

CYBERSECURITY ACT OF 2012

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the pending business.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3414) to enhance the security and resiliency of the cyber and communications infrastructure of the United States.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, every Senator has to decide what they are going to do every day when they wake up in the morning. For some in this Chamber, they wake up every day thinking about how they are going to stop President Obama, how they are going to stop his agenda, and how they are going to do everything they can to stop him from having a second term. Some spend their time waking up every day thinking about how they want to stop America from moving forward.

That is not how I spend my day. I try to look at two things every day: the needs of my people—their day-to-day needs for a job, for an opportunity, for health care—and how that translates into national policy; then I try to look at the long range needs of our country. That is why I am excited about being on the Intelligence Committee, where I am working on protecting America from the cyber attacks that are happening every day to our country, including the stealing of identity and the stealing of trade secrets. I want to move America forward. I have worked very hard to do that.

One of the areas I am most proud of that I have worked on with the men and women in this Chamber from both sides of the aisle is the whole area of women's health care. Many want to talk about repealing Obama health care. Well, I don't want to repeal it. They talk about replacing it. They never have an idea. So let me tell my colleagues one of the areas we fought for.

One of the things we knew as we embarked upon the health care debate was that we wanted to save lives and we wanted to save money. One of the areas where we wanted to do both was to look at how to utilize the new scientific breakthroughs in prevention, particularly early detection and screening. We could identify those diseases with early intervention and save lives as well as money and counteract escalating disease that ultimately costs more and can even cost a life.

Nowhere was it more glaring than with the issue of women's health care. My hearings revealed that women were charged more for their health care and got less than men of equal age and health care status. We found that we had barriers to health care because everything about being a woman was treated as a preexisting condition. If a woman had a C-section for the delivery of her baby, that was counted. In eight States, they even counted domestic violence as a preexisting condition. Then what we saw during this debate was the fact that they even wanted to take our

mammograms away from us. Well, that just went too far.

So during the health care debate, while everybody was being a bean counter, I wanted American women to know they could count on the Senate and the women and men of the Senate to stand up for them. So we came to the floor. We suited up, and we fought for a preventive health care amendment that not only passed but goes into effect tomorrow, on August 1. It will be a new day for women of all ages, who will be able to get health care coverage for preventive health care at no additional cost, no copays, no deductibles, and no discrimination where they are charged more and get less. That is what ObamaCare is. If somebody wants to repeal that, then bring it on. We are ready to fight. We want to fight for that annual health care checkup that will involve mammograms, Pap testing, and pelvic exams. We want to be able to do the screening for that dread "C" word, for colorectal cancer and lung cancer. We want to make sure that if a person thinks they are possibly a victim—a doctor suspects domestic violence—we can screen and counsel. We want women to be able to have that access, to be able to know early on what are those illnesses they are facing.

August 1 means our long-fought battle will actually go into effect. Where does it go into effect? Well, it is already in effect on the Federal law books. Now it will go into effect in doctors' offices. Women will have access to the health care their doctor says they need, not what an insurance company says they need or what some right-winger wants to take away from them.

We are pretty mad about this. We were mad 2 years ago when they wanted to take our mammograms away from us, and we are going to be pretty mad if they try to take our health care away from us. But what we are happy about—what we are happy about—is that for over more than 50 million American women tomorrow it will be a new day. They will be able to walk into their doctor's office. In the doctor's office they will say: Good morning. Can I help you? And when they say: When was the last time you had a mammogram, and the patient says: Well, I never had one because I could not afford it, they will say: Oh, we can sign you right up for that. Tell me about your family history. Is it true that your father had colon cancer? Well, listen, we worry about that for you. You could be at high risk. We are going to take a look at that and make sure you are OK.

For young women, we are going to make sure you have other kinds of counseling and services you need in order to have a productive family life. This is what this health care bill is all about. It is about people. It is about access. It is about preventing dread diseases.

People will come to this floor and they will pound their chest and com-

plain about the President. We want to pound the table and make sure women have gotten the health care they need.

Tomorrow, we are going to be very excited when we keep the doors of doctors' offices open to the women of America.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, first, I wish to give two thank-yous: first, to my colleague from California for letting me go ahead of her—I have a Finance Committee meeting—and second, to both my colleague from Maryland and my colleague from California, whose voices are so clear and clarion. I love to listen to the Senator from Maryland. She speaks right to the people. She has it. She gets it. And do you know what. If we could get every American in a giant football stadium and they could listen to Senators MIKULSKI and BOXER on health care, 80 percent would be for it. So I want to salute them and salute particularly Senator MIKULSKI for putting both the event earlier today and these speeches together.

I heard the minority leader speak, and it meant two things. First, it meant the Republican party does not want to do cyber security. It means the greatest threat to our Nation—probably even greater than terrorism, if you speak to some of our intelligence and military experts—will not be dealt with because we know what he is doing. He is asking for an unreasonable demand, unrelated to cyber security, to go on the floor, knowing that will stop us from moving forward.

It is a sad day. We have some of our colleagues from the other side of the aisle talking about that we must not abandon defense. Well, one of the strongest things the defense of our Nation needs is a strong cyber security bill. Because special interests—the Chamber of Commerce and others—do not want it, even though every military and intelligence leader has said how vital it is, it seems the other party's tea leaves show that the other party is going to block us from going forward. It is unfortunate and it is sad.

Then, second, the way he chose to block cyber security could not be worse in terms of substance and in terms of timing. Today, July 31, the minority leader wants to put on the floor the repeal of so many things that are going to happen tomorrow to women and to men across America that benefit them. So his timing could not be worse. The very day before we are going to see huge benefits for the American people, he wants us to debate repeal. Why don't we let the American people see the good parts of health care before we repeal it. And we are not going to repeal it.

I want to talk about this day—or tomorrow, actually—where so many portions of the Affordable Care Act go into effect.

Three million women in my home State of New York will benefit. From

Buffalo to Montauk, in Albany and in Manhattan, 3 million women will receive free basic preventive care for themselves and their children. So many women and men do not get preventive services because it is expensive to them. These services are free. But not only will they make those people healthier—the No. 1 goal—but they will reduce the costs of health care because every expert—Democrat, Independent, Republican; moderate, liberal, conservative—says if you do more prevention, you are going to save money.

Tomorrow, so many of those preventive services go into effect. More women will go in for annual preventive care visits to screen for cervical, ovarian, and breast cancers. More women will receive preconception and prenatal services, so their children can grow up healthy, active, and strong. More women will have access to contraception and its additional health benefits, such as reduced risk of breast cancer and protection against osteoporosis.

New mothers will have access to support and supplies for breastfeeding, and more women will be screened for domestic and sexual violence, sexually transmitted infections, and HIV.

To my colleagues on the other side of the aisle: When we say there is a war against women and they get their backs up—they want to repeal this and put nothing in its place, no preventive services, no access to contraception, none of the things I have mentioned—yes, it is a war on women. Because if they cared about women and they did not like ObamaCare, they would still have a proposal on the floor to keep these fine pieces of the legislation going forward so they are not cut off tomorrow, which is what they intend to do, but, of course, thank God, will not happen.

The change we are making helps every woman—who said: I would but I cannot afford it; it is just too expensive—finally get health care.

Removing the copays is a great thing. Cutting the costs of preventive care is something we long wished to do in America and can happen tomorrow.

What about all the other benefits that affect men and women alike: 2.5 million young adults who can stay on their parents' insurance; 5.2 million seniors—men and women—in the doughnut hole who save \$3.7 billion on prescription drugs?

What about the idea that when your insurance company charges you too much, the money goes to profits and salaries and trips and advertising and not enough goes to health care? Starting tomorrow, you can get a rebate. We know our colleagues on the other side of the aisle—to them that is anathema, to make insurance companies give people a rebate.

So bottom line: We want to move forward on a cyber security bill, and we regret that the leader is putting logs in its way. And even more importantly, we want benefits to millions of women and millions of men to go forward, as

was intended, as was voted for, as is the law of the land, and we will not let them deter us from bringing people those benefits.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New York for putting this into context for America.

What has happened here this morning is, instead of celebrating with us because tomorrow, August 1, an entire list of preventive services for women goes into effect because of ObamaCare—yes, our health care law—the Republican leader says he wants to repeal all those benefits.

Not only does the Republican leader, on behalf of the Republican minority, want to repeal the benefits that go into effect tomorrow for women, he wants to repeal the entire health care bill. He wants to have an amendment to the cyber security bill—which is so critical to our national security—he wants to put an amendment on there to repeal a law that the U.S. Supreme Court found was constitutional and whose benefits are beginning to take hold in this country, benefits that mean right now people are receiving refund checks in the mail because their insurance company overcharged them, and under ObamaCare you cannot do that, and hundreds of millions of dollars are going out to our people. The Republicans want to, I assume, force those people to send back their refunds because they want to repeal ObamaCare.

Look at the list of preventive health benefits I have on this chart that are already in effect because of the legislation. Already because of health reform—and I see Senator HARKIN in the Chamber, who shepherded this through, as our dear friend Ted Kennedy became sicker and sicker with brain cancer. I will never forget how Senator HARKIN stepped up to the plate, Senator Dodd stepped up to the plate, Senator MIKULSKI stepped up to the plate, and they were the lieutenants who got it done. And the Republicans want to take it away. I can only imagine how Senator HARKIN feels, having been in that fight. But I am here to say I am your supporter. I know what you did.

I know my people in California—the largest State in the Union—are getting breast cancer screenings now, with no copays. They are getting cervical cancer screenings, hepatitis A and B vaccines, measles and mumps vaccines, colorectal cancer screenings, diabetes screenings, cholesterol screenings, blood pressure screenings, obesity screenings, tobacco cessation, autism screenings. How important is that? In my State, they say there is an epidemic of autism. They are getting hearing screenings for newborns, sickle cell screenings for newborns, fluoride supplements, tuberculosis testing for children, depression screenings. How important is that? They are getting osteoporosis screenings. I watched as my mother was in agony from

osteoporosis. There are things you can do now to avoid it. But you need the screening. You need to know whether those bones are losing their density. They are getting flu vaccines for children and the elderly.

This list goes into effect tomorrow. So let's take a look at the list that goes into effect tomorrow that my Republican friends want to repeal today.

Tomorrow, women will get access to all of these things without copays or coinsurance: contraception, well-woman visits, STD screenings and counseling, breastfeeding support and supplies, domestic violence screenings, gestational diabetes screenings, HIV screenings, and HPV testing.

I am stunned that on the eve of the broadest increase in benefits in my lifetime, the Republicans want to repeal these benefits for women. This is a continuation on their part of the war on women. They can get up and stand on their head and deny it and everything else. How else can you explain why, on the eve of the day that women are going to get all these benefits, they want to now cancel ObamaCare and stop all this from happening?

If you think it does not matter—let me say to you, Mr. President, I know you know it matters whether women get free contraception to cut back on unintended pregnancies and abortion and well-woman visits and breastfeeding support. How about domestic violence screenings—so critical. Some women are in these terrible relationships, and they go to the doctor, and they say: Well, I do not want to talk about it. Doctors will be taught how to spot domestic violence, and there can be an intervention that will save lives.

So here we stand. We have this list of benefits, women's preventive health benefits, that are going to go into effect tomorrow.

We are here to celebrate that. And instead of our Republican colleagues coming on the floor and joining us and saying how wonderful this is, and by the way, at the end of the day this saves money—we all know that. We all know it saves money when you have screening and counseling for STDs and you head off an illness. We all know it saves money. The health care bill saves money, and it reduces the deficit because of this investment in prevention. I cannot think of a more ridiculous situation than after a bill has become law for how many years now, Senator HARKIN? Is it a couple of years since we passed it? Years. It went to the Supreme Court. It was upheld. And now, just as we are about to see these great benefits for women go into place, the Republican leader says: Let's repeal ObamaCare today. Let's have an amendment on the cyber security bill, he said, to repeal the entire health care law.

The House voted 33 times, at least, to repeal it. So I am wondering, what is with this idea of repealing? Do you want to take away these benefits from

women? From children? From men? From families? Yes, I guess you do. I guess you stand for going back to the old days when people could hear from their insurance company that they were cut off, when insurance companies could spend 70 percent on themselves, on their own perks, and CEOs getting hundreds of millions of dollars and you, the patient, getting hardly anything. They want to go back. They want to take away the refunds. They want to take away the funding our seniors are getting as they deal with the high cost of prescription drugs. And we fixed that in this bill.

So I have to say, we make an investment in prevention, in keeping people healthy. We make sure being a woman is not a preexisting condition. And the Republicans today have relaunched their war against women. They are holding up the Violence Against Women Act that we passed over here in a bipartisan way. They will not take up the Senate bill and pass it. Why? They want to take away coverage in that bill from 30 million Americans.

They do not care about the immigrant population, obviously, the most vulnerable women there. They do not care about the college students, apparently. Because we get extra protections for them on college campuses. We protect the LGBT community. Clearly they are not interested in that. And they are not interested in protecting the Native American women.

So while the Speaker says: Oh, I will send conferees to a nonexistent conference on the Violence Against Women Act, he could simply pass the bill and make sure everyone is protected. Instead of celebrating today because women are getting all these wonderful benefits without a copay, they want to repeal all these benefits. They want to repeal this law.

Truly, I do not know what motivates them. I do not speak for them. But if they say it is to save money, that is simply not true. Because this bill saves money. This law saves money. Because we are investing in prevention. So the only thing I can think of is they want to hurt this President.

The Republican leader said his highest priority was making sure that President Obama is a one-term President. So I guess if it means attacking the health care law to hurt this President, he is willing to do it and hurt all my constituents who are getting these benefits and all of our constituents who are getting these benefits, hurting the American people.

Well, I say put politics aside. Let's see the Republicans come down here and celebrate the fact that finally our people are getting the health care they deserve and that they pay for.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I am proud to join my colleagues on the floor today—I thank Senator BOXER

and Senator HARKIN for their leadership—just as I was proud back in December of 2009 to join Senator MIKULSKI in sponsoring the women's health amendment to the Affordable Care Act.

We are here today celebrating the fact that tomorrow, August 1, women will have access to important health services at no cost. Senator BOXER showed very clearly what a number of those preventive services are. Thanks to the provisions of the Affordable Care Act that go into effect this week, women will have access to a broad range of preventive services from well woman and prenatal visits to gestational diabetes screening, and they will have access to those services without copayments or deductibles. So finances will no longer stand in the way of women getting the preventive health care they need.

This also has the potential to save our health system money in the long run. The Centers for Disease Control estimates that 75 percent of our health care spending is on people with chronic diseases. So by taking these preventive measures, we can slow this growth and the associated cost of disease.

One of those preventive measures I want to talk about this morning is screening for gestational diabetes. As cochair of the Senate Diabetes Caucus, I understand the importance of gestational diabetes screening and the impact it can have on both the mother and the baby. Gestational diabetes affects almost 18 percent of all pregnancies in the United States. Unfortunately, the number of those cases is increasing. The consequences of gestational diabetes are real. Not only are there significant health effects for the mother and baby during pregnancy, but researchers have found that both the mother and baby may be at risk for developing type 2 diabetes later in life. By getting screened, both the mother and child can be alerted to potential long-term health risks.

I want to tell the story of one of my constituents, Megan from Panacook, NH, because she is a great example of why this screening is so important. During her 28th week of pregnancy, Megan was diagnosed with gestational diabetes. The screening she had alerted her to the potential related health issues and they allowed her to get the necessary treatment. I am happy to report that Megan gave birth to a healthy baby girl, Grace. She is now 8 weeks old. Under the Affordable Care Act, all pregnant women will now be able to receive the gestational diabetes screening for free.

Tomorrow also marks an important milestone in women's health for another preventive service. Women, beginning tomorrow, will have access to contraception at no cost. Birth control is something that most women use, and it is something the medical community believes is essential to the health of a woman and her family. For some 1.5 million women, birth control pills are not used for contraception but for med-

ical purposes. They can reduce the risk of some cancers. With costs as high as \$600 a year, birth control can be a serious economic concern for many women. Being able to now receive birth control for no cost will bring financial relief to so many of those women.

Again, I have a story of a young woman from New Hampshire who I think illustrates so clearly why these are such important provisions. Keri Wolfe from Swanzey, NH, is a full-time graduate student at Dartmouth. She is going to benefit from this provision because Keri takes birth control as a medical necessity for treating a health issue that affects her adrenal gland. While Keri is lucky to have insurance, she has to pay her plan's full deductible and then a monthly copay for her birth control. As a student who is trying to balance academic and living expenses, her prescriptions come at a significant cost annually. When her new insurance plan goes into effect, Keri is going to be able to get the full price of her birth control covered. That is great news in making sure she gets the health care she needs.

As Governor of New Hampshire, I was proud to sign legislation that required insurance companies to provide contraceptive coverage to women with no religious exemption. At that time it was understood by people on both sides of the aisle of all religious faiths that requiring contraceptive coverage was about women's health, and it was a basic health care decision. Yet over the last several months, opponents have continued to roll back contraceptive coverage at both the State and Federal level. Every woman should be able to make her own health care decisions. She should not have to have her boss stand in the way. The provisions that go into effect tomorrow ensure that women can make these decisions.

I thank Senator MIKULSKI and Senator HARKIN for their leadership on women's health. I join them in celebrating these important provisions that are going to make a huge difference for women's health, that are going to be good for women, for families, and for everyone in this country.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, first of all, let me commend the Senator from New Hampshire for her great leadership as a Governor and as a Senator in this whole area of health care for women especially. She is providing great leadership in this area, continues to provide that leadership. I want to join with the Senator from New Hampshire in saying we are not going to let these provisions that now are expanding coverage for so many women—47 million women in America—we are not going to let these roll back. We are not.

Again, if the people of this country elect Mr. Romney to be President and they turn over the Senate to the Republicans, there it goes. It is gone. It is

gone. I did not hear this this morning, but I understand the Republican leader said this morning—I stand to be corrected. As I understand, he said they wanted the first amendment that would be offered on the cyber security bill that I think is now before the Senate—he wanted the first amendment to be a repeal of the Affordable Care Act.

What timing. What timing, I say to the Republican leader. On the eve of when we are expanding preventive health care services for 47 million women in America, the Republican leader gets up and says: We want to vote to repeal this tomorrow. Tomorrow. Repeal it tomorrow.

Does that not kind of give you some idea of how they feel about the women of America and the health care of our mothers, our sisters, our daughters? That is what they want.

We have already voted 33 times to repeal portions of the health care act. I think we voted twice in the Senate to repeal the whole thing. They want to have another vote. I think it is more than curious that the Republican leader wants to vote to repeal it on the very day when we are expanding health care coverage for the women of America. Interesting.

Tomorrow is an important day for American women, thanks again to key provisions of the Affordable Care Act. I do want to commend Senator MIKULSKI for her great leadership in this area, Senator Dodd, Senator BINGAMAN, Senator Kennedy, when he became ill, asked us to take the leadership on different provisions of the Affordable Care Act on the HELP Committee and to get it through.

We had wonderful support from our colleagues here on the floor of the Senate and our committee. These provisions that we put in to move us from a sick care system to a health care system—I have often said that in America we do not have a health care system, we have a sick care system. If you get sick, you will get care one way or the other, usually in the emergency room if you are poor, or maybe not at all if you do not make it to the emergency room. But there is very little in our country to keep you healthy in the first place. Yet we know, we have good data that shows preventive services upfront save you a lot of money and a lot of lives, a lot of pain and suffering later on. So in the Affordable Care Act we put in a big provision on preventive services. We said basically that what the Preventive Services Task Force of the Center for Disease Control and Prevention—what they listed as their A and B, those that had the, if I can use their term, “best return on investment” or the “biggest impact,” that those would be free, there would be no copays or deductibles.

Senator MIKULSKI reminded us of what is obvious but not too often taken into consideration in legislation; that is, women are different from men. So we asked the Institute of Medicine to come up with provisions that applied

to the preventive health care of women. That is what goes into effect tomorrow.

Senator BOXER very eloquently talked about that and had the chart showing all of the different things that will start tomorrow—an all-new plan that would cover women in this country—again, to keep women healthy in the first place, preventive services to keep women healthy without copays and deductibles.

Right on the eve of this wonderful expansion of health care coverage, of making sure women are not second-class citizens when it comes to prevention and wellness—on the very eve of saying to women that no longer can insurance companies sort of say, because you are a woman you have a pre-existing condition—the Senate Republican leader gets up and says he wants to have the next vote on repealing the health care bill.

Talk about a slap in the face to the women of this country. Well, I think women know what they are facing coming up this fall. I point out that tomorrow about 520,000 women in Iowa will have expanded health care coverage, preventive services. We fought very hard to put these into law, and we are not going to let them repeal it. We have the votes—let's face it—in the Senate to stop that. The Republican leader can bring it up again, and it can be voted on, but I think it is indicative of where they want to take this country.

We can stop it now, but if Mr. Romney is elected President, he said on day one he wants to repeal it. When he is first sworn in he will send up legislation to repeal it, and if the Senate and the House are in Republican hands, we can kiss it goodbye. It is gone. We will not be able to stop it then.

It is hard to believe, but prior to the Affordable Care Act essential services that were unique to women, such as maternity care, were not often included in health plans. Tomorrow, we include preventive care checkups, screening for gestational diabetes, and breast-feeding support and supplies.

How many low-income women in this country would know that the best thing for their babies is breast milk? Breast feeding, we know, is the preferred method of starting off babies, but sometimes these supplies can be expensive, especially if women are working at a low-wage job and they may need these supplies, but they can't afford it, so, therefore, they turn to another method, to formula for the babies. I am not saying formula is bad, but as we know, and doctors will tell us—every pediatrician will tell us that breast feeding is the best. But women would be forced to choose the less best option if they didn't have these breast-feeding supports and supplies.

Let me take head on, if I can, this idea of contraception. As the Senator from New Hampshire pointed out, this can be pretty expensive—up to \$600 a year or more. For one of us who is

making \$172,000 a year and have great health care coverage, that is not a big deal. But to a low-income woman with a couple of kids, working at a minimum wage job, trying to scrape enough just to get by, \$600 a year is a lot of money.

Let me point out another facet of this issue. Somehow people think, for example, birth control pills are only to prevent a pregnancy. There are many young women of childbearing age in this country who take birth control pills on the advice of their doctor not to avoid a pregnancy but because their monthly cycles are so painful that they can't even work. So what are we saying? A young woman who gets a prescription from the doctor and says it is not for birth control but is for other physical problems, she has to take that in and show it to her employer now or her insurance carrier? That makes women second-class citizens again. Nonsense.

I respect religious freedom as much as anyone, but despite the Republican propaganda, this law doesn't mandate that any woman has to use contraception, and it doesn't force employers to provide it. It gives women affordable access to birth control for a variety of reasons should they and their doctor decide it is right for them or their families. As for religious organizations that object to contraception, the President has issued a very sensible compromise to accommodate their beliefs, while ensuring that women still have access to this critical service.

I respect the views of all people on these often divisive issues, and I would oppose any measure that threatens the fundamental religious liberties of people or institutions. But the Republicans are not motivated by a genuine desire to protect religious liberty; rather, they are determined to undo these and other benefits for women in the Affordable Care Act. They have repeatedly introduced legislation, approved by the House Appropriations Committee, that allows anyone to opt out of providing services to which they have any religious or moral objection.

Well, one might say that sounds reasonable on the face of it, but think about this. Any employer with any religious or moral objection could opt out of any coverage. They could say, well, they object not only to contraception but to mammograms, prenatal screening. They just have a moral objection to that based upon their religious beliefs.

I respect Christian scientists—I always have—and their beliefs. Can they say, well, they are not going to cover insurance for an employee who goes to see a doctor for allopathic medical care, that is not their religious belief?

We have to have reasonable compromise, and I believe the President has come up with that. So what the Republicans would do, according to their leader, is rob 47 million women of these new preventive services. They would rob 1 million young women of the insurance they have already gained

through the Affordable Care Act, of an extension of dependent coverage. America's women will not be dragged backward. They are not going to allow health insurance companies to return to the policies and abuses that hurt them and their families prior to the passage of the Affordable Care Act.

Tomorrow marks another step forward in transforming our current sick care system into a true health care system, and many women will now experience this firsthand. We are going forward. The Republicans can bring it up time and time again. They have sent a very clear signal to the women of America that whatever they gain out of the Affordable Care Act—all these benefits—they are going to take them away from women if they put them in office.

I think the women of America need to have some deep soul searching about who they want deciding their fate in the future, after this next election.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. First, I thank my colleague from Iowa, Senator HARKIN, for the clarity of his statement, for his sincerity and, most importantly, for his leadership. We have the Affordable Care Act because of TOM HARKIN, Chris Dodd, BARBARA MIKULSKI, and others who worked hard to make sure it was here to help families all across America, particularly those in low-income situations.

Like Senator HARKIN, I was stunned this morning when the Republican leader came to the floor and said: The first thing we want to do is to repeal all of this health care preventive care that will be available across America, including the provisions that go into effect tomorrow protecting 47 million of our women and family members all across the United States—2 million in Illinois, I might add, will be helped by this. They insist on bringing up on the pending bill on the Senate floor this amendment to basically remove the protection for these women that is built into the Affordable Care Act.

I have to say to Senator HARKIN, we can't be too surprised at this. Does the Senator remember the very first amendment the Republicans offered on the Transportation bill—a bill that we wanted to pass to build highways and airports? Remember what Senator BLUNT, the Republican from Missouri, offered as the first Republican amendment to the Transportation bill? It was on family planning. Family planning on transportation? I guess some late night comedian can make a connection, but I don't get it.

Now we have the pending cyber security bill to protect America from a cyber attack that could cost American lives—something we are told is the No. 1 threat to America—and Senator MCCONNELL comes to the floor on behalf of the Republicans and says: This bill won't go forward unless we can offer an amendment to repeal the Af-

fordable Care Act—repeal the protections that are there for families and women across America.

It is stunning that no matter what issue we go to the Republican Senators return to this issue of denying health care coverage and denying protection and preventive care to our families. In a way—the Senator touched on it—it is pretty easy for a Senator to come to the floor and talk about somebody else's health care because, as you and I know, and Senator MCCONNELL knows, the health care we have as Members of the Senate—American families would die for the health care we have. We have the best health care insurance in the world, and we have it in a government-administered plan that protects every Senator and their family. We are lucky. We are in the Federal Employees Health Benefits Plan. I believe people across America should have the same opportunity for the same type of health care.

I am still waiting for the first Republican Senator who gets up on the floor and denounces government-administered health care to walk to the well and say: As a proof of my sincerity, I am going to abandon my own health insurance as a Senator. Not one has done that, not a single one.

So for the Senators who come to the floor, their wives will still be protected by our health insurance, and their daughters will still be protected. The question we have to ask is, Should the protection we have as Senators for our families be available to others all across America? That is what this is about.

Tomorrow is the launch of an amazing development in health care protection for our families. I applaud it. My wife and I are still celebrating because our daughter gave birth to twins in November. We have twin grandchildren—now 8 months old. They got through the pregnancy well; she was cared for and did just great. We are so proud of our daughter, our son-in-law, and their family. I think about the provision that will go into effect tomorrow. The Senator from Iowa knows that pregnant women in danger of gestational diabetes that could threaten their lives and the lives of the babies they are carrying will have preventive screening to protect them.

Don't come to the floor and tell me you are pro-life and pro-family and you oppose that. If you want a healthy mom and baby, this screening that starts tomorrow for millions of American women is going to be a step forward, a positive step toward uneventful births and healthy babies. Think about the care and screening for cancer and for all of the problems that women face.

I see Senator MURRAY on the Senate floor. She has been an extraordinary leader on this issue. I will yield to her in a moment.

All those who are on this campaign to repeal ObamaCare—that was their slur on that, and we accept it. It was

accomplished under President Obama, and I was proud to vote for it. It is one of the most important votes I ever cast as a Member of the Senate. Those who want to repeal this so-called ObamaCare—as Senator MCCONNELL called for again today on behalf of the Republicans—would repeal a few basic things we should not forget. Every family in America has a child with a preexisting condition. Think of asthma, diabetes, or a history of cancer.

Under our law, they cannot be denied health insurance coverage. We protect those kids, and we protect their families. The Senate Republicans want to repeal it. Seniors across America who are paying for prescription drugs and going into their savings to fill the doughnut hole each year are getting a helping hand from the affordable health care act. The Senate Republicans want to repeal it. Families across America with kids fresh out of college looking for jobs and can't find them or have a job without good health care can still be covered under their parents' policy until the young person reaches the age of 26. That is what the affordable health care act does. The Senate Republicans want to repeal it. And tomorrow 47 million women in America will have preventive screening so they can be healthy on an affordable basis and be mothers giving birth to healthy babies. That is in this new law, and the Senate Republicans want to repeal it.

This isn't just a war against the pill. This isn't just a war against family planning. It is literally a war against women. And the statements of the Senate Republican leader on the floor today are proof positive that they have one focus, and that is to take away these protections we built into the law.

I am happy to yield the floor for our leader on this issue, my colleague from Washington State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANCHIN). The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I come to the floor today very excited about the great progress America is going to make tomorrow, August 1, for women across this country and to share the outrage I just heard from the Senator from Illinois and others that before those even go into effect tomorrow, on the eve of this great opportunity for so many women, the Republican leader has come to the floor and said: We want to repeal it—first amendment, on an issue not related at all to cyber security but to take those away before they even begin.

It is an exciting moment for women in this country. Two years ago health insurance companies could deny women care due to so-called preexisting conditions such as pregnancy or being a victim of domestic violence—denied. Two years ago women were legally discriminated against when it came to insurance premiums and were often paying more for coverage than their male counterparts.

Two years ago women did not have access to the full range of recommended preventive care, such as mammograms or prenatal screenings, that the Senator from Illinois talked about. Two years ago insurance companies had all the leverage. Two years ago, too often, women paid the price. That is why I am so proud today to come to the floor with so many of our colleagues to highlight just how far we have come for women in the past 2 years and the new ways women will benefit from health care reform starting tomorrow, August 1.

Since the Affordable Care Act became the law of the land, women have now been treated more fairly when it comes to health care costs and options. Deductibles and other expenses have been capped, so a health care crisis won't cause a family to lose their home or their life savings. Women can use the health care exchanges to pick quality plans that work for themselves and their families. And if they change jobs or have to move, which so many people have to do today, they can keep their coverage.

Starting tomorrow, August 1, additional types of maternity care are going to be covered. Women will be armed with the proper tools and resources in order to take the right steps to have a healthy pregnancy. Starting tomorrow, women will have access to domestic partner violence screening and counseling, as well as screening for sexually transmitted infections. Starting tomorrow, women will finally have access to affordable birth control so we can lower rates in maternal and infant mortality and reduce the risk of ovarian cancer and improve overall health outcomes and encourage far fewer unintended pregnancies and abortions, which is a goal we all share.

I also wish to note that the affordable contraceptive policy we put in place preserves the rights of all Americans while also protecting the rights of millions of Americans who do use contraceptives, who believe that family planning is the right choice for them, and who don't deserve to have politics or ideology prevent them from getting the coverage they deserve and want.

Starting tomorrow, women will be fully in charge of their health care, not an insurance company. That is why I feel so strongly that we cannot go back to the way things were. While we can never stop working to make improvements, which we all know are important, we owe it to the women of America to make progress and not allow the clock to be rolled back on their health care needs.

Despite the recent Supreme Court decision upholding this law, I know some of our Republican colleagues are furiously working to undo all the gains we have made in health care reform for women and families. We heard the minority leader this morning come to the floor, and he wants to offer an amendment on the next bill that is now coming up on cybersecurity to repeal all of

these important protections for women, that women are taking advantage of today, and certainly something we all should want for our families and our daughters and for the women in this country. I know they apparently think repealing the entire health care law would be a political winner for them, but the truth is that this law is a winner for women and for men and for children and for our health care system overall.

So I am proud to be out here with my colleagues today who are committed to making sure the benefits of this law do not get taken away from the women of America because politics and ideology should not matter when it comes to making sure women across America get the care they need at a cost they can afford.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, as the Senate now turns its attention to the pending legislation that aims to enhance our Nation's cyber defenses, I would like to take a few moments to review where we are because I think the bill we now have on the floor brings us closer than ever to an agreement on a way to better defend our country, our prosperity, and our security against what is emerging as the most significant threat we face today, bigger than a conventional attack by a foreign enemy, bigger even than Islamist terrorism, a threat that is very different from anything we have faced before and so probably hard for most Americans to conceptualize but, trust me, it is here. That is why it is so important. We have come closer than ever to an agreement, but we are not there yet.

I have come to the floor to say to my colleagues that those of us who sponsor the pending legislation—Senators FEINSTEIN, ROCKEFELLER, COLLINS, and I—are eager to continue to work with our colleagues toward a broad bipartisan solution to this urgent national security threat—crisis. Obviously, to do that we have to begin processing amendments, and they have to be what the majority leader has said: germane or relevant. The majority leader has said we will have an open amendment process, and I thank him for that. No filling of the tree here. But the amendments have to be germane or relevant. We are dealing with a national security crisis unlike any we have faced before.

A broad bipartisan group of us met with the leaders of our cyber defense agencies yesterday—not political people, not partisan people—and they urgently appealed to us to pass this legislation in this session of Congress. It gives them authority to protect us that they don't have now. Frankly, they worry that without that authority to share information with the private sector, for the private sector to share cyber threat information with each other without fear of liability, for the government to have the ability to create some standards for the private

owners of cyber space and then give them the voluntary option to abide by those standards—that all of those additions, all of those realities that will be created by passage of this bill are desperately needed now. The fact is they were needed yesterday. They were needed last year.

That is why I am so disheartened to hear this morning that our friends in the Republican caucus are talking about introducing an amendment to this bill that will repeal ObamaCare, as they call it. There is a day for that, but it is not this week on this bill. Frankly, I feel the same way about some of the gun control amendments that have been submitted by members of the Democratic caucus. Those amendments deserve debate at some point but not this week on this bill.

We can get this bill done and protect our security. Nobody believes that we are going to repeal ObamaCare this week or that we are going to adopt gun control legislation. Those are making a statement. They are sending a political message. And they will get in the way of us protecting our national security.

So I appeal to my colleagues on both sides, pull back these irrelevant amendments. Let's have a full and open debate on cyber security, and let's get it done this week. There are already more than 70 amendments filed that are germane or relevant.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time for the majority has expired.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I ask my friend from Kansas if I could have 2 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I thank the Senator from Kansas.

There are already 70 amendments filed, so we don't have time to sit here staring at each other while we could be working through them. The truth is that we have a number of amendments on which we are ready to take votes, but of course we need cooperation from both sides in order to nail down that agreement with the consent that is required.

Before I yield the floor, I wish to underscore that while there are important issues we still need to work through this week, the reality is that because Senators on all sides have been willing to compromise, we have a golden opportunity to prove we can work together when it counts the most, which is in defense of our security and prosperity. Leading sponsors of the pending bill, leading sponsors of the leading opposition bill, SECURE IT, and leaders of the peacemakers in between led by Senators KYL and WHITEHOUSE have been meeting for the last week and making progress. And I would say that what was once a wide chasm separating us is now a narrow ridge, which we can bridge—and I firmly believe we will—with good faith on all sides, in a willingness to compromise. You can rarely get 100 percent

of what you want in a democratic—small “d”—legislature such as ours, but if each side can get 75 or 80 percent and we can begin to fix a problem and close the vulnerabilities that exist in our cyber infrastructure this week, we will have done exactly what the American people want us to do. That is my appeal to my colleagues.

Mr. President, I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I wish to thank my distinguished friend and colleague, Senator LIEBERMAN, for his leadership and for urging Members of Congress to bring amendments down that are germane on very serious national security issues. So I again thank him for his comments and his leadership.

HONOR FLIGHT NETWORK

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize a distinguished group of World War II veterans from Kansas who are now visiting their Nation's Capital this week as part of the Honor Flight Network.

The Honor Flight Network is an organization with the main mission to give veterans the opportunity to visit their memorials on the National Mall, free of cost to the veteran. The veterans who participate are many times unsung heroes of World War II, and in many cases their remembrances and their stories are shared for the first time and become public for the first time for families and hometowns. In many cases, young people traveling with these veterans hear the stories and can put the stories of these famous battles that protected our country in their local newspapers and in their school newspapers. It is history—it is history shared, lessons learned, and certainly renewed thanks to the “greatest generation.”

Many of these veterans are in their eighties and nineties. There are fewer than 20,000 World War II veterans in Kansas. As time marches on, that number only decreases. Nationwide, the VA estimates that approximately 740 members of the “greatest generation” pass each day. So I am especially pleased that this Tuesday a group of 28 veterans will fly in to our Nation's Capital from Kansas to see their World War II memorial, and other memorials, and allow us the privilege to pay homage to their heroism. With five regional hubs in Kansas, there is a steady stream of veteran groups making their way to our Nation's Capital. The leaders of these groups include Brian Spencer and Bill Patterson leading the Honor Flight Kansas Student Edition from Lyndon, KS; Adrienne McDaniel and Peggy Hill, who lead the Jackson Heights Honor Flight; Beverly Mortimer and Denise Cyr head up the North Central Kansas Honor Flight out of Concordia, KS; Mike Kastle and Jeff True guide the Southern Coffey County High School Honor Flight out of Leroy, KS; and finally, the leaders of this

group coming in on Tuesday are Mike VanCampen and Lowell Downey.

These hub leaders and the many volunteers deserve our recognition for the hours of work, organization, and fundraising that go into planning these trips. Thank you for what you do and for setting such a fine example in remembering and honoring the sacrifices made by those who stood in defense of our country in World War II.

Kansans and all Americans should know that this program—as a matter of fact, the World War II Memorial itself would not even exist without our former Senate majority leader, the senior Senator from Kansas and a World War II veteran himself, Bob Dole. Bob was instrumental in bringing the World War II Memorial to the National Mall. And even now Bob meets personally with Honor Flight groups who make their way out to see their memorial. When veterans learn that Bob Dole is at the World War II memorial, there is a crush of veterans like a flock of chickens going to the mother hen. I am not sure Bob Dole will appreciate that allegory, but at least I think that indicates everybody comes to hear him and thank him for his efforts.

Finally, I wish to recognize each member of this Honor Flight trip from Kansas visiting their memorial, and I ask unanimous consent that their names be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KANSAS HONOR FLIGHT NETWORK TRIP—JULY 31–AUG. 2, 2012—WORLD WAR II AND KOREAN WAR VETERANS

WORLD WAR II VETERANS

Dwight E. Aldrich; William Henry Bernard; Eugene H. Brown; Thomas Dale Coffman; Glenn J. Compton; Richard D. Ellison; Perry L. Garten; Bob F. Holdaway; Edwin D. Jacques; Paul H. Koehn; Jay Edwin Kramer; Howard Russell Krohn; Howard Logan; Ralph Lundell; John L. Meyer; Richard Morrow Mosier; Charles G. Niemberger; Harvey L. Peck; Donald L. Revert (Don); John Russel Roberts; Rix D. Shanline; Lowell L. Smart; Norbert E. Stigge (Doc); John D. Topham; Delmar L. Yarrow; George A. Yohn; Keith R. Zinn.

KOREAN WAR VETERAN

Richard D. Wood.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I know under the order this hour is reserved for Members of the Republican caucus, and although I am an Independent, I don't qualify exactly under the terms of the agreement to speak now. But seeing no Member of the Republican caucus on the floor, I thought I would take the opportunity to con-

tinue to speak about the pending item, S. 3414, the Cybersecurity Act of 2012, and if any of my colleagues arrive, I will yield to them immediately.

Before I yielded to Senator ROBERTS a short while ago, I made a statement that the two sides, if I can put it that way; that is, the sponsors of the pending legislation, Senators COLLINS, FEINSTEIN, ROCKEFELLER, and myself, and the sponsors of essentially the alternate approach, SECURE IT, sponsored by Senators MCCAIN, CHAMBLISS, HUTCHISON, and others—have been meeting. We have particularly been assisted by the bridge builders here—blessed are the peacemakers—Senators KYL, WHITEHOUSE, and others, and we have been making progress. I said what was once a chasm separating us is now a narrow ridge that we are close to bridging. Let me explain what I mean by that.

The sponsors of S. 3414, the pending legislation, strongly believe that owners of critical cyber infrastructure—and this is a unique aspect of our free society, thank God; 80 to 85 percent of the critical infrastructure in our country is privately owned, including cyber infrastructure. That is the way it ought to be. But it means when critical cyber infrastructure in a new world becomes a target of cyber attack and cyber theft, that we—the rest of us Americans—represented by the government, have to enter into a partnership with the private sector owners of critical cyber infrastructure so they will take steps to protect the cyber space that they own and operate because, if they don't, the whole country is in jeopardy. If an electric grid is knocked out, the kind of awful experiences we have all had at different times when the power grid has been out in our area of the country will be felt perhaps for weeks and weeks.

Think about it. What if the financial cyber system, Wall Street, the hub of the systems that handle millions—trillions, really—of transactions over and over again, were knocked out? It would have a devastating effect on our economy, let alone the most nightmarish, which is that some enemy breaks into the cyber-control system of a dam holding back water and opens the dam and floods surrounding communities with a terrible loss of life. We could go on and on with the nightmare scenarios, but they are out there, and we are vulnerable to them.

So the sponsors of S. 3414 have felt that private sector owners of critical infrastructure should be mandated—that is only the owners of the most critical infrastructure—to adopt the standards that would be set under our legislation to protect their systems and our country. Sponsors of the SECURE IT Act started this debate firmly convinced that the only thing we need to do is to enhance our cyber security information-sharing between private sector operators and between the government and the private sector. We have a section in our bill that does exactly that, but we feel that is not

enough. We feel there also needs to be these standards set for the private operators of the electric grid, of the transportation system, of the financial system, et cetera. If both sides had just stuck to their guns, no legislation would be possible. But when it comes to cyber security, no legislation, which is to say the status quo, is not only unacceptable, it is dangerous. Some of our real—really most of our national security leaders in this country from the last two administrations, the George W. Bush administration and the Barack Obama administration—have warned, as if in a single voice, that we are already facing the equivalent of a digital Pearl Harbor or a 9/11 if we don't shore up and defend our exposed cyber flanks. The same is true of the impact of our vulnerability in cyber space to cyber theft.

GEN Keith Alexander, the head of the Defense Department Cyber Command and the National Security Agency, made a speech a week or two ago in which he estimated that more than \$1 trillion has been stolen over cyber space from America. He called it the largest transfer of wealth in history. That results from moving money out of bank accounts that a lot of us never hear about because the banks believe it would be embarrassing if we knew, the theft of industrial secrets to other countries that then builds from those industrial secrets and creates the jobs in their countries that our companies wanted to create here. So there is a unified position among national security leaders, apart from which administration they served under, that we need this legislation, and we need it urgently.

Several of us met with the leaders of the cyber security agencies of this administration yesterday. These are not political people; these are professionals from the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Defense, the FBI, and others. They warned us again that the cyber systems that are privately owned and that are critical to our Nation's security remain terribly vulnerable to attack. They said to us, and I am paraphrasing, that we need this legislation to respond urgently and effectively to an attack on infrastructure as critical as the electric grid or Wall Street itself.

One of the leaders in our government, uniformed leaders, said to him today is a little bit like 1993 when it comes to cyber security; when, as we will remember, al-Qaida launched a precursor attack on the Twin Towers in New York with a truck bomb that blew up in the parking garage. We all know there was a loss of life then, but the damage was relatively small. But al-Qaida persisted and, of course, on 9/11 succeeded in bringing down the two towers of the World Trade Center. This leader of cyber security efforts in our government said our adversaries in cyber space are just about where al-Qaida was in 1993 when they blew up that truck bomb in the parking garage of the World Trade Center.

What I was impressed with yesterday, I will say parenthetically, is though there is some controversy out here about who is capable of what in our Federal Government—and let me speak frankly. Some people don't have much respect for the Department of Homeland Security. I don't understand why because they do a great job, in my opinion, in so many different areas, including the one that is relevant here, cyber security. But it was clear that the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Defense, and the FBI are working as a team—really, like a seamless team—24/7, 365 days a year to leverage each other's capabilities to provide for the common defense. They all agreed yesterday we need to pass this legislation to give them the tools they urgently need, that they don't have without this legislation, to work with one another and the private sector.

I wish to again give thanks to Senators KYL and WHITEHOUSE, joined by Senators MIKULSKI, BLUNT, COONS, GRAHAM, COATS, and BLUMENTHAL, who have come together with a compromise proposal after a series of good-faith negotiations and, as a result, Senators COLLINS, ROCKEFELLER, FEINSTEIN, and I have made major and difficult compromises in our original bill in order to move the legislation forward, to get something started, to protect our cyber security.

I think we now have a broad agreement on a bill containing those same cyber security standards that were in our original bill that resulted from a collaborative public-private sector process and negotiation. But now, instead of mandating them, we are going to create incentives for the private sector to opt into them. We are going to use carrots instead of sticks. We have added some compromises also from the original legislation to guarantee Members of the Senate and millions of people out in the country that when we act to share information from the private sector to the government, we are going to have due regard for the privacy of people's data in cyber space—personal information—without compromising our national security at all.

There are advocates on both sides of both the information-sharing provision and the critical cyber-standards provision that think we have gone too far, and some think we haven't gone far enough. But while advocates on the outside of the Senate can hold fast to their particular positions, legislators on the inside of the Senate need to take all of these deeply held views into account. Ultimately, our responsibility is to get something done to protect our security—it is our responsibility to pass a law—and we have done that here.

I wish to first review some of the broad areas of agreement and then outline the differences that remain because I want my colleagues to understand how much progress has already been made. Sometimes the news stresses the differences between us.

Let me start with title I of the bill, which is the one on critical infrastructure. I think there is a growing, broad agreement now that the private sector owners of critical infrastructure should work with the government to develop what somebody yesterday called the best cyber hygiene or standards of defense that are needed to safeguard their facilities and the rest of us.

In the original bill we had the Department of Homeland Security playing the singular role for the government. We broaden that now in response to, particularly, recommendations from the Kyl-Whitehouse group, and we have created a new interagency council we call the national cyber security council, which will consist of the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Defense, the Department of Commerce, the FBI, and the Director of National Intelligence, as well as relevant primary regulators when that sector of cyber structure is put forth in the council.

What do I mean by that? If they are dealing with the cyber security of the financial sector of our government, then on those standards we would expect the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Treasury Department, for instance, among others, to be seated at the table to come up with an agreement on those standards.

We have also agreed that adoption of these practices will be voluntary and that there will be no duplication of existing regulations or any new regulatory authorities that will be added to law.

We have also agreed that incentives need to be created—the carrots I spoke about, such as liability protection—to entice private sector owners to adopt these practices once they have been developed—totally voluntary. But I think if we build this right, they will come. Although it is not mandatory, we will set a standard, and private sector operators of critical infrastructure will want to meet that standard because they will want to act in the national interests to protect their customers, but also because when they do they will receive very valuable immunity from liability in the event of an attack or a theft.

Look, I decided that we needed to make the system voluntary in order to get something passed this year. I think it has a good chance of working as a voluntary system. But if it doesn't, and the cyber threat grows as much as I think it will, then some future Congress is going to come along and make it mandatory.

So there will be an incentive on both the public and private sector—particularly the private sector—to make this voluntary system work. God forbid between now and then there is a major cyber attack against our country; Congress will come flying back and adopt mandatory regulations. That is not what we want to happen. This is the time for rational, thoughtful discussion and legislation that will begin a

process that will go on for years because the cyber threat is not going away.

So that is title I. That is the compromise we offered on title I, which deals with cyber infrastructure. I go now to title VII. In between there are some very good titles, titles II through VI, but the good news is—maybe I should stress this—there seems to be broad bipartisan agreement on those titles.

Title VII is the one on information sharing, and there is some disagreement on that. But we have come to agree that private sector companies must be able to share cyber-threat information with the government and each other, with protections against liability that will incentivize—really allow—that sharing; that this sharing must be instantaneous.

In other words, to protect—to respond to concerns about private data being shared when a private sector operator of cyber security shares information with the government, we are requiring in this bill, the pending legislation, that the first point of contact for cyber sharing and reporting cyber attack is with a civilian agency—not a military or law enforcement agency or an intelligence agency but a civilian agency, such as the Department of Homeland Security or some other approved civilian exchange.

Some people have worried that if we did that, it would delay the referral of that information to the law enforcement and intelligence and military parts of our government, almost as if when the information of a cyber attack is sent to the Department of Homeland Security, somebody is going to have to go find the Secretary of Homeland Security to make sure she sees it before it goes to the Department of Defense, FBI. The world we are in is very different from that. It has been explained to me and others who met with, particularly, General Alexander, the head of Cyber Command at the Department of Defense that everything travels instantaneously, at cyber speed. That means that according to preset programs, cyber attack, if this bill is passed, will automatically—notification of it—go to the Department of Homeland Security or a civilian exchange, and at the same instant it will go to the Department of Defense, the FBI, and the intelligence community.

But when it first goes to the civilian exchange, there will be software in there to screen out—to prevent the possibility that any personal data—e-mails, private financial information—will not be sent to the law enforcement and defense branches of our government. That is another reason sharing will have to be instantaneous—that existing information-sharing relationships will continue undisturbed; that is, for instance, between the defense contractor and the Defense Department, and that there should be no stovepipes among government agencies. Agencies that need information

should have access the instant it is provided to the government.

I know some colleagues want more assurance that while a lead civilian agency will serve as the hub for immediate distribution of cyber-threat information, it will do so without slowing down DOD's and NSA's abilities to access and act on that information. I have just told my colleagues that would be the case. Others want to add further privacy protections. I do want to say in this regard that we have already significantly strengthened the privacy protections, thanks to a lot of good negotiation with a group of Senators—Senators FRANKEN, DURBIN, COONS, WYDEN, and others—and a broad range of privacy and civil liberties groups ranging, really quite remarkably, from the left to right and in between, who seem generally pleased with what we have done to protect privacy under our legislation.

Here is the good news: The people in charge of cyber security in our government say the privacy protections we have added in the underlying bill to the information-sharing section of this bill will not stop them for a millisecond from receiving the information they need and protecting our national security. So, to me, this is the Senate at its best.

We are not there. My dream—because this is—we are legislating here. We are not in the midst of some traditional sort of government regulation controversy. We are legislating actually in the midst of a war because we are already being attacked every day over cyber space. We have been lucky that it hasn't been a major attack that has actually knocked out part of our cyber infrastructure, but that vulnerability is there.

A few months ago there was a story in the Washington Post about a young man in a country far away that launched an attack against a small utility—I believe it was a water company—in Texas. He got into their system and actually had the ability to totally disrupt the water supply in that area of Texas. What the hacker did instead—and he just had a computer and was smart—what he did instead was post proof that he had broken into the industrial control system in that small utility in Texas just to show the vulnerability. In a sense, he might have been bragging he could do it, but it also was a warning to us. What if the next time that happens it is a larger utility or a group of smaller utilities around the country—maybe water, maybe electricity, maybe gas—and this time they are not just warning us or showing us our vulnerability, but they are actually going to disrupt the flow of electricity or water to people who depend on that? That is the kind of crisis we face and why it is so urgent that we deal with this.

So let me come back to my dream. My goal here is that as we go on this week, we are able to submit a managers' amendment, but it is not just

from the managers—Senators COLLINS, ROCKEFELLER, FEINSTEIN, and me—that we are joined by a much broader group and we form a broad bipartisan consensus to protect our country from a terrible danger that is real, urgent, and growing.

I always like to think back at these moments—and I was thinking about it again in this case, and since I do not see anybody else on the floor, I will indulge myself and go back—to a hot July day in Philadelphia, over 225 years ago, when the U.S. Senate was created as part of the—I am glad to say, proud to say—Connecticut Compromise offered to the Constitutional Convention by two of Connecticut's delegates to that convention, Roger Sherman and Oliver Ellsworth. It passed by just a single vote, but it helped keep the convention together and to enable our new government, including our Congress, to take shape because the Connecticut Compromise guaranteed the small States that their interests would be protected—small-population States—in the Senate because every State, no matter how big or small its population, would have two Senators, and it guaranteed the larger States that they would have a greater say in the House of Representatives, whose membership would be reflected, as it still is today, by population. Not everyone got everything they wanted that day, but they found a common ground that allowed them to go forward and finish writing our Constitution. That is the kind of position we are in today.

Shortly after the Connecticut Compromise was adopted at the Constitutional Convention, James Madison, as you know, Mr. President, often referred to as the father of the Constitution, wrote—and I am paraphrasing a little bit here—“the nature of the senatorial trust” would allow it to proceed with “coolness” and “wisdom.” I think these negotiations on the Cybersecurity Act of 2012 show thus far that we have the ability to put ideological rigidity, partisanship, and politics aside when our security is at risk and move beyond gridlock and fulfill our Founders' vision of what this body can do when it comes to debating the great challenges of our time, with “coolness” and “wisdom,” as Madison said.

So over the next couple of days, let's debate all the relevant and germane amendments. Let's start voting as soon as we can on them. But then, for the good of the country, let's each compromise some, acknowledging that none of us can get everything we want and we cannot afford to insist on everything we want because if we do, nothing will happen and our country will remain vulnerable to cyber attack until the next opportunity Congress has—which I would guess will be sometime as next year goes on—to deal with this challenge. We cannot wait. We simply cannot wait. I know we can do this. I urge my colleagues, therefore, to come to the floor. I urge the leaders of

both parties to agree that the amendments submitted should be germane and relevant and that we can and will finish our work on this legislation this week.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COTTON TRUST FUND/AGOA

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to enter into a colloquy with the majority leader, Senator REID, and the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee, Senator BAUCUS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, let me begin by clearly stating I understand the majority leader later today will issue a unanimous consent request to move forward on the AGOA, the African Growth and Opportunity Act trade bill, and the Burma sanctions package as well as CAFTA-DR. Those are all efforts I supported as a member of the Finance Committee and voted for and ultimately want to see passed.

I believe trade is an effective development tool and that by investing in people we can make a long-term and sustainable change in developing countries. But at the same time, I am very concerned about our failure to reauthorize the cotton and wool trust funds which are crucial to sustaining jobs in the United States and jobs in my State of New Jersey.

For some time now I have been working tirelessly to reach an agreeable resolution on the issue, one that enables us to pass AGOA and CAFTA-DR and Burma sanctions while simultaneously protecting dwindling apparel sector jobs in the United States, hundreds in my home State, thousands across the country, and ensuring that our trade is not just free but is also fair.

That is not the case right now. So I come to the floor to enter into a colloquy with the distinguished majority leader and the chairman of the Finance Committee to ask for their help and commitment to addressing this domestic jobs issue, the cotton and wool trust funds this year, so we can seek to move this legislation and do right by American workers as we are trying to also help African workers.

I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the Senator from New Jersey coming to the floor to discuss this issue. As my friend from New Jersey knows, as the chairman of the Finance Committee knows, I support the wool

and cotton trust funds. That is very clear in the record of this body for what I believe was wrong with the Olympic uniforms. It is such a shame our athletes over there are wearing clothes made in China. I think that is too bad. I support the wool and cotton trust fund. I support the citrus trust fund. There are only three of them. I support all of them. I agree with my friend from New Jersey that we need to find a way to move these forward and ensure that American manufacturers are placed on equal footing with foreign manufacturers so there is an easier place for people to go if they want products made in the United States.

I am happy to work with Senator MENENDEZ and Chairman BAUCUS to find a vehicle to ensure that these trust funds and these American jobs are a priority that is addressed this year. So my friend has a commitment that I will do everything within my abilities to make sure we have an agreement on extending these very important trust funds this year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I strongly endorse the suggestions made by the majority leader as well as by the Senator from New Jersey and also thank the Senator from New Jersey for pushing these measures so aggressively, the cotton trust fund and wool, and also, to some degree, the citrus which is part of this.

I support these provisions. I support the cotton trust fund, support it strongly. I am working diligently to try to find the right vehicles so we can get this passed—the cotton trust fund passed this year. I deeply appreciate the strong passion on this by Senator MENENDEZ. He has come to me many times in looking for an opportunity to pass this.

I deeply appreciate that. This place works on basic comity. Sometimes the pathways to get to a result are not well known and difficult to see, initially. But I am quite confident we are going to find a way to get this cotton trust fund passed this year. The Senator has my support to make that happen.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, before I yield to my friend from New Jersey, I wish to also state on the record that no one is a better advocate for an issue they believe in than Senator MENENDEZ from New Jersey. This is an issue he has spoken loudly and clearly about. So I reiterate what I said: I feel very compelled to do something to satisfy my friend from New Jersey on such a worthy cause.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I wish to thank and appreciate the majority leader's and the chairman's ongoing commitment to this issue. I look forward to continuing to work with them on the issue to protect American workers and American manufacturers from the negative effect of certain trade policies and tariffs that threaten their livelihood.

I appreciate them both coming to the floor and for their commitment. I just

wish to take a minute or two for those who have asked me—I have had a whole host of our colleagues who have come and said to me: What are you trying to achieve? So we can move quickly to try to achieve the passage of AGOA and CAFTA-DR, Burma sanctions, all which I support.

I know colleagues, such as Congressman RANGEL, who was the original author of AGOA, has called, among many others. You know, very simply, pursuant to the passage of NAFTA and CAFTA and AGOA and other trade preference programs, Congress has eliminated duties on, for example, imported shirts from other countries. In some cases such as AGOA, it has also allowed the use of third-country fabrics to make those imported shirts.

Our tariff policy, however, has not changed. While foreign-made dress shirts are entering the United States duty free, we are charging American manufacturers a duty as high as 13½ percent on cotton shirting fabric. So not surprisingly, this made-in-America tax resulted in American manufacturers moving production offshore where shirting fabric is not subject to those high duties and where the finished product can come back to the United States duty free.

Six years ago, Congress recognized that, in fact, is simply unfair. Why should an American manufacturer have to pay a duty when those abroad using the same fabric can send it to the United States without any duty? They created the cotton trust fund to provide a combination of duty reductions and duty refunds to shirt manufacturers that continue manufacturing in the United States.

That program expired in 2009. Since then, these businesses have suffered and dwindled. I am just simply trying, as we promote jobs in Africa and in the Caribbean, to promote jobs in the United States. I want the women in the factories I have visited—this is the essence of how they sustain their families—to be able to continue to have those jobs.

That is why I appreciate the effort by the chairman and by the majority leader to try to get us to that point, so we can have free trade, but it also has to be fair to Americans who are here and can compete. They cannot compete when they have to pay a 13½-percent tax and people sending it from all over the world have to pay nothing. That is the essence of what I am trying to accomplish.

I will not object later today when the majority leader proposes his unanimous consent request and will support the effort to move those trade bills.

Mr. CARDIN. Would the Senator yield.

Let me thank Senator MENENDEZ for his leadership on this issue. He has been very articulate about preserving jobs and creating jobs in New Jersey and in America.

I thank him for once again standing for American workers. I thank Senator

REID, the majority leader, for his commitment to bring up the trust fund and the chairman of the Finance Committee, Senator BAUCUS, I thank him for his leadership.

Senator MENENDEZ has laid out the issue very clearly. This is an averted tariff. It works against American workers. Cotton, mainly on shirts but other commodities, such as wool and suits—as the Senator pointed out, if someone manufactures the suit or the shirt out of America and imports it into America, costing us jobs, they pay less tariff than if they are an American manufacturer that imports the product to manufacture the product in America. They pay a heavier tariff, which costs us jobs, which makes no sense whatsoever.

I thank Senator MENENDEZ for his leadership. I thank Senator REID and Senator BAUCUS for understanding this and giving us an opportunity before this expires on the wool trust fund. It is making sure it works effectively. I took the floor last week to talk about English-American Tailoring, located in Westminster, MD. There are 380 union jobs in Westminster, MD. I showed a photograph of seamstresses making suits in America. I think most people thought that photo was taken decades ago, but it was taken this month. This is about how we can preserve jobs in America. They are making the best suits in the world. They are exporting their suits to other countries, but they can't do it unless we have a level playing field.

The leadership of the Senator from New Jersey on bringing to the attention of the American people the need to extend and make effective the cotton and wool trust fund is critically important to preserving jobs in Maryland, New Jersey, and in our Nation.

Again, I thank Senator MENENDEZ, on behalf of American workers, for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. MENENDEZ. I thank my colleague.

Mr. REID. Will my friend yield to me for 1 minute?

Mr. MENENDEZ. Yes.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time for debate on S. 3414, the cyber security bill, be extended until 5 p.m. and at that time I be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished colleague from Maryland, a fellow member of the Finance Committee. Senator CARDIN has been a passionate voice on this as well. I am thrilled to have him as an ally in this endeavor.

All we want is for Americans to stay employed. They can compete with anybody in the world but not when they have to pay a tariff or tax that nobody else has to pay who sends the same product back into the United States. That is our goal. I appreciate his work, his passion, and his commitment. I look forward to working with the ma-

majority leader and the chairman of the Finance Committee.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, if I may have a few moments, the Senate is not in a quorum call, is it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no quorum call.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Very briefly, Mr. President, I have just received a copy of a letter that has been sent this morning to the majority leader, Senator REID, and the Republican leader, Senator MCCONNELL, from GEN Keith Alexander of the United States Army, Director of the National Security Agency and Chief of Cyber Command at the Department of Defense. He is a distinguished and honored leader of our military, one of the people who has the greatest single responsibility for protecting our security, both in terms of the extraordinary capabilities the National Security Agency has but now increasingly for the defense of our cyber system.

This is a career military officer, not a politician. He is somebody who has a mission, and it is from that sense of responsibility that General Alexander has written to Senator REID and Senator MCCONNELL. He writes—and I will ask to have it printed in the RECORD—to express his “strong support for passage of a comprehensive bipartisan cyber security bill by the Senate this week.” Why? I continue to quote:

The cyber threat facing the Nation is real and demands immediate action. The time to act is now; we simply cannot afford further delay.

He adds:

Moreover, to be most effective in protecting against this threat to our national security, cyber security legislation should address both information sharing and core critical infrastructure hardening.

Then he explains both of those in very compelling language. He also says:

Finally, any legislation needs to recognize that cyber security is a team sport. No single public or private entity has all of the required authorities, resources, and capabilities. Within the federal government, the Department of Defense and the Intelligence Community are now closely partnered with the Department of Homeland Security and the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The benefits of this partnership are perhaps best evidenced by the Managed Security Service (MSS) program, which affords protection to certain government components and defense companies. The legislation will help enable us to make these same protections available widely to the private sector.

I cannot thank General Alexander enough. He ends by saying this:

The President and the Congress have rightly made cyber security a national priority. We need to move forward on comprehensive legislation now.

He urged Senators REID and MCCONNELL “to work together to get it passed.”

I ask unanimous consent that this very compelling letter from GEN Keith Alexander be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY,
CENTRAL SECURITY SERVICE,
Fort George G. Meade, MD.

Hon. HARRY REID,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate, The Capitol,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR REID: I am writing to express my strong support for passage of a comprehensive bipartisan cyber security bill by the Senate this week. The cyber threat facing the Nation is real and demands immediate action. The time to act is now; we simply cannot afford further delay. Moreover, to be most effective in protecting against this threat to our national security, cyber security legislation should address both information sharing and core critical infrastructure hardening.

Both the government and the private sector have unique insights into the cyber threat facing our Nation today. Sharing these insights will enhance our mutual understanding of the threat and enable the operational collaboration that is needed to identify cyber threat indicators and mitigate them. It is important that any legislation establish a clear framework for such sharing, with robust safeguards for the privacy and civil liberties of our citizens. The American people must have confidence that threat information is being shared appropriately and in the most transparent way possible. This is why I support information to be shared through a civilian entity, with real-time, rule-based sharing of cyber security threat indicators with all relevant federal partners.

Information sharing alone, however, is insufficient to address the vulnerabilities to the Nation's core critical infrastructure. Comprehensive cyber security legislation also needs to ensure that this infrastructure is sufficiently hardened and resilient, as it is the storehouse of much of our economic prosperity. And, our national security depends on it. We face sophisticated, well-resourced adversaries who understand this. Key to addressing this peril is the adoption of minimum security requirements to harden these networks, dissuading adversaries and making it more difficult for them to conduct a successful cyber penetration. It is important that these requirements be collaboratively developed with industry and not be too burdensome. While I believe this can be done, I also believe that industry will require some form of incentives to make this happen.

Finally, any legislation needs to recognize that cyber security is a team sport. No single public or private entity has all of the required authorities, resources, and capabilities. Within the federal government, the Department of Defense and the Intelligence Community are now closely partnered with the Department of Homeland Security and the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The benefits of this partnership are perhaps best evidenced by the Managed Security Service (MSS) program, which affords protections to certain government components and defense companies. The legislation will help enable us to make these same protections available widely to the private sector.

The President and the Congress have rightly made cyber security a national priority. We need to move forward on comprehensive legislation now. I urge you to work together to get it passed.

KEITH B. ALEXANDER,
General, U.S. Army,
Director, NSA.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m. today.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:37 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. WEBB).

CYBERSECURITY ACT OF 2012—
Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I am so glad the Presiding Officer is in the chair while I am making these remarks. I wish to salute the Presiding Officer for his service in the Senate and his service to the Nation. One knows he is a member of the U.S. Marine Corps although he no longer wears the uniform. I believe once a marine, always a marine. And his service in Vietnam and to the Nation as Secretary of the Navy is well known and well appreciated. The Presiding Officer has served as a marine in the Marine Corps and as Secretary of the Navy and now in the Senate as a Member of the Democratic Party. The Presiding Officer really serves the Nation.

I come to the floor today to talk about cyber security and the need to pass cyber security legislation this week, in this body. And I come to the floor not as a Democrat, I come to the floor as a patriot.

I say to my colleagues in the Senate that this week, on this floor, the Senate has a rendezvous with destiny. We have pending before us cyber security legislation, a framework to protect critical infrastructure of the dot-com world against cyber attacks from those who have predatory, hostile intent to the United States of America. We are bogged down. We are not moving. We are once again following what has become a usual pattern in the Senate: when all is said and done, more is going to get said than gets done.

But I say to anyone listening and anyone watching, we cannot let that happen. The United States of America is in danger. And this danger is not something in the future. It is not something written in science fiction books. This is not the wave that is going to come. It is happening right now in cyber attacks on our banking services, our personal identity, our trade secrets, and things I will talk about more.

The naysayers here say: We can't pass this bill because it will be overregulation and it will lead to strangulation, and, oh my gosh, we can't ask the private sector to spend one dime on protecting itself.

Well, I respect healthy criticism, but let me say to my friends, because I want them to know that if anything happens to the United States of America—if the grid goes down, if NASDAQ goes down, if our banking system goes down, if we will not be able to function

because the streetlights won't be on and we won't be able to turn the electricity on—I will tell you what will happen. Once again, politicians will overreact, we will overregulate, and we will overspend.

In a very judicious, well-thought-out, well-discussed process, we could come up with a legislative framework that would defend the United States of America and at the same time balance that sensible center that another great patriot, Colin Powell, calls us to do: Always look for the middle ground while we look at where we want to go.

There is a cyber war, and I want everybody to know about it. Cyber attacks are happening right now. Cyber terrorists are thinking every single day about attacking our critical infrastructure. There are nation states that want to humiliate and intimidate the United States of America and cause catastrophic economic destruction. How do they want to do it? They want to take over our power grids. They want to disrupt our air traffic control. They want to disrupt the financial functioning of the United States of America. Cyber spies are working at breakneck speed to steal many of our state secrets. Cyber criminals are hacking our networks. So what are we talking about in this bill? We are talking about critical infrastructure.

Now, I am a Senator from Maryland, and the Presiding Officer is a Senator from Virginia. Does he remember that freaky storm a couple weeks ago? Remember Pepco? Oh, boy. I still have my ears ringing from my constituents calling about Pepco. I can tell you what it was like in Baltimore when that freaky storm hit. You couldn't get around when the stoplights were down. It was like the Wild West getting around. You could go into stores—if they were open—and nothing functioned. The lights weren't on. The refrigeration was off. Businesses were losing hundreds of thousands, if not millions of dollars. There were families, like a mother with an infant child and another child, with no electricity for 5 days who went to hotel rooms.

Now, they want to talk about this bill costing too much money? Just look at what it cost the national capital region of the United States of America because of a freaky storm.

It took us 5 days to get the utilities back on because of the utility company, but what happens if our destiny is outside of our control, if cyber terrorists have turned off the lights in America and we can't get them turned back on? It is going to cost too much? Wait until this kind of thing happens. I don't want it to happen, and we can prevent it from happening, and we can do it in a way that understands the needs of business.

I want to understand the needs of small business, but I sure understand the needs of families.

For those who say it is going to cost too much and they have the concerns of the chamber of commerce, fine. I

don't want to trash-talk them. My father owned a little neighborhood grocery store. I know what it is like when the electricity goes down. My father lost thousands of dollars because the frozen food melted, lost thousands of dollars when we had a freaky storm because of the refrigeration and his meats and produce went bad. My father lost thousands of dollars years ago in a freaky storm.

This bill means that if we come up with the kind of legislation that we want, we can deal with it. Just remember what critical infrastructure means. It means the financial services. It means the grid. So when there is no power, schools are shut down, businesses are shut down, public transit is crippled, no traffic lights are working. By the way, in Virginia didn't 9-1-1 stop working, and they are still investigating? Don't we love to investigate? Well, right now I don't want to investigate and I don't want to castigate, but I sure want the Senate to be able to get going.

Then there is the issue of financial services. The FBI is currently investigating 400 reported cases of corporate account attacks where cyber criminals have made unauthorized transfers from bank accounts of U.S. businesses. The FBI tells me they are looking at the attempt to steal \$255 million and an actual loss of \$85 million. Hackers are already going into the New York Stock Exchange, they are already going into NASDAQ in an attempt to shut down or steal information. Gosh, if we allow this to continue, they could attack and cost us billions of dollars.

Does the Presiding Officer remember that in 2010 we had a flash crash? New vocabulary, new things out there. The Dow plunged 1,000 points in a matter of minutes because automatic computer traders shut down. This was the result of turbulent trading. But just imagine if terrorists or nation states that really don't like us—and I am really not going to name them, but we really know who they are—really create flash crashes?

I know there are patriots in this Senate who have been the defenders of the Nation in other wars. They have said themselves that they worry about the Asia Pacific, they worry about China. I worry about China too. So while we are looking at the Defense authorization and appropriations—and people want more aircraft carriers to defend us in the blue waters against China. But what happens if there is a cyber attack? Now, we do know how to protect dot-mil, but don't we also want to protect dot-com in the same way? I think so.

I salute Senators LIEBERMAN and COLLINS. They have come forth with a bill that does two things from a national security perspective. First of all, it tells business: You can come in voluntarily. There is no mandate to participate. But if you do come in, you will get liability protection.