

John Nash, Jr., was born in Bluefield, West Virginia, on June 13, 1928. At a young age, he displayed immense intelligence and an affinity for mathematics. Many may know Dr. Nash's story from the movie, "A Beautiful Mind," where he was portrayed by actor Russell Crowe, but many are unaware of the groundbreaking impacts he had in the field of mathematics and economics.

In 1994, Dr. Nash shared a Nobel Prize in economics for his work on game theory. Dr. Nash's work developed the concept of an equilibrium in non-cooperative games that has come to be known as the Nash equilibrium. Today, economics students across the world are familiar with Dr. Nash's contributions to the field of economics, studying the Nash equilibrium and game theory exclusively.

He revolutionized economics, and his work will have lasting impacts in business, sports, politics, and is even applicable to nuclear deterrence theories. Dr. Nash's work in pure mathematics is just as important and revolutionary as his work on game theory.

Dr. John Nash was not only a genius, he was also an advocate for those suffering from mental health issues. As many who have seen the film know, Dr. Nash suffered from mental illness. He used his struggles as a way to help others with mental health problems, becoming a staunch supporter for awareness and outreach for those with mental health issues.

Dr. Nash's advocacy work and brilliance will be missed by so many. This Saturday would have been John Nash's 87th birthday. Dr. Nash was clearly taken from us too soon, but his work and his advocacy will live on. The best way we can honor his legacy is to continue his fight for treatment, for education, and for dignity for those facing mental health issues and their families.

OPPOSING THE AMERICAN INNOVATION ACT

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

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to alert my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans, and I would like to alert the American people that there is a monstrous piece of legislation that will do great damage to our country and to the welfare of the American people making its way through the Judiciary Committee.

In fact, the Judiciary Committee will have a markup this Thursday of what is called the American Innovation Act, H.R. 9. This, in reality, is the anti-innovation act. It is one of the most egregious examples of crony capitalism that I have witnessed in this body as I have been here for the last 26 years.

This legislation uses a legitimate problem, which is frivolous lawsuits, and then portends to solve that prob-

lem by dramatically restricting the right of all Americans to sue in order to address those who have violated their rights in the name of usurping those who have been called patent trolls. A patent troll is someone who has purchased the right for a patent from an inventor and now has that property right himself. In the name of restricting those patent trolls from enforcing the right that they have bought from the inventor, they are dramatically restricting those people, both the inventors and anyone else who owns these intellectual property rights known as patents.

Early provisions of this bill, and almost every provision of this bill, make it more difficult for the inventor to protect himself against the theft of huge corporations. And there you go; huge, multinational corporations are seeking to destroy America's patent system.

I have been fighting this for 25 years. They have been fighting it because they want to take the property of American inventors, and they don't want to pay for it—surprise, surprise. So they passed legislation in the name of stopping frivolous lawsuits that prevent people with legitimate lawsuits from actually obtaining the justice they deserve. This will undercut American innovation. It will destroy the individual inventors.

Almost every American university now has come out opposed to this because they have found that the result of this bill, by restricting the people's right to actually defend their own intellectual property rights, will undermine the value—dramatically decrease the value—of patents, which will mean people won't invest in patents, which means the universities now have less resources. Who will benefit? Large corporations, multinational corporations with no loyalty to the United States will then have the power to take from our inventors their inventions.

This is a game changer for American innovation. It is the anti-innovation act. I ask my colleagues to please pay attention to H.R. 9. Don't let them push this over. Don't let this crony capitalism being done using a decoy, meaning the patent trolls, get away from the fact that they are actually trying to destroy the system for legitimate inventors.

As I say, I have been fighting this for 25 years. We have seen this in many forms. The last time, the decoy was submarine patentors. This time it is patent trolls.

The fact is that none of this is an excuse to dramatically decrease the ability of our inventors to own what the Constitution gives them: a 15- to 17-year period where they own what they invented; thus, they can make a profit from it. This would have destroyed all of the young inventors that made such a difference in the American way of life.

We will not be prosperous and we will not be secure unless the American peo-

ple have the right to own their intellectual property, unless the inventors that are the basis of many of our new industries know that they will control their patent and that some big corporation won't just come along and steal it.

This goes so far as to limit and to say that, for example, one of the provisions in the bill, if an inventor sues a major company that has stolen his or her patent, well, not only now will the inventor be liable for the costs of the litigation, but anybody who has invested in his patent will then be liable for those court costs. Who the heck will ever invest in an inventor when he is up against a megacorporation? No, we should not be permitting the theft of the intellectual property rights of our inventors.

I would ask my colleagues to pay attention to H.R. 9. I would ask the American people to get ahold of your Congressman and make sure he understands how heinous this bill is that has already, as I say, been opposed by every major university in this country and, of course, every group of inventors in this country.

If it was the Innovation Act, as the title would suggest, why would the inventors be against it?

I would ask my colleagues to join me in opposing H.R. 9 as it is marked up in the Judiciary Committee this coming Thursday.

FREE TRADE IN AMERICA

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

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I am a big proponent and supporter of free trade. I think the American workforce is so productive. I think that American businesses and our industries are so productive and so innovative that we can compete in the global markets. I am confident that our innovation and that our workforce can compete and we can win, when given an opportunity, again, to compete in global markets.

At home, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce has determined that the State of Louisiana is the top export State in the United States. In fact, one out of every five jobs in our State is tied back to our waterways, and that is because we are home to 5 of the top 15 ports in the United States.

□ 1215

We have an awful lot to export at home. We have a huge petrochemical industry, one of the largest ones in the United States. Large agriculture—in fact, over half the grains from the Midwest from American farms come down through our port system and are then exported around the country, around the world.

We are home to all six class I rail lines, only one of two places in the United States that actually has all six class I rail lines in our State.

Free trade can be good for America; it can be good for our country, good for our businesses, good for our families, if it is fair trade, and that is where my concerns come in, is our ability to compete fairly.

The President said: “High-standard trade helps level the playing field for American workers”—“high-standard trade helps level the playing field.” The problem is that, when you compare the cost of compliance in the United States with environmental policies, with tax policies, and with labor regulations, it is not a level playing field in the United States. In fact, it is extraordinarily out of balance.

The National Association of Manufacturers estimates that in 2012 alone, that the American workforce wasted 4.2 billion hours just complying with regulations, 4.2 billion. The Competitive Enterprise Institute estimates that \$1.88 trillion in lost economic productivity and higher prices were experienced by the American workforce and by American families across the country, again, \$1.88 trillion in 2014.

CEI also did a study that estimated that, for every small business in the United States, for each employee that small business has, that they pay over \$11,000 a year just complying with Federal regulations. If the total cost of the aggregate cost of Federal regulations were at GDP—were at gross domestic product—it would rank behind Russia’s economy and just ahead of India’s economy. There are extraordinary costs. In fact, it is a backdoor way to tax our families.

Eighty-eight percent of the manufacturers in the United States, according to a survey done by NAM, 88 percent identified Federal regulations as being their top concern in regard to their ability to compete on a level playing field.

If you take, for example, tax compliance alone, tax policies are going to cost \$1.7 trillion over the next 10 years, as proposed by the current administration, \$1.7 trillion on top of all of these other extraordinary costs that I have covered to date.

One of the huge costs that we have in the environmental world is the ozone standard. There has been a proposal to change the ozone standard. Some have said that the ozone standard being proposed, Yellowstone National Park couldn’t comply with; yet they want the State of Louisiana, where I represent, to comply with this new ozone standard.

When we had the top—or one of the top petrochemical industries in the United States, that standard is estimated to cost perhaps—it is estimated to be the most expensive Federal regulation in history. It could cost over \$2 trillion to comply with the regulation—over \$140 billion per year it could cost to comply with the regulation. In our home State of Louisiana alone, nearly 34,000 jobs are estimated to be lost on an annual basis.

Mr. Speaker, I am a proponent of the environment. I spent years and years of

my life, of my career, working to restore the environment, working to restore the ecological function of south Louisiana, of our coastal area, of our fisheries, and of our wetlands. I am a big proponent of the environment.

But, Mr. Speaker, I am concerned that, as we move forward with free trade, under the policies being put forth by this administration, American workers are going to have their hands tied behind their back in the cost of complying with environmental regulation, the cost of complying with the expensive tax regulation in the United States, and the cost of extraordinary labor regulation.

I will say in closing, Mr. Speaker, I am a proponent of free trade, but it must be fair trade.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o’clock and 20 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Eternal God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

As the days grow warmer throughout our land, major legislative issues loom with the potential of warmer debate and disagreement.

Bless the Members of the people’s House with the graces they need to engage one another as colleagues of the 114th Congress, entrusted by America’s citizens to forge solutions to the major issues facing our time, be they in agriculture, transportation, or areas of national security.

Grant to each an extra measure of wisdom and magnanimity that all might work together for a better future for our great Nation.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day’s proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker’s approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Speaker’s approval of the Journal.

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. KILDEE led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

CYBERATTACK STANDARDS STUDY ACT

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, recent cyber attacks targeting the personal data of Americans make it clear cyber is a new domain of warfare that threatens personal information, financial security, and the physical safety of our citizens. Last week, millions more were affected when the Office of Personnel Management’s network was compromised.

This complicated nature of cyber defense means we need a clear standard of measurement for assessing the damage of attacks on our citizens and to affected computer systems and devices. It is for this reason that I have introduced the Cyberattack Standards Study Act today to instruct the Director of National Intelligence, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Director of the FBI, and the Secretary of Defense, to define a method of quantifying cyber incidents for the purpose of determining a response.

Recent cyber attacks are a sobering reminder that Congress, all government agencies, and private companies and citizens need to work together to better protect our public and private networks now.

I appreciate the research of legislative director Taylor Andreae and military fellow Major Jacob Barton for their service in providing the ability to establish this legislation.

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