.

By the way, everything they are presenting in this legislation would be the equivalent if someone says: Well, we have got this horrible thing about frivolous lawsuits. Because, in fact, what the businessmen often are complaining about and claiming that trolls are being the ones who are doing this, what they are really talking about are frivolous lawsuits.

Well, there are frivolous lawsuits throughout our entire justice system

and court system. Would we then say that because there are some lawyers who are willing to scam the system or that we know that there are some people who will file frivolous lawsuits that we should eliminate the rights of the American people to sue for damages when they have been damaged by someone or sue to protect their rights when their rights have been violated? No. But that is what is going on here.

In the name of stopping the trolls, which they made up the term, we are being asked to support legislation that dramatically eliminates the rights and protections of honest inventors, although that is not what is being said every time there is a debate—“We are for the small inventor; we are for the small inventor,” when every single one of the provisions hurts the small inventor.

What is happening, basically, is we are seeing that the legislation being pushed forward now is under a bill, which is H.R. 9. It is already in the committee. It was a bill that went through last year. What happened is, yes, it went through last year with the same sort of, “Oh, we are not really trying to hurt the little guy,” but knowing that is what it was doing because what happened is, yeah, the legislation passed this body. The legislation passed this body.

To show you how bad it was, I managed to lead the fight and have one amendment that got one of the bad provisions out. You know what that provision was? The provision was, if a small inventor feels that the Patent Office has not been dealing with him on a legal basis, on a legitimate basis, that he no longer has the right to take his case to court. They were eliminating the right of our inventors to take their case to court when their government isn't operating legally.

Now, we managed to push that one back. Unfortunately, the other provisions of the bill moved forward. But guess what. Even though it would hurt small inventors and technology investors and universities, that bill went forward out of this body, but it was stopped in the Senate. It was stopped in the Senate because some of these technology laboratories and some small inventors as well, but mainly the universities, stepped forward and said: Wait a minute. You are trying to supposedly get patent trolls, but what you are doing is going to undercut us. It was analyzed that the result of that legislation, if signed into law and passed through the Senate, would have decreased the value of patents owned by our universities.

Now, that is a major source of their income is their patents because they have laboratories and research centers. That would have negated about half the value of the patents that they own. This would have been a disaster. Luckily, the universities spoke up, and they need to speak up in the House this time because it is the same bill they are trying to put through the House, and they

are trying to ship it over to the Senate again. We need to make sure that we mobilize and let those people in elected office, whether they are a Congressman or a Senator, know that they have to pay attention to what the effects of this will be on our universities, what it will be on—yes, and on the small inventors. It is unconscionable that we have these huge multinational corporations in a power grab like this.

Why is it that they are able to do this, this attack on little guys, on average Americans who have dedicated their life to developing a new technological idea? Why? Why is that? Well, because they are able to give major campaign contributions. I am not talking about anybody's vote being bought. I don't believe that that happens here. I know that a lot of people claim that, but I don't claim that. What I do know is that contributors get the attention of the Member of Congress or the Senator. That is what happens.

These big megacorporations—and they are multinational corporations by and large—have bought the attention of these people and have made their argument. So we have 90 percent of the Members of Congress and the Senate who are yawning and nobody is talking to them about the bill, but they have got these other 10 percent with their best friends who have donated to their campaigns actually are able to make the argument.

If we are to protect our prosperity, if we are to protect our security, we have got to move forward and interact with those people who are elected to represent us in the Congress and the United States Senate. That is the only thing that will thwart these multinationals and their ability to buy the attention of a certain number of Members of Congress.

The Congress will not pay attention unless the universities, unless the average working people, the voters in their district come and see them and talk to them and say: We do not want our rights to be diminished. We don't want any of our rights, but especially our patent rights, which are the rights that protect our jobs because it makes us competitive with overseas. It produces wealth enough for average people to live well in our country.

Well, we need to make sure that these huge corporations don't run roughshod over the rest of us because they, themselves, now, as I say, they haven't bought votes; they bought attention. We need to call attention to this issue, and it is up before the Committee on the Judiciary. We are talking about H.R. 9, a piece of legislation that will do a tremendous damage to the American people by cutting off the very constitutional right that our Founding Fathers knew was so important, and that is the right to own, for a given period of time, any type of technology creation and creative genius that you have as a writer or an inventor.

This is the little guys versus the big guys. This is David versus Goliath. I

will tell you, we little guys need to stick together. If we do, we will win. That is what America is all about. We can and will win. We will not let cynical, powerful forces like those who sit around the room and say: What is the bad word that we can come up with that will scare everybody into supporting our restrictions and our diminishing of patent rights? The cynical people came up with the word "troll."

Well, what is wrong with this, by the way? Let me just note that this bill, H.R. 9, will greatly diminish patent protection, but, for example, it destroys the right of discovery. It means that if people actually invest in a small inventor—let's say someone, a small inventor needs an investor. Of course they do. They are not like these huge corporations. They need someone to invest. But later on, the big corporation does what? Steals that invention. In order to what? These big corporations are sued all the time for infringement.

□ 1915

What infringement means is they are arrogantly taking something that belongs to somebody else, something that has been patented, and ignoring the patent, putting it into their product, and then say, "Well, sue me," knowing that the little guys have trouble suing because they don't have the money.

Well, if anybody has invested in that inventor and the investor sues for infringement—let's say his lawyers aren't as good and he loses that case—well, now, they are changing the rules here. All of a sudden, all of the expenses of that big company, the legal expenses, will have to be picked up by that small inventor.

Oh, my gosh, what happens when that happens? You will never get anybody to invest in that small inventor because the law not only says the inventor will pay for the cost of asking for the infringement case, but anybody who has invested in his invention will also have to bear that burden. Who is going to want to become liable if a big company starts stealing and they can't prove it in court?

The bill destroys treble damages. Right now, if a big company decides to steal from a little guy—well, if the little guy can prove this guy knew that that was my patent and he is stealing my intellectual property, if he can prove that, he will get treble damages. That is triple damages.

Well, that has been what we have had all along. That permits the little guy to have legal counsel because, if it is just simply getting the money back that he has lost, this is damages, because he gets a certain amount because he has been violated.

Well, if you eliminate that, how will these little guys get a lawyer? Now, these big guys are trying to eliminate triple damages so the little guys can't get lawyers. By doing these things, H.R. 9 will dramatically decrease the value of patents held by our major universities, held by retirement accounts,

held by our laboratories—the people who own these patents.

Now, by the way, let me tell you what they claim a patent troll to be and how they claim that this is bad. A patent troll, according to these huge corporate interests, is someone who didn't invest in something but now has the rights to sue them because that investor—the "troll"—has purchased the patent rights to certain technologies.

Let me note that a patent sometimes runs around 10 to 20 years that a patent owner can own his patent. An inventor gets granted the patent, and for 17 years, they own that patent.

Well, many of them don't have any money, and they can't even develop it, so they have to have investors. Some of them face the theft of their technology, and they don't have the money to put out, and they, themselves, challenge in court that their rights have been violated.

It is like a piece of property. If somebody comes and builds a railroad track across your property and refuses to give you any compensation for it, well, you have a right to sue; but some of the little guys don't have enough money to sue.

Well, in this case, what we have got is legal entities that are not involved with actually the invention, but they will come in and say, I will invest in your patent so you will have enough money to sue these big guys because they are stealing from you—or they just buy the patent outright, and then they own that property for a given period of time, and then they sue.

There is nothing wrong, I believe, with someone stepping forward and buying the property rights of an inventor and then enforcing it through our court system. There is nothing wrong with that, but we have been told that these are all frivolous lawsuits by the trolls.

Well, they are not. Some of them are like this, a troll—supposedly, by that name—is nothing more than an investor who has bought the property rights of an inventor, of the person who owned the property in the first place.

What we have is these multinational corporations trying to vilify someone who comes in and buys patent rights from small inventors and then using that person to destroy all of the patent rights of the small inventor.

Luckily, we have a bill in the Senate, which is S. 632. It is CHRIS COONS from Delaware who actually has a piece of legislation to try to strengthen people's patent rights, and it eliminates some of the—you might say—bad tactics that were used by people who were involved with frivolous lawsuits in the technology area. He takes care of that without greatly diminishing the patent rights of real inventors.

We also have a bill with Representative JOHN CONYERS here in the House, and that bill protects the small guy while trying to improve the Patent Office. By the way, what his bill does is ensure that all the patent fees that go

into the Patent Office stay there and, thus, improve the quality of the patents that our people have.

Over a billion dollars has been taken from the Patent Office in the last 10 years and goes into the general fund when it should be spent trying to protect—and trying to make the system work—intellectual property ownership by inventors.

That is the last I have on that piece of legislation, which is H.R. 9, which deserves the attention of the American people.

I would like to end my time tonight talking about one other issue very quickly. Today, I introduced legislation, H.R. 1940, which basically says that the Federal Government shall not interfere in those States that have eliminated the penalties on marijuana use and sales or have allowed the operation of medical marijuana dispensaries.

This legislation, H.R. 1940, would basically leave it up to the States as to whether or not people should be permitted to use marijuana, especially medical marijuana.

I don't see any reason why the people of the United States should face the type of controls and the type of police state activity that impacts their lives by people—whether they are well meaning or not—who have set up, basically, a bureaucratic law enforcement state that activates and prevents people from living their own lives.

If, indeed, someone is using marijuana—for medical purposes especially, but also even for recreational use—if someone is in their backyard, smoking some marijuana, we should not spend limited dollars.

We have limited tax dollars here. We are cutting off veterans' benefits, cutting down on people who need help, but then we are spending it on trying to put in jail someone who is smoking marijuana in their backyard or trying to supply someone with the marijuana to smoke in their backyard. That is absolutely absurd.

My bill, H.R. 1940, will insist that, if a State has legalized the use of marijuana or the medical use of marijuana, the Federal Government cannot infringe upon that.

It is sort of like you see a guy over in the corner of a park, and he is surrounded by policemen, and they throw him to the ground, and they handcuff him and put him in jail, and they go through the court procedures with the judges and all these expenses for smoking marijuana, versus the other end of the park, where some lady is getting raped, but there is no policeman there, and they spend all of their money focusing on the people who are smoking marijuana. That makes no sense.

When you have limited dollars, we should especially respect people's right to live their own lives; and, if they make mistakes, which they do, they will have to live with those mistakes.

I would ask my colleagues to support H.R. 1940, which is consistent with

criminal law should be made at the State and local level and not at the Federal level. We should not have a Federal police force knocking in doors, going into people's homes, and spending huge amounts of money in order to prevent people from personal consumption behavior.

I would ask my colleagues, if you believe in liberty, believe what our Founding Fathers believed in, support a strong patent system and oppose H.R. 9 and support my legislation, H.R. 1940, which will restore to the American people and to the States therein the right to control criminal law and their own personal behavior.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CURBELO of Florida (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of attending a Presidential visit to the Everglades National Park in his district.

Mr. HASTINGS (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for April 21 through April 23.

Mr. PAYNE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for the first series of votes today on account of medical appointment regarding foot surgery.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 971. An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for an increase in the limit on the length of an agreement under the Medicare independence at home medical practice demonstration program; to the Committee on Ways and Means; in addition, to the Committee on Energy and Commerce for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

S. 984. An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide Medicare beneficiary access to eye tracking accessories for speech generating devices and to remove the rental cap for durable medical equipment under the Medicare Program with respect to speech generating devices; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce; in addition, to the Committee on Ways and Means for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 535. An act to promote energy efficiency.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 26 minutes

p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 23, 2015, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1239. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 21-39, "Public Charter School Priority Enrollment Temporary Amendment Act of 2015", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, section 602(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1240. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 21-40, "Chancellor of the District of Columbia Public Schools Salary Adjustment Temporary Amendment Act of 2015", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, section 602(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1241. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 21-41, "Health Benefit Exchange Authority Financial Sustainability Temporary Amendment Act of 2015", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, section 602(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1242. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 21-42, "Educator Evaluation Data Protection Temporary Amendment Act of 2015", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, section 602(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1243. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 21-38, "Wage Theft Prevention Clarification Temporary Amendment Act of 2015", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, section 602(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1244. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 21-43, "At-Risk Funding Temporary Amendment Act of 2015", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, section 602(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1245. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 21-37, "H Street, N.E., Retail Priority Area Clarification Temporary Amendment Act of 2015", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, section 602(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1246. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 20-492, "Student Nutrition on Winter Weather Days Act of 2014", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, section 602(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1247. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 21-48, "Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Clarification Temporary Amendment Act of 2015", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, section 602(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1248. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 21-49, "Marijuana Possession Decriminalization Clarification Temporary Amendment Act of 2015", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, section 602(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1249. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 21-44, "Vending Regulations Temporary Amendment Act of 2015", pursuant to

Public Law 93-198, section 602(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1250. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 20-596, "Limitations on the Use of Restraints Amendment Act of 2014", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, section 602(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1251. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 21-47, "Testing Integrity Temporary Amendment Act of 2015", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, section 602(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

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. SCOTT of Virginia (for himself, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. TAKANO, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. POCAN, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. DELAURO, and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts):

H.R. 1926. A bill to improve compliance with mine safety and health laws, empower miners to raise safety concerns, prevent future mine tragedies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GOODLATTE (for himself and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona):

H.R. 1927. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to improve fairness in class action litigation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCHENRY (for himself, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. HUDSON, and Mr. ROUZER):

H.R. 1928. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the coverage of qualified tuition programs and increase the limitation on contributions to Coverdell education savings accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WITTMAN (for himself, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. COFFMAN, and Ms. SINEMA):

H.R. 1929. A bill to restrict United States nationals from traveling to countries in which foreign governments or anti-government forces allow foreign terrorist organizations to engage in armed conflict for purposes of participating in such armed conflict or from providing material support to entities that are engaged in such armed conflict, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 1930. A bill to eliminate certain subsidies for fossil-fuel production; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Natural Resources, Science, Space, and Technology, Energy and Commerce, Agriculture, Appropriations, Financial Services, and Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. CARTER of Texas):

H.R. 1931. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to sell certain Federal land, to direct that the proceeds of such sales be applied to reduce the Federal budget deficit, and for

other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. HARTZLER:

H.R. 1932. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to allow employers a grace period to abate certain occupational health and safety violations before being subject to a penalty under such Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FARR, Mr. FATAH, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HONDA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. POCAN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUSH, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHA-KOWSKY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia):

H.R. 1933. A bill to eliminate racial profiling by law enforcement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS (for herself and Mr. ISRAEL):

H.R. 1934. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to establish a national Oncology Medical Home Demonstration Project under the Medicare program for the purpose of changing the Medicare payment for cancer care in order to enhance the quality of care and to improve cost efficiency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CULBERSON (for himself and Mr. McCLINTOCK):

H.R. 1935. A bill to protect 10th Amendment rights by providing special standing for State government officials to challenge proposed regulations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (for himself, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. REED, Mrs. BLACK, and Mr. MARCHANT):

H.R. 1936. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to exclude certain medical sources of evidence in making disability determinations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. AMODEI (for himself, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. FLORES, Mr. STEWART, Mr. COOK, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. HARDY, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. McCLINTOCK, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. SALMON, Mr. LAMALFA, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. LATTA, Mr. BARR, Mr. COLE, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, and Mr. NEWHOUSE):

H.R. 1937. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to more efficiently develop domestic sources of the minerals and mineral materials of strategic and critical importance to United States economic and national security and manufacturing competitiveness; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. KIND (for himself, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. POCAN, Ms. MOORE, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. GROTHMAN, and Mr. DUFFY):

H.R. 1938. A bill to amend the Inspector General Act of 1978 to increase transparency of the Inspectors General, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 1939. A bill to amend the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012 to establish prohibitions to prevent the use of an unmanned aircraft system as a weapon while operating in the national airspace system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ROHRBACHER (for himself, Mr. COHEN, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. TITUS, Mr. McCLINTOCK, Ms. SCHA-KOWSKY, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. POLIS, Mr. AMASH, and Mr. POCAN):

H.R. 1940. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to provide for a new rule regarding the application of the Act to marijuana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WESTMORELAND (for himself, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. COOPER, Mr. BARR, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. MESSER, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. HILL, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. LUCAS, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. POSEY, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. MCHENRY, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. HURT of Virginia, and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 1941. A bill to improve the examination of depository institutions, and for other

purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GUINTA (for himself, Ms. SCHKOWSKY, Mr. BUCHANAN, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LANCE, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. GIBSON, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. JONES, Mr. FARR, Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. MARINO, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. DENT, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. STEFANK, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. CALVERT, Ms. LEE, Mr. HARRIS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. JOLLY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER):

H.R. 1942. A bill to prevent human health threats posed by the consumption of equines raised in the United States; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER (for herself, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COSTA, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FARR, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HONDA, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. POLIS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TONKO, Mr. YARMUTH, and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 1943. A bill to require the Supreme Court of the United States to promulgate a code of ethics; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLUM (for himself, Mr. BUCK, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, and Mr. PETERSON):

H.R. 1944. A bill to provide regulatory relief to alternative fuel producers and consumers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 1945. A bill to amend the African Elephant Conservation Act and the Rhinoceros and Tiger Conservation Act to provide for trade sanctions against countries involved in illegal trade of elephant ivory and rhinoceros horn, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mr. KIND, Mr. NEAL, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, and Mrs. DAVIS of California):

H.R. 1946. A bill to amend the Trade Act of 1974 to authorize the United States Trade Representative to take discretionary action if a foreign country is engaging in unreasonable acts, policies, or practices relating to the environment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mr. KIND, Mr. NEAL, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. MCDERMOTT):

H.R. 1947. A bill to establish the Trade Agreements Enforcement Trust Fund to take actions to enforce free trade agreements to which the United States is a party, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California (for herself, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. TITUS, Mr. WALZ, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. KUSTER, and Miss RICE of New York):

H.R. 1948. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide child care assistance to veterans receiving certain medical services provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BUTTERFIELD (for himself and Mr. MCCLINTOCK):

H.R. 1949. A bill to provide for the consideration and submission of site and design proposals for the National Liberty Memorial approved for establishment in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BYRNE:

H.R. 1950. A bill to abolish certain executive agencies unless Congress disapproves of such abolishment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mrs. CAPPS:

H.R. 1951. A bill to prohibit the use of hydraulic fracturing or acid well stimulation treatment in the Pacific Outer Continental Shelf Region until the Secretary of the Interior prepares an environmental impact statement and conducts a study with respect to such practices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. CAPPS (for herself, Mr. FARR, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mr. HUFFMAN):

H.R. 1952. A bill to permanently prohibit oil and gas leasing off the coast of the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. DESANTIS (for himself, Mr. BLUM, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. SALMON, and Mr. MULVANEY):

H.R. 1953. A bill to require members of Congress and congressional staff to abide by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act with respect to health insurance coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on House Administration, Ways and Means, 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. FINCHER:

H.R. 1954. A bill to align exemptions for general solicitation of investment in commodity pools similar to the exemption provided for general solicitation of securities under the Jumpstart Our Business Startups Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HIGGINS (for himself, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. MOORE, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. FUDGE, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 1955. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide assistance for nutrient removal technologies to States in the Great Lakes System; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. HINOJOSA (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr.

BUTTERFIELD, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. KIND, and Ms. FUDGE):

H.R. 1956. A bill to improve the Federal Pell Grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HINOJOSA (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. KIND, and Ms. FUDGE):

H.R. 1957. A bill to improve the Federal Pell Grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HINOJOSA (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. KIND, and Ms. FUDGE):

H.R. 1958. A bill to improve the Federal Pell Grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HINOJOSA (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. KIND, and Ms. FUDGE):

H.R. 1959. A bill to provide Dreamer students with access to student financial aid; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. HONDA (for himself, Mr. FARR, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. NORTON, Ms. PINGREE, and Ms. LOFGREN):

H.R. 1960. A bill to establish national goals for the reduction and recycling of municipal solid waste, to address the growing problem of marine debris, to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to promulgate regulations to attain those goals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HONDA (for himself, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, and Ms. LOFGREN):

H.R. 1961. A bill to authorize the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to establish a Climate Change Education Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 1962. A bill to establish State infrastructure banks for education; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HUFFMAN (for himself, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. TAKAD):

H.R. 1963. A bill to provide for the upgrade of the vehicle fleet of the United States Postal Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HULTGREN (for himself, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. SALMON, Ms. ESTY, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. ROTHFUS):

H.R. 1964. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to revise hiring practices for air traffic controller positions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. HURT of Virginia:

H.R. 1965. A bill to exempt smaller public companies from requirements relating to the use of Extensible Business Reporting Language for periodic reporting to the Securities and Exchange Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. KAPTUR (for herself, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. MOORE, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. TAKAI):

H.R. 1966. A bill to authorize the President to reestablish the Civilian Conservation Corps as a means of providing gainful employment to unemployed and underemployed citizens of the United States through the performance of useful public work, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. KILMER (for himself and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER):

H.R. 1967. A bill to authorize Federal agencies to establish prize competitions for innovation or adaptation management development relating to ocean acidification; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. KING of Iowa (for himself, Mr. BABIN, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. YOHO, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. MASSIE, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 1968. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to limit Federal court jurisdiction and funding over questions concerning the issue of marriage with respect to the Defense of Marriage Act and the Constitution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGEVIN (for himself, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. ESTY, and Mr. CARNEY):

H.R. 1969. A bill to expand eligibility for the program of comprehensive assistance for family caregivers of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to expand benefits available to participants under such program, to enhance special compensation for members of the uniformed services who require assistance in everyday life, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, Oversight and Government Reform, Energy and Commerce, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. LAWRENCE:

H.R. 1970. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against tax for manufacturing job training expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California (for himself, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BEYER, Mr. HONDA, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. LEE, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. COHEN, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. PETERS, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. NADLER, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. HAHN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT):

H.R. 1971. A bill to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and protect the climate; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself and Mr. ENGEL):

H.R. 1972. A bill to provide certain requirements for the licensing of commercial nuclear facilities; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 1973. A bill to require the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to retain and redistribute certain amounts collected as fines; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico (for herself, Mr. TAKAI, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. LEE, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. HONDA, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. MOORE, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. GRAYSON, and Ms. MENG):

H.R. 1974. A bill to expand access to health care services, including sexual, reproductive, and maternal health services, for immigrant women, men, and families by removing legal barriers to health insurance coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MEEKS (for himself, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. FOSTER, and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York):

H.R. 1975. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require the Securities Exchange Commission to refund or credit excess payments made to the Commission; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 1976. A bill to provide for nuclear weapons abolition and economic conversion in accordance with District of Columbia Initiative Measure Number 37 of 1992, while ensuring environmental restoration and clean-energy conversion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PALLONE (for himself, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. SIRES, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. TONKO, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. KEATING, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Mr. QUIGLEY):

H.R. 1977. A bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to permanently prohibit the conduct of offshore drilling on the outer Continental Shelf in the Mid-Atlantic, South Atlantic, and North Atlantic planning areas; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. POLIS (for himself, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SIRES, Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. WALZ, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. NOLAN):

H.R. 1978. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a veterans conservation corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Transpor-

tation and Infrastructure, the Judiciary, and Science, Space, and Technology, 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 Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN (for herself, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MEEKS, and Mrs. LAWRENCE):

H.R. 1979. A bill to strengthen the protections from levy by the Internal Revenue Service for taxpayers in economic hardship; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself and Mr. CARTWRIGHT):

H.R. 1980. A bill to enhance consumer access to electricity information and allow for the adoption of innovative products and services to help consumers manage their energy usage; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BECERRA:

H. Res. 219. A resolution electing a Member to a certain standing committee of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to, considered and agreed to.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia:

H.R. 1926.

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. GOODLATTE:

H.R. 1927.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this legislation is based is found in Article I, Section 8, Clause 9; Article III, Section 1, Clause 1; and Article III, Section 2, Clause 2 of the Constitution, which grant Congress authority over federal courts.

By Mr. MCHENRY:

H.R. 1928.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, which states "The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States" and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, which empowers Congress to "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. WITTMAN:

H.R. 1929.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following.

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests in the preamble of the Constitution providing for the "common defense" and in the powers governing national security in Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 1930.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States, which states:

“The Congress shall have the 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 on the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.”

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 1931.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mrs. HARTZLER:

H.R. 1932.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I: Section 8: Clause 3 The United States Congress shall have power

“To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.”

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 1933.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to Section 5 of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution, Congress shall have the power to enact appropriate laws protecting the civil rights of all Americans.

By Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS:

H.R. 1934.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority in which this bill rests is the power of the Congress to regulate Commerce as enumerated by Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 as applied to providing for the general welfare of the United States through the administration of the Medicare program under Title 18 if the Social Security Act.

By Mr. CULBERSON:

H.R. 1935.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article III, Section 2, Clause 1 & the Tenth Amendment.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 1936.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution, to “provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.”

By Mr. AMODEI:

H.R. 1937.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by 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 Mr. KIND:

H.R. 1938.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 1939.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The attached language falls within Congress’ delegated authority to legislate interstate commerce, found in Article I, Section 8, clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution. Further, Congress’ authority to authorize the FAA to regulate airspace within the U.S. has been

found to be within its authority under the General Welfare clause of the U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section 8, clause 1.

By Mr. ROHRBACHER:

H.R. 1940.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 3 of the United States Constitution, which grants Congress the power to, among other things, regulate Commerce among the several States.

By Mr. WESTMORELAND:

H.R. 1941.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Commerce Clause, Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution states that Congress shall have power to regulate the regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. GUINTA:

H.R. 1942.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 Clause 18—The Congress shall have Power . . . To make 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 Ms. SLAUGHTER:

H.R. 1943.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The authority to enact this bill is derived from, but may not be limited to, Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. BLUM:

H.R. 1944.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, the Commerce Clause

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 1945.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 1946.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article I of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 1947.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article I of the U.S. Constitution

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 1948.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 14

To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces.

By Mr. BUTTERFIELD:

H.R. 1949.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 17 of the Constitution of the United States of America.

By Mr. BYRNE:

H.R. 1950.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution. 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 of Officer thereof

By Mrs. CAPPS:

H.R. 1951.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2:

By Mrs. CAPPS:

H.R. 1952.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2:

By Mr. DeSANTIS:

H.R. 1953.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. FINCHER:

H.R. 1954.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8—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. HIGGINS:

H.R. 1955.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. HINOJOSA:

H.R. 1956.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Clauses 1 and 18 of Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HINOJOSA:

H.R. 1957.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Clauses 1 and 18 of Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HINOJOSA:

H.R. 1958.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Clauses 1 and 18 of Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HINOJOSA:

H.R. 1959.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Clauses 1 and 18 of Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 1960.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 1961.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 1962.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8, Article I of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 1963.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 7 of Section 8, Article I of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. HULTGREN:

H.R. 1964.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3, as this legislation regulates commerce between the states. Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18, providing Congress with the authority to enact legislation necessary to execute one of its

enumerated powers, such as Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. HURT of Virginia:

H.R. 1965.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 1966.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, with specific power to provide for the general welfare of the United States and to regulate commerce among the several states, and with the Indian tribes of the Constitution.

By Mr. KILMER:

H.R. 1967.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 1968.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article III, Section 2, Clause 2

"In all Cases affecting Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls, and those in which a State shall be Party, the supreme Court shall have original Jurisdiction. In all the other Cases before mentioned, the supreme Court shall have appellate Jurisdiction, both as to Law and Fact, with such Exceptions, and under such Regulations as the Congress shall make."

Article I, Section 8, Clause 9

"To constitute Tribunals inferior to the Supreme Court . . ."

By Mr. LANGEVIN:

H.R. 1969.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mrs. LAWRENCE:

H.R. 1970.

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. TED LIEU of California:

H.R. 1971.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 3 of the Constitution

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 1972.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 1973.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 1974.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. MEEKS:

H.R. 1975.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 1976.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clauses 1 and 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 1977.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2:

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. POLIS:

H.R. 1978.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8, Clause 12 & Clause 18 of the Constitution, Congress, has the power "To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper" for carrying out power including the power "To raise and support Armies"

By Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN:

H.R. 1979.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 1980.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 24: Mr. DIAZ-BALART and Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 140: Mr. ROHRABACHER.

H.R. 169: Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 178: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 209: Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 210: Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 282: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 287: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 310: Mr. CRAWFORD.

H.R. 317: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 353: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 381: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. HAHN, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Ms. GABBARD.

H.R. 393: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 402: Mr. SCHRADER.

H.R. 424: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 425: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 430: Ms. BROWNLEY of California and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 432: Mr. DOLD.

H.R. 450: Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 456: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. KATKO, and Mrs. LAWRENCE.

H.R. 465: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. TROTT, and Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 467: Mr. PETERS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. RANGEL, and Ms. ESTY.

H.R. 501: Ms. DUCKWORTH.

H.R. 524: Mr. ROTHFUS.

H.R. 532: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 540: Mr. MASSIE.

H.R. 546: Mr. POMPEO.

H.R. 566: Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 591: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 592: Mr. ROUZER.

H.R. 605: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 624: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mrs. WALORSKI, and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 662: Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 670: Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 672: Mrs. NOEM.

H.R. 702: Mr. MULLIN.

H.R. 712: Mr. GOSAR and Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 717: Ms. DUCKWORTH.

H.R. 721: Mr. CRAWFORD and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 727: Mr. DELANEY, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. VELA.

H.R. 756: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 771: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 803: Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H.R. 812: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.

H.R. 815: Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 825: Ms. TITUS, Mr. LATTA, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, and Mr. MICA.

H.R. 836: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. LONG.

H.R. 842: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 845: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 846: Mr. KIND, Mr. KEATING, and Ms. ADAMS.

H.R. 868: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 885: Mr. COLE and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 891: Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. BABIN, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. HURD of Texas, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. HENSARLING, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 902: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 907: Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 916: Mr. DOLD.

H.R. 920: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. HANNA.

H.R. 921: Mr. LONG.

H.R. 935: Mrs. TORRES.

H.R. 972: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 980: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri and Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 985: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 986: Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. JONES, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. GUTHRIE, and Ms. STEFANIK.

H.R. 994: Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 996: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 997: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan and Mr. WESTMORELAND.

H.R. 1062: Mr. GROTHMAN, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Mr. BYRNE.

H.R. 1086: Mr. BYRNE and Mr. BUCSHON.

H.R. 1087: Mr. SALMON.

H.R. 1117: Mr. HARPER.

H.R. 1128: Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 1141: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1143: Mr. CHABOT.

H.R. 1147: Mr. ROE of Tennessee and Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 1151: Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia.

H.R. 1170: Mrs. LAWRENCE.

H.R. 1178: Mr. PETERS and Mr. CROWLEY.

H.R. 1194: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 1202: Mr. PETERSON and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 1206: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 1211: Mr. Cárdenas and Mrs. LAWRENCE.

H.R. 1215: Mr. ROHRABACHER.

H.R. 1220: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. NORTON, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. LEE, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 1229: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 1233: Mr. WILLIAMS and Mr. JOLLY.

- H.R. 1234: Mr. GROTHMAN.
 H.R. 1247: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, and Mr. HANNA.
 H.R. 1258: Mr. TAKAI.
 H.R. 1271: Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 1284: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee and Mr. RUSH.
 H.R. 1288: Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 1309: Mr. VELA and Mr. HASTINGS.
 H.R. 1310: Mr. DOLD, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
 H.R. 1312: Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico, Mr. SIRES, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. DELBENE, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, and Mr. GRAYSON.
 H.R. 1365: Mr. BOST and Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.
 H.R. 1383: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
 H.R. 1384: Miss RICE of New York.
 H.R. 1388: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. GUTHRIE, and Mr. GRIFFITH.
 H.R. 1392: Mrs. LAWRENCE.
 H.R. 1404: Mr. DEUTCH.
 H.R. 1435: Mr. DESAULNIER.
 H.R. 1443: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.
 H.R. 1453: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.
 H.R. 1461: Mr. MULVANEY.
 H.R. 1477: Mr. HUFFMAN.
 H.R. 1478: Mr. STIVERS and Mr. BYRNE.
 H.R. 1493: Mr. SIRES.
 H.R. 1516: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 1528: Mr. CLEAVER.
 H.R. 1538: Mr. JONES and Mr. PERLMUTTER.
 H.R. 1559: Mr. LAMALFA.
 H.R. 1567: Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Ms. KUSTER.
 H.R. 1568: Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. DOLD, and Mr. VALADAO.
 H.R. 1572: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
 H.R. 1594: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. SARBANES, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. NUGENT, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. COOPER, Mr. WALZ, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. GOODLATTE, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
 H.R. 1610: Mr. MOOLENAAR.
 H.R. 1612: Ms. SINEMA.
 H.R. 1613: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. BYRNE, and Mr. LONG.
 H.R. 1614: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
 H.R. 1623: Mr. RUSSELL.
 H.R. 1624: Mr. HARPER and Mr. BARLETTA.
 H.R. 1634: Mr. RUSSELL.
 H.R. 1650: Mr. HANNA.
 H.R. 1651: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.
 H.R. 1652: Mr. BENISHEK.
 H.R. 1666: Mr. MULVANEY and Mr. HARPER.
 H.R. 1669: Mr. PEARCE, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. LONG, and Mr. COLE.
 H.R. 1671: Mr. HENSARLING and Mr. RUSSELL.
 H.R. 1674: Mr. WELCH, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. RANGEL.
 H.R. 1675: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. HIGGINS, and Ms. SINEMA.
 H.R. 1677: Mr. PETERSON.
 H.R. 1684: Mr. ROUZER.
 H.R. 1700: Mr. O'ROURKE and Mr. CÁRDENAS.
 H.R. 1732: Mr. HARRIS, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. ROSS, and Mrs. ROBY.
 H.R. 1736: Mr. PETERSON.
 H.R. 1737: Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. LATTA, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. GUTHRIE.
 H.R. 1739: Mr. HENSARLING.
 H.R. 1752: Mr. YODER, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. FORBES, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. MARINO, and Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.
 H.R. 1769: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LATTA, and Ms. DUCKWORTH.
 H.R. 1784: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. HANNA, Mr. LONG, Mr. WITTMAN, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
 H.R. 1786: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.
 H.R. 1800: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.
 H.R. 1807: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.
 H.R. 1832: Mr. POLIS.
 H.R. 1844: Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina.
 H.R. 1869: Mr. BUCK and Mr. TIPTON.
 H.R. 1876: Mr. LONG.
 H.R. 1885: Mr. FORTENBERRY.
 H.R. 1907: Mr. BRADY of Texas and Mr. BOUTSTANY.
 H.R. 1925: Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.J. Res. 42: Mr. GOSAR.
 H.J. Res. 43: Mr. AMASH, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. HARRIS, and Mrs. NOEM.
 H.J. Res. 44: Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. PITTS, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. YOHO, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. JONES, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, and Mr. BYRNE.
 H. Con. Res. 17: Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. BUCK, and Mr. BARLETTA.
 H. Con. Res. 28: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. TROTT, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. BYRNE, and Mr. HENSARLING.
 H. Con. Res. 40: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. SALMON, Mr. WOODALL, Ms. MENG, and Mr. SIRES.
 H. Res. 56: Mr. WALZ.
 H. Res. 181: Mr. SALMON.
 H. Res. 188: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
 H. Res. 194: Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. RENACCI, and Mr. TROTT.
 H. Res. 207: Mr. COSTA, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. HANNA, Mr. WELCH, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, and Mr. KATKO.