

There is no reason that the international community should accept a scenario where we allow Beijing to compromise global health as they play the bully with respect to their neighbor. That is another reason why Kosovo should be admitted as well.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this measure, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, many of the members who serve in this chamber, myself included, value the important relationship the United States shares with Taiwan. To this end, The House of Representatives unanimously passed legislation in the 115th Congress similar to the bill that is being debated today. Both bills direct the Secretary of State to develop a strategy to assist Taiwan in regaining observer status at the World Health Organization.

As a cosponsor of H.R. 3320 in the 115th Congress, I commend the gentleman from the great state of Florida for bringing this bill to the floor early in this Congress. Taiwan has been a model member of the global health community, having served as an observer in the World Health Assembly from 2009 until 2016. Taiwan has also contributed in enhancing regional and global disease prevention networks, along with working with other countries to ensure the World Health Organization's vision of health being a fundamental human right is successfully met.

While some outside actors try to prevent Taiwan from contributing to the global health community as an observer at the World Health Organization, it is important for all of us to realize that the best way to address the challenges of today and tomorrow with regards to global health is to work together, rather than exclude parties due to geopolitics. Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 353.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 353.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATO SUPPORT ACT

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 676) to reiterate the support of the Congress of the United States for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 676

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "NATO Support Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that:

(1) The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), which came into being through the North Atlantic Treaty, which entered

into force on April 4, 1949, between the United States of America and the other founding members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, has served as a pillar of international peace and stability, a critical component of United States security, and a deterrent against adversaries and external threats.

(2) The House of Representatives affirmed in H. Res. 397, on June 27, 2017, that—

(A) NATO is one of the most successful military alliances in history, deterring the outbreak of another world war, protecting the territorial integrity of its members, and seeing the Cold War through to a peaceful conclusion;

(B) NATO remains the foundation of United States foreign policy to promote a Europe that is whole, free, and at peace;

(C) the United States is solemnly committed to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's principle of collective defense as enumerated in Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty; and

(D) the House of Representatives—

(i) strongly supports the decision at the NATO Wales Summit in 2014 that each alliance member would aim to spend at least 2 percent of its nation's gross domestic product on defense by 2024;

(ii) condemns any threat to the sovereignty, territorial integrity, freedom and democracy of any NATO ally; and

(iii) welcomes the Republic of Montenegro as the 29th member of the NATO Alliance.

SEC. 3. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the President shall not withdraw the United States from NATO; and

(2) the case *Goldwater v. Carter* is not controlling legal precedent with respect to the withdrawal of the United States from a treaty.

SEC. 4. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

It is the policy of the United States—

(1) to remain a member in good standing of NATO;

(2) to reject any efforts to withdraw the United States from NATO, or to indirectly withdraw from NATO by condemning or reducing contributions to NATO structures, activities, or operations, in a manner that creates a de facto withdrawal;

(3) to continue to work with NATO members to meet their 2014 Wales Defense Investment Pledge commitments; and

(4) to support robust United States funding for the European Deterrence Initiative, which increases the ability of the United States and its allies to deter and defend against Russian aggression.

SEC. 5. PROHIBITION ON THE USE OF FUNDS TO WITHDRAW FROM NATO.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds are authorized to be appropriated, obligated, or expended to take any action to withdraw the United States from the North Atlantic Treaty, done at Washington, DC on April 4, 1949, between the United States of America and the other founding members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. McCaul) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 676, reit-

erating the support of the Congress of the United States for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, let me start by thanking the author of this bill, the gentleman from California (Mr. PANETTA). I was glad to join him as an original cosponsor, and I am grateful as well to our ranking member, Mr. McCaul, for his strong support of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, for nearly 70 years, the NATO alliance has been the bedrock of transatlantic peace, security, and stability. For seven decades, NATO has been synonymous with Western democracy.

The organization's architects had a tremendous vision, and that vision translated into the most successful political military alliance in history, an alliance that won the Cold War, that brought peace to the Balkans, that fought terrorism in Afghanistan, that today is guarding against Russian aggression in Europe and training forces in Iraq and elsewhere.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have heard, most notably from the President, that NATO is obsolete, that it is ill-suited to 21st century challenges. That is just plain wrong.

Would we be safer without Article 5, the principle that says an attack on one is an attack on all, an attack on one NATO member is an attack on all NATO members, the commitment that brought our NATO allies to fight at our side after September 11? Would we be better off without 28 other countries that share our values and that know how to fight together effectively? Of course not.

NATO is not a burden, Mr. Speaker. It is a bulwark against aggressive forces that seek to undermine democracy and the rule of law, against strongmen who flout international law and act as though might makes right.

NATO is our greatest strategic advantage, one built over time and at great sacrifice. We simply cannot cede such an advantage. Past and future generations alike would never forgive the squandering of something so precious. We cannot betray our young soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines by sending them into battle alone, without capable allies to share the burden.

So this bill, again, reiterates Congress' commitment to NATO. It would also prohibit any withdrawal from NATO.

I am glad we are considering it so early in this Congress. It sends a clear message to our allies, to our adversaries, and to the administration that this branch of government fully supports the alliance, the collective defense of our allies, and peace across the North Atlantic region.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to endorse the NATO Support Act. We are rapidly approaching the 70th anniversary of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, a fitting time for the House to reaffirm the importance of the transatlantic alliance.

NATO was born out of the chaos of World War II and built to fortify European democracies against Soviet totalitarianism. Time and again, the alliance has proven that the free peoples of the world are strongest when they stand together.

From the confrontation with communism during the Cold War, to the defeat of Milosevic in Kosovo, to the battlefields of Afghanistan, American soldiers and those of her NATO allies have fought and bled together to protect our country and to make others free.

This alliance has enhanced our military capability, increased our intelligence collection, and created a bulwark against international terror. NATO is critical to our national security and to the preservation of our military prowess around the world.

It solidifies our friendship with the individual countries in the alliance. But friends also must be honest with each other. That is why I am glad that this bill strongly supports the decision of the Wales Summit in 2014, that each member country should ramp up defense spending to 2 percent of their GDP.

An alliance of mutual defense is only as strong as each country's commitment to its spending goals. While some member countries have made great strides toward this commitment, others are still lagging behind.

Statements of support, like this bill, are important in affirming our relationships around the world. But actions speak louder than words. No statement about the importance of NATO speaks as loudly as the tangible commitment each country makes to ensuring the strength of the alliance.

In the meantime, I am glad to join this effort to reaffirm the continuing importance of NATO, which deserves our full support.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. PANETTA), the author of this legislation who has worked very hard on this legislation.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity. Obviously, I would like to share my appreciation of Chairman ENGEL for everything that he has done as a leader of all of his constituents in his district and, more importantly, all of our fellow countrymen and -women here in the United States of America; as well as Ranking Member McCaul; and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD), my good friend.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 676, the NATO Support Act. This is a bipartisan bill that allows

Congress to assert our Nation's support for NATO; to answer anybody who questions the purpose of this alliance; and to reaffirm the NATO pledge, that an armed attack on one of us is an attack on all of us.

The mutual defense pledge is why NATO has been the most successful military alliance in human history. It is an interdependency that has stood as a sturdy, strong, and sound anchor for peace that has prevented new world wars, fostered Western prosperity, and advanced democratic governance.

It has been the will of our Nation, the United States of America, to lead and to finance the defense of other nations, which has allowed them to develop and prosper economically, and to expand and evolve democratically.

Yet, at the same time, Moscow never went to war with a NATO partner. We got bases and a guarantee that we would not have to fight alone. Europe became our largest trading and investment partner and our chief diplomatic and military companion. And everybody on the European Continent got stability and peace to strengthen their democracies.

Now, all of us agree that we can continue to put pressure on our NATO partners to pay their self-stated goal of 2 percent of their GDP to this alliance. But that doesn't mean that we want to get out of NATO. In fact, doing such would be a historic mistake.

NATO is not—is not—a transactional relationship. Our sole focus can't be just on who pays and who gets what. Being a part of NATO is not like being a part of a country club. Instead, we value our NATO partners, and more importantly, we realize that the power of the NATO partnership is absolutely—absolutely—invaluable. The tangible results prove it, not just what we have seen in the past, but what we are seeing now.

In our enduring fight against terrorism, our NATO partners' will to join that effort was demonstrated just hours after the attack on 9/11, as partner nations volunteered to invoke Article 5.

Now, I served alongside many troops from many NATO countries during my service in Afghanistan from 2007 to 2008. I left that country in 2008, but I can tell you, after 17 years of war, NATO troops are still there, serving alongside our sons and daughters who are serving in uniform.

When it comes to Russia, our NATO partners will continue to play an important role as a deterrent for their aggression, and they will continue to coordinate and collaborate with us as we not only ready for a conventional war but also push back against Russia's use of hybrid warfare.

NATO is instrumental in setting us apart from Russia. Why? We have allies that will stand by us; Russia does not. That is the foundation for our NATO partnership, and that is the foundation for the NATO Support Act, an act that rejects efforts to withdraw from NATO

and prohibits any funds to be used as such.

It supports increased defense spending by NATO partners, as well as the funding of the European Deterrence Initiative to deter against Russian aggression. It reaffirms our unwavering support of NATO, not only as a defense pledge, not only as a partnership, but as a proven core for an international order that favors democracy and peace.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman ENGEL. I also thank Daniel Silverberg from Majority Leader Hoyer's staff, Jacqueline Ramos from the Foreign Affairs Committee, and Matt Manning and Jay Hernandez from my office.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully thank and ask all of my colleagues, Republican and Democrat, for their support on H.R. 676, the bipartisan NATO Support Act.

Mr. McCaul. Mr. Speaker, in the spirit of the bipartisanship behind supporting this bill, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I do want to take a moment to clarify a conversation we had here on the floor last week on sanctions legislation against Mr. Deripaska, a Russian oligarch. My remarks were passionate and aimed at the administration's proposed policy to lift sanctions on that individual. In no way did my remarks intend to reflect on the integrity of my friend from Texas, who was, in fact, co-managing the bill to oppose that action.

As my friend from Texas knows, I admire him deeply, and I believe that he is a leader of integrity. Nothing I said last week was meant in any way to deflect from that. I wanted to clarify that publicly on the floor.

I thank my good friend for yielding me time, and I look forward to talking about the issue at hand. I, again, thank my good friend from Texas.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), a very respected member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my dear friend, the distinguished chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and I thank my friend, the distinguished ranking member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, for helping Mr. PANETTA bring this bill to the floor.

I rise today in support of H.R. 676, the NATO Support Act, reiterating congressional support for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and prohibiting U.S. withdrawal from that organization.

As we mark 70 years of the NATO alliance this year, it is critical we recognize the invaluable role that NATO has played in protecting U.S. national interests and global stability.

NATO remains the foundation of U.S. foreign policy to promote a Europe that is whole, free, and at peace. NATO

has invoked Article 5, the commitment to collective defense, only once in 70 years, and that invocation was on behalf of the United States after we were attacked on 9/11.

As a result, nearly one-third of the fatalities suffered by coalition forces when we fought in Afghanistan to rid that country of al-Qaida and the Taliban—one-third of the casualties—were from non-U.S. NATO member and partner countries.

□ 1715

They put their blood and their flesh on the line on behalf of this country as part of that alliance.

Despite these sacrifices, unfortunately, our President has questioned the value of NATO and falsely claimed that NATO allies owe the United States money.

As head of the United States delegation to the NATO Parliamentary Assembly and rapporteur for the political committee of that assembly, I can attest to the anxiety within NATO regarding this administration's commitment to the alliance.

Case in point: one can't talk about the U.S. commitment to Article 5 in 2019 without mentioning President Trump's failure to embrace it in full view of our NATO allies during his first Presidential trip to Brussels in 2017.

This past summer at NATO's annual summit in Brussels, President Trump injected further discord into the alliance by calling our NATO ally, Germany, a "captive of Russia" and demanding that "delinquent" alliance members increase their defense spending "immediately."

The President's provocative comments undermined the summit's goal of projecting unity in the face of renewed Russian aggression, especially given that they occurred just days before what turned out to be a very difficult, if not disastrous, Helsinki summit with Vladimir Putin.

Meanwhile, Russia continues its forcible and illegal occupation in the Crimea, eastern Ukraine, Abkhazia and South Ossetia in Georgia, and parts of Moldova, and its attack on democracies throughout Europe and even in our own country.

Mr. Speaker, that is why I urge my colleagues to support Mr. PANETTA's bill. This bill affirms the U.S. support for NATO and preempts any attempts to withdraw from the same.

Mr. McCaul. Mr. Speaker, let me first say to Mr. CONNOLLY, we have a lot of passionate partisan debates on this floor, but I have to say, that was a class act on his part, and I thank him for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD), an original cosponsor of the bill.

Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join with my colleagues to introduce this bipartisan bill to reaffirm the commitment of Congress to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, as we know it. We call it NATO.

For 70 years now, almost 1 billion people from Los Angeles and London, to Tallinn and Thessaloniki have lived in peace and prosperity, in no small part due to the security provided by NATO.

As a CIA officer in Afghanistan, like my friend and colleague from California, I had the opportunity to serve side by side with NATO forces in the fight against al-Qaida and the Taliban. I saw every day the professionalism and dedication of these brave men and women who, like our soldiers, were fighting to protect their nations and way of life.

More than 1,000 NATO soldiers paid the ultimate sacrifice fighting alongside the United States in Afghanistan.

In the global fight against terrorism, NATO allies have stood with us time and time again. As my friend from the Commonwealth of Virginia noted, in NATO's entire history, 9/11 was the first time the alliance invoked Article 5, the commitment that an attack against one ally is an attack against all.

In our darkest hour, every member of NATO answered the call to fight terror at home and abroad.

In Europe, NATO countries continued to deter Russia from threatening our democratic partners. Through military exercises in forward deployments in Eastern Europe, we have demonstrated our shared resolve against the aggressive ambitions of Vladimir Putin. That includes a stronger commitment by our allies to provide for their own defense. They have spent over \$2.8 trillion on defense in the last decade, with spending increasing for the fourth straight year in 2018.

These partners, not Russia, are our true friends, and we must always stand with them.

We face many shared challenges, and the only way we can overcome them is by working together and continuing the strong transatlantic bond that unites our Nations.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation. It is an honor to work alongside my friend from the great State of California, Mr. PANETTA, the chairman, and the ranking member of this important committee.

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

Mr. McCaul. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers. I am prepared to close, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot overstate the critical role that NATO has played in the history of the 20th century, and for 7 decades, it has been the cornerstone of international security and a force for freedom around the world.

I look forward to its continued vitality in defending America and our allies for another 70 years.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, let me again, in closing, thank my friend from Texas (Mr. McCaul); Mr. PANETTA; our majority leader, Mr. HOYER; and all of this bill's sponsors.

As this debate has made perfectly clear, there is no partisan disagreement in this body when it comes to the importance of NATO.

Right now, we are dealing with an adversary in Russia that desires nothing more than to see the western alliance splinter. Vladimir Putin's aim is to undermine democracy, to split us apart from our allies, to drive division in the organizations that have kept Russia in check.

The last thing the United States should do is send mixed signals about our commitment, as this President, unfortunately, has done. It plays right into Putin's hands.

From Congress, you will get no such ambiguity. We hope our allies hear that and we hope Putin hears it as well.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support this bill strongly, I urge Members to do the same, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 676, critical legislation that expresses the unified opposition of Congress to any attempt by the President to withdraw from the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and reaffirms that it is the policy of the United States to remain a member in good standing of NATO and its commitment to Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty and its principle of collective defense.

In the aftermath of World War II, the greatest conflict in all of human history, the United States, Canada, and their Western Europe allies founded the North American Treaty Organization (NATO) on April 14, 1949 in Washington, D.C.

Founded on the principle of collective defense, Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty states that, "The Parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all."

In the 69 years since the Treaty's ratification, Article 5 has only been invoked once, following the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, when NATO members came to the aid of the United States.

NATO sent seven planes with 830 crewmen from 13 countries to protect American skies until May 2002, marking the first time in American history that the continental United States was protected by foreign forces.

NATO allies and partners have stood with the United States in joint operations in the Western Balkans, Afghanistan, Iraq, and elsewhere around the world.

Until the current President took office, every American president since the treaty's signing in 1949—Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson, Nixon, Ford, Carter, Reagan, George H.W. Bush, Clinton, George W. Bush, and Obama—has publicly reaffirmed the American commitment to Article 5.

American presidents have affirmed this nation's commitment to come to the aid of any NATO member that is under attack.

That is the symbolic meaning of the immortal words spoken by President Kennedy in

West Berlin at the Brandenburg Gate in 1963: “Ich bin ein Berliner.”

Mr. Speaker, the principle of collective defense is the core of NATO’s founding treaty and the NATO alliance has been the backbone of American national security and foreign policy for nearly 70 years.

The strength and solidarity of this western alliance kept Western Europe whole, prosperous, and free and paved the way for the collapse of the Soviet Union and the liberation of the nations of Eastern and Central Europe, many of which have now been integrated into NATO.

The Constitution of the United States grants Congress the sole power to declare war, but Article 5 does not increase the chance of war.

Rather, NATO is a bulwark against the outbreak of war because it deters aggression by any adversary.

As a result, NATO is the most successful military alliance in world history, successfully deterring the outbreak of a third world war, seeing the Cold War to a victorious conclusion, and protecting the principle of territorial integrity.

This is why I strongly support H.R. 676, which reaffirms the commitment of the Congress to Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty.

The legislation also expresses support for the agreement reached at the 2014 NATO Wales Summit calling upon each NATO member nation to allocate at least two percent of its gross domestic product to defense by 2024.

The legislation also expresses congressional support for robust United States funding for the European Deterrence Initiative, which increases the ability of the United States and its allies to deter and defend against Russian aggression.

Finally, H.R. 676 provides that no funds are authorized to be appropriated, obligated, or expended to take any action to withdraw the United States from the North Atlantic Treaty signed on April 14, 1949, in Washington, D.C., between the United States of America and the other 15 founding members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

I urge all Members to join me in affirming the commitment of the United States to the North Atlantic Treaty, which has kept the peace on the European continent for nearly 70 years and continues to serve as a bulwark and deterrent to Russian aggression and its long-held strategic objective of splitting the Western Alliance that has done more than any other collective enterprise in history to preserve and maintain international peace.

Mr. KINZINGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 676, the NATO Support Act.

For almost 70 years, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization has formed the cornerstone of national security policy for the post-war world order. Through this alliance, we have successfully defeated communism, halted genocide in the Balkans, defended against threats from terrorism in Afghanistan, and maintained cohesion with our like-minded democratic partners. By forming these relationships, we have successfully defended our values and principles in the face of repression and tyranny. While we no longer face the same existential threat posed by the Soviet Union, NATO’s resolve and stability has helped maintain peace in a world drowning with strongmen. That is why I stand in support of this bipartisan legislation.

H.R. 676 codifies Congressional support of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, while calling on our allies to modernize their capabilities and meet the Wales Defense Investment Pledge. Five years ago, NATO members agreed to reverse their declining defense budgets and balance the responsibilities that come with our partnership. While it was an ambitious goal, we have already seen many of our partners increase their commitments to our mutual security by meeting the agreed upon threshold of spending 2 percent of GDP on defense.

As part of our commitment, we must continue to support the European Deterrence Initiative, by maintaining a robust U.S. presence throughout the European theater. Most importantly, this legislation would ensure that no matter which way the political winds blow no administration could use funds to withdraw from this treaty without the consent of the co-equal branch of government in Congress.

NATO is not some outdated relic from past conflicts. We are living in a world where repression is on the rise, and human freedom is increasingly in jeopardy. What our partnership stands for, what NATO defends—it gives hope to the repressed. That is why I urge my colleagues in joining me in passing this legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 676.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

HACK YOUR STATE DEPARTMENT ACT

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 328) to require the Secretary of State to design and establish a Vulnerability Disclosure Process (VDP) to improve Department of State cybersecurity and a bug bounty program to identify and report vulnerabilities of internet-facing information technology of the Department of State, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 328

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Hack Your State Department Act”.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) BUG BOUNTY PROGRAM.—The term “bug bounty program” means a program under which an approved individual, organization, or company is temporarily authorized to identify and report vulnerabilities of internet-facing information technology of the Department in exchange for compensation.

(2) DEPARTMENT.—The term “Department” means the Department of State.

(3) INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY.—The term “information technology” has the meaning given such term in section 11101 of title 40, United States Code.

(4) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of State.

SEC. 3. DEPARTMENT OF STATE VULNERABILITY DISCLOSURE PROCESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall design, establish, and make publicly known a Vulnerability Disclosure Process (VDP) to improve Department cybersecurity by—

(1) providing security researchers with clear guidelines for—

(A) conducting vulnerability discovery activities directed at Department information technology; and

(B) submitting discovered security vulnerabilities to the Department; and

(2) creating Department procedures and infrastructure to receive and fix discovered vulnerabilities.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—In establishing the VDP pursuant to paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—

(1) identify which Department information technology should be included in the process;

(2) determine whether the process should differentiate among and specify the types of security vulnerabilities that may be targeted;

(3) provide a readily available means of reporting discovered security vulnerabilities and the form in which such vulnerabilities should be reported;

(4) identify which Department offices and positions will be responsible for receiving, prioritizing, and addressing security vulnerability disclosure reports;

(5) consult with the Attorney General regarding how to ensure that individuals, organizations, and companies that comply with the requirements of the process are protected from prosecution under section 1030 of title 18, United States Code, and similar provisions of law for specific activities authorized under the process;

(6) consult with the relevant offices at the Department of Defense that were responsible for launching the 2016 Vulnerability Disclosure Program, “Hack the Pentagon”, and subsequent Department of Defense bug bounty programs;

(7) engage qualified interested persons, including nongovernmental sector representatives, about the structure of the process as constructive and to the extent practicable; and

(8) award contracts to entities, as necessary, to manage the process and implement the remediation of discovered security vulnerabilities.

(c) ANNUAL REPORTS.—Not later than 180 days after the establishment of the VDP under subsection (a) and annually thereafter for the next six years, the Secretary of State shall submit to the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate a report on the VDP, including information relating to the following:

(1) The number and severity, in accordance with the National Vulnerabilities Database of the National Institute of Standards and Technology, of security vulnerabilities reported.

(2) The number of previously unidentified security vulnerabilities remediated as a result.

(3) The current number of outstanding previously unidentified security vulnerabilities and Department of State remediation plans.