

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

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

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

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 631

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1230

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1240

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

every principle that this Nation stands for.

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

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

According to Mr. Rosenbach:

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

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

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

blanket immunity that this bill includes.

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

□ 1250

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I would just point out two other things, briefly:

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

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

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

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1300

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

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

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

Mr. SCHIFF. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

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

these amendments were made in order in this rule.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1310

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. TIERNEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

How are you going to pay for that?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The politics has changed. That's the fact.

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

Support the Tierney motion and oppose this rule.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. NUGENT. I do not.

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

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

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

□ 1310

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

□ 1330

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. POLIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NUGENT. I yield to the gentleman.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1340

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

and protecting our students and student loans.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Amend section 3 to read as follows:

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

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

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

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

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

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

[Roll No. 182]

YEAS—241

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

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

NAYS—179

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

NOT VOTING—11

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

□ 1405

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

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

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

[Roll No. 183]

YEAS—236

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

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

NAYS—185

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

NOT VOTING—10

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1414

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

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

LOWELL NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK LAND EXCHANGE ACT OF 2012

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

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1420

CYBER INTELLIGENCE SHARING AND PROTECTION ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 3523.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

□ 1422

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

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

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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