

their jobs for us. This violence against our coastal defenders is yet another wake up call to America, sounding anew a warning that we must as a nation summon courage to defend our border equal to the devotion to duty Chief Petty Officer Horne exemplified. There was no price he was unwilling to pay to protect our nation, and we must honor him by rising in the same degree to the cause for which he died.

Every day courageous men and women of the USCG are on the front line of the struggle to restore the rule of law in the navigable waters of our nation. As the daily assault on our coastal communities escalates, the USCG stands between us and lawlessness on the open seas and along the shorelines where our very civil order now is under siege. This tragic loss of one of America's finest is the terrible price we pay to turn back those emboldened to violate our border security and threaten our homeland in desperate criminal enterprises, profiting from trafficking in drugs and human beings.

Unyielding in our vigilance against these modern day pirates and slave traders, we pause to mourn the loss of a fellow American whose service to our nation humbles us and deepens our resolve to prevail against the perpetrators of violence and crime making landfall on our coast from the sea.

That can and must be done to honor Chief Petty Officer Horne and all those who have sacrificed all so we may remain a sovereign nation and free people. We owe it to Terrell Horne and each and every one of our fallen heroes. I again urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 825 in honor of Terrell and all those who sacrifice so much for all of us.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LoBiondo) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 825.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SENSE OF CONGRESS ON GOVERNANCE OF THE INTERNET

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 50) expressing the sense of Congress regarding actions to preserve and advance the multistakeholder governance model under which the Internet has thrived.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

S. CON. RES. 50

Whereas given the importance of the Internet to the global economy, it is essential that the Internet remain stable, secure, and free from government control;

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

Whereas the structure of Internet governance has profound implications for competi-

tion and trade, democratization, free expression, and access to information;

Whereas countries have obligations to protect human rights, which are advanced by online activity as well as offline activity;

Whereas the ability to innovate, develop technical capacity, grasp economic opportunities, and promote freedom of expression online is best realized in cooperation with all stakeholders;

Whereas proposals have been put forward for consideration at the 2012 World Conference on International Telecommunications that would fundamentally alter the governance and operation of the Internet;

Whereas the proposals, in international bodies such as the United Nations General Assembly, the United Nations Commission on Science and Technology for Development, and the International Telecommunication Union, would attempt to justify increased government control over the Internet and would undermine the current multistakeholder model that has enabled the Internet to flourish and under which the private sector, civil society, academia, and individual users play an important role in charting its direction;

Whereas the proposals would diminish the freedom of expression on the Internet in favor of government control over content;

Whereas the position of the United States Government has been and is to advocate for the flow of information free from government control; and

Whereas this and past Administrations have made a strong commitment to the multistakeholder model of Internet governance and the promotion of the global benefits of the Internet: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, should continue working to implement the position of the United States on Internet governance that clearly articulates the consistent and unequivocal policy of the United States to promote a global Internet free from government control and preserve and advance the successful multistakeholder model that governs the Internet today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. Blackburn) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. Eshoo) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. BLACKBURN. 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 in the RECORD for S. Con. Res. 50.

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

There was no objection.

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

This week, representatives from 193 countries are meeting in Dubai to reexamine an international treaty dealing with telecommunications. Several hostile countries are seeking to use this opportunity to impose new international regulations on the Internet.

We need to send a strong message to the world that the Internet has thrived under a decentralized, bottom-up,

multistakeholder governance model. That is why I stand in strong support of Senator RUBIO's Senate Concurrent Resolution 50. The U.S. is united in its opposition to international control over Internet governance, and we've seen leadership pushing back against ceding more power to the International Telecommunication Union. It is referred to as the "ITU." It's a branch of the United Nations.

Some want to give it new powers. Several countries see the Internet as a tool for political and/or economic control that they want to exploit. For example, Russia's Vladimir Putin has openly stated his intention to seek "international control over the Internet using the monitoring and supervisory capabilities of the ITU." Just last week, the Syrian Government shut off Internet access as the regime sought to suppress the free exchange of information among its private citizens. But it's because the Internet is the ultimate tool of political and economic liberation that we should foster and protect it, not give those who fear its impact on politics and the economy the power to repress its continued innovation and untapped potential.

I also want to make an important point about our legitimacy in the fight to keep the Internet thriving, democratic, and decentralized. Unfortunately, we did undermine our credibility when the Federal Communications Commission imposed net neutrality regulations without the proper statutory authority to do so. Even Ambassador Verveer at the State Department had made the point. He said in 2010 that the net neutrality proceeding "is one that could be employed by regimes that don't agree with our perspectives about essentially avoiding regulation of the Internet and trying to be sure not to do anything to damage its dynamism and its organic development. It could be employed as a pretext or as an excuse for undertaking public policy activities that we would disagree with pretty profoundly."

□ 0950

We need to pass S. Con. Res. 50 and rebuild our credibility in support of Internet freedom. Regulating beyond our authority at home sets a very bad example when we want to oppose truly devastating regulations at the international level. Despite our domestic disagreements on telecom policy, one thing both sides of the aisle can agree on is that we should uphold the Internet governance model that's working. Let's not try to fix what's not broken.

In Dubai, we want our country promoting private markets and U.S. interests. Let's encourage the decentralized governance model that's been successful in the past, and let's show leadership instead of giving away broad regulatory powers to those who don't deserve and who should not have it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, it's fitting that on the week in which the World Conference on International Telecommunications convenes in Dubai that the House will once again take up a resolution demonstrating the bipartisan commitment of Congress to preserve the open structure and multistakeholder approach that has guided the Internet over the past two decades.

I think we are all very, very proud that there is not only bipartisan but bicameral support underlying this resolution, and there is complete support across the executive branch of our government. In other words, the United States of America is totally unified on this issue of an open structure, a multistakeholder approach that has guided the Internet over the past two decades.

The Senate resolution before us today, Mr. Speaker, makes a minor technical change to a resolution that the House passed unanimously in August by a vote of 414-0. I have no objection to this change, and I ask my colleagues to support this bipartisan measure.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN), who is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Telecommunications and the Internet.

Mr. WALDEN. I thank my colleague and friend for the time.

I rise today in support of Senate Concurrent Resolution 50, which, as you've heard, opposes international regulation of the Internet. It is virtually identical to the language that our friend and colleague Representative MARY BONO MACK put forward in H. Con. Res. 127, which was introduced earlier this year and passed by my subcommittee and in the full Energy and Commerce Committee and went on to pass this House without opposition. With this vote, we unify that language and we send a strong bipartisan, bicameral signal about America's commitment to an unregulated Internet.

I want to thank Representative BONO MACK for championing this important legislation to keep the Internet free from government regulation. I also wish to thank FCC Commissioner Robert McDowell, who has tirelessly sounded the call, not only about the peril we face if we stand idly by as countries like Russia and China seek to exert control over the Internet, but also about how FCC's own actions adopting network neutrality rules regulating the Internet undermine America's case abroad.

I also fear that recent talks of cybersecurity executive orders here at home may be cited back to us by some foreign nations with them accusing us of telling them to do as we say but not as we do.

The historical hands-off regulatory policy has allowed the Internet to become the greatest vehicle for global, social, and economic liberty since the

printing press. And despite the current economic climate, it continues to grow at an astonishing pace.

FCC Commissioner McDowell and Chairman Genachowski are in Dubai this week as U.S. delegates to the World Conference on International Telecommunications. Our committee has also sent representatives from both parties to keep an eye on the proceedings. There, the 193 member countries of the United Nations are considering whether to apply to the Internet a regulatory regime that the International Telecommunications Union created in the 1980s for old-fashioned telephone service, as well as whether to swallow the Internet's nongovernmental organizational structure whole and make it part of the United Nations. Neither of these are acceptable outcomes and must be strongly opposed by our delegation.

Among those supportive of such regulation is Russian President Vladimir Putin, who spoke positively about the idea of "establishing international control over the Internet," to use his own words. Some countries have even proposed regulations that would allow them to read citizens' email in the name of security, require citizens to register their email addresses for tracking purposes, and to charge for Internet access to their countries on a per-click basis.

This resolution rejects these proposals by taking the radical position that if the most revolutionary advance in technology, commerce, and social discourse of the last century is not broken, as you've heard others say, there's no reason to "fix" it.

The ability of the Internet to grow at this staggering pace is due largely to the flexibility of the multistakeholder model that governs the Internet so successfully today. Nongovernmental institutions now manage the Internet's core functions with input from private and public sector participants, and this structure prevents governmental or nongovernmental actors from controlling the design of the network or the content that it carries. Without one entity in control, the Internet has become a driver of jobs, information, business expansion, investment, and innovation. Moving away from the multistakeholder model would harm these abilities, preventing the Internet from spreading prosperity and the cause of freedom.

As the United States delegation continues its work at the WCIT, this resolution is an excellent bipartisan demonstration of our Nation's commitment to preserve the multistakeholder governance model and keep the Internet free from international regulation. I encourage my colleagues to support passage of this measure.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), who is a member of the Telecommunications and Internet Subcommittee.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlelady from Tennessee for yielding and for her leadership on this issue.

As has been noted, right now, in Dubai, an arm of the United Nations is considering trying to take international control over parts of the Internet. If you look at the struggling economy we have right now in the United States, one of the few bright spots is the telecommunications industry. One of the reasons—as a computer science major, I would argue that one of the reasons that the telecommunications and technology industry has been so successful even in a tough economy is because the government hasn't figured out how to regulate it and slow it down.

And yet here you have a proposal by the United Nations, coming out of the United Nations, to interfere with that multistakeholder organization which has been and allowed this industry to be so successful and allowed the Internet to shape and dramatically improve so many people's lives. So many of the things we can do today and all of the conveniences that have been added through great new apps and great new technology have come from this multistakeholder governance of the Internet. And yet here you have the United Nations try to step in.

And let's be real clear about who some of these countries are that want to do this and what they're intending to do if they are successful. Countries like Russia and China are leading this. Some of the Arab nations right now where you see uprisings, and many of those uprisings, by the way, have been brought through social media, through an open and free Internet where people can come together in cyberspace and hold their leadership accountable and in some cases rise up against oppressive governments, and those governments would like nothing more than to be able to shut that down by taking over control of the Internet.

I know it's been brought up before by the gentlelady from Tennessee and others, but I think it's important to know that Vladimir Putin, when he was meeting with the ITU Secretary-General said his goal, the reason that he and others like China are pursuing this, is to establish international control over the Internet through these new ITU rules.

And so while these discussions are going on in Dubai, I think it's critical that this piece of legislation is something we can arm our supporters with, those who stand up for Internet freedom, to say it is the United States Congress' bipartisan agreement that we want to maintain that freedom. We don't want United Nations control over the Internet.

□ 1000

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, we have no further speakers, and as I close, I want to thank Ms. ESHOO for the leadership that she has given. She's

the ranking member of the Telecommunications and Internet Subcommittee.

I also want to draw attention to the outstanding work that Representative MARY BONO MACK did as she led the debate and the discussion and pushed for the resolution, authored the resolution that the House passed earlier on this very issue. I also want to thank her for her work with Senator RUBIO and having a resolution that would be agreed to by both Chambers.

As Ms. ESHOO indicated earlier, the Senate resolution makes a technical change, a small technical change, in the resolution that was passed by the House. This is where the U.S. needs to stand firm. It's a way that we, in a bipartisan manner, can stand firm for freedom. I encourage the passage of this resolution; and I encourage that we, as a body, will continue to stand for a free and open Internet.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 50.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

FORMER PRESIDENTS PROTECTION ACT OF 2012

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 6620) to amend title 18, United States Code, to eliminate certain limitations on the length of Secret Service Protection for former Presidents and for the children of former Presidents.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6620

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Former Presidents Protection Act of 2012".

SEC. 2. ELIMINATING CERTAIN LIMITATIONS ON THE LENGTH OF SECRET SERVICE PROTECTION FOR FORMER PRESIDENTS AND FOR THE CHILDREN OF FORMER PRESIDENTS.

(a) FORMER PRESIDENTS.—Section 3056(a)(3) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking "unless the former President did not" and all that follows through "warrant such protection".

(b) CHILDREN OF FORMER PRESIDENTS.—Section 3056(a)(4) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking "for a period" and all that follows through "comes first".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from

Texas (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 6620, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 6620, the Former Presidents Protection Act of 2012, amends Federal law to uniformly provide lifetime Secret Service protection to all of America's former Presidents.

I want to thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. GOWDY) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) for sponsoring this commonsense, bipartisan legislation.

America has a responsibility to protect its Presidents and their families, and not simply while they serve in office. We also have a duty to ensure the ongoing safety of those who serve in America's highest elected office after they leave office.

In 1958, Congress first authorized Secret Service protection for former Presidents, which was limited to a reasonable period of time after a President leaves office. Congress expanded this to lifetime protection in 1965.

But in 1994, Congress once again limited Secret Service protection for former Presidents, this time to 10 years after a President leaves office. This 10-year restriction applied to Presidents who took office after January 1, 1997.

The role of a former President has changed throughout the years. Former Presidents now have a global presence, and they are often seen as de facto representatives of the United States.

Whether it's former President Carter's work in peace negotiations with other countries or President Clinton's global initiative, former Presidents have a valuable role in using their experience and knowledge to help the U.S. in both a public and private capacity.

The world has changed dramatically since the 9/11 terrorist attacks. The threats to American personnel and interests continue as terrorists wage a war against the United States. Arbitrarily limiting Secret Service protection to 10 years may have made sense in 1994, after the Cold War had ended and before the war on terror had begun.

In a world where Americans who serve the public interest are considered targets, we must make sure that the safety and security of our former Chief Executives is not jeopardized. H.R. 6620 recognizes that those who serve as President are symbols of America and

American freedoms and deserve to be protected.

There are only a handful of Americans who will be called upon to serve this country as President. These individuals represent America, not only while serving in office, but remain in the public consciousness long after they leave. H.R. 6620, simply recognizes that unique role and reinstates lifetime protection for all of our former Presidents.

I want to again thank Mr. GOWDY and Mr. SCOTT for their work on this issue, and I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Ladies and gentlemen, H.R. 6620 is a commonsense bill that will ensure the continued safety of our Presidents after they leave the White House by extending the ability of the Secret Service to protect former Presidents; and I'm proud to join with the chairman, Mr. SMITH, of Judiciary, in support of this bill.

For Presidents who didn't serve prior to 1997, current Federal law provides that the Secret Service's protection terminates 10 years after the President leaves office. The 10-year limitation was enacted in 1994, when the nature of threats to former Presidents was more limited. But times have changed, and it's an unfortunate fact that former Presidents will require Secret Service protection for the rest of their lives. Therefore, this bill would simply restore the law to its prior form.

When a President of the United States completes his term, he remains a symbol of our Nation. Sadly, our Presidents who've worked hard to protect us from those who would harm our Nation may, themselves, continue to be in harm's way even after they complete their terms in office.

Most former Presidents remain prominently in the public eye, continuing to represent our country in significant ways and providing leadership on important issues. We should recognize and encourage their continued service by providing them with the protection they need.

This bill would also expand the Secret Service's authorization to protect the children of former Presidents until they reach 16 years of age. This also makes good sense under the current circumstances.

I want to recognize the Secret Service for their excellent and tireless job that they perform in protecting our national leaders. The men and women of the Secret Service conduct themselves with valor, while carrying out the protective function of their agency. They provide protection for a variety of people and events, including the President and special national security events as well.

The Secret Service has other important functions which also deserve recognition. For example, the investigative role of the Secret Service has expanded greatly, from protecting the