



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 166

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 11, 2020

No. 47

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 11, 2020.

I hereby appoint the Honorable HENRY CUELLAR to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2020, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with time equally allocated between the parties and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

COMMEMORATING TOWN OF RAYVILLE AND EULA D. BRITTON ALUMNI ASSOCIATION

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

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the efforts of the town of Rayville, Louisiana, and the Eula D. Britton Alumni Association to preserve their community's heritage.

The only part of Eula D. Britton school still standing is its gymnasium,

but that didn't stop the 1960 graduate class from doing something good. Quincy Mason, who is in the audience today, and the rest of the alumni association purchased and turned it into a museum, showcasing the school's history.

First known as Rayville Colored School, its first class of 11 students graduated in 1939. It was renamed Rayville Rosenwald High School in 1949, and eventually Eula D. Britton High School in 1956 after its long-serving principal, Eula D. Britton.

In 2014, Quincy Mason, who is present here today in the House gallery, as I said, had the idea to petition for a historical marker to commemorate the school's history for generations to come. This year, on July 3, it will become a reality when the marker is dedicated by its alumni association.

The town of Rayville, Louisiana, is proud of Quincy Mason, who went on to play professional baseball for the Chicago Cubs organization and was inducted into the Southern University Sports Hall of Fame in 2015.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring the town of Rayville and the Eula D. Britton Alumni Association for their efforts to preserve their community's rich history.

THANKING RONNIE ANDERSON

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank Mr. Ronnie Anderson for his 51 years of service to Louisiana farmers and ranchers.

After graduating from LSU in 1970 with a degree in animal science, Ronnie returned home to work on his family's farm. He quickly became involved in the Louisiana Farm Bureau Federation and was elected president of his parish chapter shortly thereafter.

In 1989, he was elected president of the statewide farm bureau, and he has been elected an additional 31 times since.

I have known Ronnie personally for many, many years as a farmer myself,

and it has always been clear to me that he loves Louisiana agriculture. When I was elected to Congress, I came to rely on his counsel to advocate for our farmers and ranchers.

During his tenure, the Louisiana Farm Bureau has grown from 67,000 members to more than 148,000, and Ronnie still raises several hundred head of cattle, as well as horses, hay, and timber, on his farm in East and West Feliciana Parishes in my congressional district.

In addition to his work at home and with the farm bureau, Ronnie has served for all but 2 years since 1997 on the Louisiana State University Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in thanking Ronnie Anderson for his many, many years of service to Louisiana and wish him well as he retires after 31 years as president of the Louisiana Farm Bureau Federation.

HONORING ALVARO CIFUENTES

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

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to honor the life of my longtime friend and mentor, Alvaro Cifuentes.

On March 2, Puerto Rico suffered a tragic loss.

Born in Mayaguez, Alvaro graduated magna cum laude from the University of Puerto Rico in 1972, earning a bachelor's of business administration.

He then went on to graduate from law school from the University of Puerto Rico School of Law, earning a J.D., again magna cum laude, in 1975.

He came from a long line of wise politicians from Puerto Rico who helped navigate the island over decades.

Alvaro practiced law for 17 years and became a managing partner at the law firm of Goldman Antonetti in San Juan.

In 1992, he managed Pedro Rosello's successful race for Governor of Puerto

This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H1591

Rico, a man who would go on to win two terms, a hard task in the history of the island.

After serving as Governor Rosello's chief of staff for 3 years, he moved to Washington, D.C., where he focused on building the Democratic Party within the Hispanic community. From 2001 to 2005, he served as the chair of the DNC's Hispanic Caucus, where he increased the party's Hispanic membership by over 30 percent. As chair, Alvaro rebuilt an unprecedented Hispanic campaign network and called for John Kerry to work toward winning Hispanic votes.

In 2004, he earned the honor of being named one of the 100 most influential Hispanics in the United States by the Hispanic Business Magazine.

Anyone who crossed paths with Alvaro knew he was a true man of the people and a fearless champion of Puerto Rico statehood. I remember the first time we talked about how important statehood would be for Puerto Rico.

He recalled the story of the mighty punga, a story in Chinese folklore that talked about a huge bird that played with other smaller birds on a tiny island and had a wingspan over 500 meters.

They would laugh at this giant bird, the mighty punga, with his awkwardness. He found out, through the hawk, that through thermal glides, he would be able to potentially fly like the other birds.

He set off, needing a year to reach the height required. When asked about this difficult task and his inability to fly, he said: "It is okay. We have a long way to go."

That is where Alvaro talked about statehood, about how it has been over 120 years, and about how we have an island that is larger in population than 26 States, yet it is taking over a century for us to even get to this point, but it is okay. Alvaro passed before getting to see it happen. We have a long way to go.

He is survived by three children, Alvaro, Carolina, and Natalia Isabel.

Alvaro, you will be dearly missed by myself, by so many in Florida, and on the island of Puerto Rico, but the fight will continue to live on.

RECOGNIZING K-9 VETERANS DAY

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize March 13 as K-9 Veterans Day, an opportunity to commemorate the working dogs that support our men and women in uniform.

This year marks the 78th anniversary of the establishment of the K-9 Corps.

After the attack on Pearl Harbor, the Army began training for the K-9 Corps in 1942, originally known as the War Dog Program. In the years that passed, the K-9 Corps has become a vital part of our Armed Forces operations.

Though military working dogs initially served as morale boosters for our soldiers, they were eventually trained and incorporated into combat. A dog's sense of smell is 5 to 10 times stronger than a human's, which has made them expert counterparts in detecting explosive devices.

More than 1,500 dogs served in the Korean war, 4,000 in Vietnam, and many more in Afghanistan and Iraq.

Like their human counterparts, our military K-9s eventually retire. Many dogs and their handlers develop a strong bond during their service together.

Sadly, prior to the year 2000, military working dogs were considered "equipment" and were either left behind or euthanized at the end of their service.

Today, retired military working dogs are put up for adoption, and their personal handlers get first priority to give them a home.

To further this effort, the American Humane Society works to unite our four-legged heroes with their handlers by raising funds to ensure their safe transport home.

Oftentimes, these retired dogs will serve as support animals to servicemembers who may be suffering from PTSD and other disabilities, both mental and physical. Our veterans can greatly benefit from the assistance and the companionship that a dog provides, and our K-9 veterans benefit from their newfound forever homes.

Our K-9 veterans have served our country, and they, too, deserve to be honored for their service.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL RED CROSS MONTH

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize March as National Red Cross Month.

This tradition began in 1943 when President Franklin D. Roosevelt issued the proclamation to designate the month of March to celebrate Red Cross volunteers, donors, and instructors.

The history of the Red Cross, however, goes back even further into American history. In 1881, Clara Barton established the organization right here in Washington, D.C., to better serve people in need. On June 5, 1889, Clara Barton and five volunteers came to Johnstown to respond to the Johnstown Flood.

For more than 100 years, the American Red Cross has worked to support those in need, whether they are men and women in uniform or victims of natural disaster.

Perhaps the organization's best-known program, the American Red Cross established the first nationwide civilian blood donation program in the 1940s.

According to the organization, someone in the United States needs blood every 2 seconds. There are regular blood donation drives right here on Capitol Hill, where we can all volunteer to donate blood that has the potential to save a life.

Less than 38 percent of the U.S. population is eligible to give blood, and

only 3 percent of those individuals donate annually.

The critical need for blood and the lifesaving potential that comes from a donation cannot be overstated.

The American Red Cross has always been a leader in this effort, and today, they still provide more than 40 percent of the blood products in the United States.

The success of the Red Cross relies on the generosity of the American spirit.

This month and all year long, I am thankful for their service to our Nation.

COMMENDING HEMET AND PALM SPRINGS FIREFIGHTERS

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

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, this week, members of the Hemet and Palm Springs Fire Departments gathered in Washington, D.C., for the International Association of Firefighters' annual legislative conference.

I met with several of them in my office and want to express my personal appreciation for their unrelenting service that so often goes above and beyond their call of duty.

Last December, tragedy struck in my district when three children and their father died in an apartment complex fire in Hemet, California.

Despite the dangerous and grim circumstances, Hemet first responders worked heroically and helped save lives.

Days later, the Hemet Fire Department, in a demonstration of kindness, joined with community members to give financial support for the victims' family and everyone affected by the fire.

They simply said they were closing the loop. From fire to getting them back on their feet, they saw it as their responsibility to help those who were afflicted.

This act of compassion shown by the first responders is just one example of the selflessness in which they live their lives every day.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the firefighters from Hemet and Palm Springs, and I thank first responders everywhere. Their heroism is as inspiring as it is impactful.

RECOGNIZING CATHERINE LANG

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

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Women's History Month to recognize a dedicated public servant from Nebraska's Seventh District. Catherine Lang's record of leadership and advocacy for the State's small business community has improved the lives of many Nebraskans.

Catherine earned both her bachelor of fine arts and juris doctor degrees

from the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. As a leader with a passion for fostering educational and economic opportunities for Nebraskans, she has worked hard to build a more robust environment for businesses and universities. She also plays an active role in several philanthropic and public organizations.

□ 1015

Not only has she grown as a leader, the responsibilities entrusted to her have grown as well. Catherine has been crucial in guiding State agencies through periods of transition and expansion. Throughout her career, she has served Nebraska as the Department of Revenue's deputy tax administrator, the Nebraska property tax administrator, the commissioner of labor, and as the director of the Department of Economic Development.

Catherine inherited a legacy of service from her parents, Hugh and Lillian Lang. Her father, Commander "Chic" Lang, served as a distinguished Navy pilot during World War II and later as an instructor at the U.S. Navy War College, and her mother enlisted in the U.S. Air Force.

Catherine's parents instilled in her a value she has instilled in her three sons: the importance of a college education as a door to opportunity. Because of this, the Lang family established a scholarship for students at the UNO College of Business for the purpose of cultivating opportunity and character.

Currently, Catherine holds the position of State director of the Nebraska Business Development Center and assistant dean at the UNO College of Business. She leads statewide outreach for NBDC and builds collaborative efforts in the Nebraska University system to support the institution's mission of economic development.

Thank you, Catherine, for dedicating your life to serving and inspiring others, and we thank you for strengthening relationships within our community.

HONORING TIMOTHY KENNY ON HIS RETIREMENT

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Timothy Kenny and his exceptional service as the executive director of the Nebraska Investment Finance Authority, or NIFA. Timothy has been serving Nebraskans in this role since 1994. Before he joined NIFA, he served as director of programs for the Utah Housing Finance Agency and as executive director of the Texas Housing Finance Agency.

NIFA administers programs to help Nebraskans finance affordable housing, medical facilities, community infrastructure, and industrial development projects. They also serve first-time farmers and ranchers by providing affordable financing strategies across the Great Plains.

In the 36 years of its existence, NIFA has worked diligently to finance over 91,000 mortgages for affordable single-family homes. Additionally, over 23,600

affordable rental housing units for Nebraskans living on a budget have been created. Under Tim's leadership, NIFA has taken care of our Armed Forces by providing over \$96.1 million in home buyer's assistance.

Previously, Timothy served as a certified public accountant for a private tax and audit practice in Dallas, Texas, and then worked his way up to chief financial officer for homebuilding and real estate firms in Texas and Colorado.

He now resides in Cass County, Nebraska, with his wife, Sara, three children, and numerous grandchildren. On top of his commendable public service, Timothy has supported his children and country through more than 20 deployments in the United States Armed Forces.

Timothy continues to be active in Nebraska by serving on the National Council of State Housing Agencies, the National Association of Home Builders, the Nebraska Subprime Advisory Task Force, and the Governor's Disaster Recovery Task Force. He exemplifies what it means to be a Nebraskan through his hard work, service to others, and compassion for those in need.

I congratulate Timothy on a notable career of public service and a retirement that is well deserved.

SIMLEY WRESTLING TEAM STATE CHAMPIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. CRAIG) for 5 minutes.

Ms. CRAIG. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to congratulate the Simley Spartans wrestling team on their AA State championship.

Simley High School in Inver Grove Heights is surely proud of their accomplishments, as are we all in the Second Congressional District. In fact, their head coach, Will Short, called it a perfect season.

Congratulations to the Spartan wrestlers. They have demonstrated excellence in their sport and a strong commitment to the success of their team. They have delivered outstanding results that they can be proud of in their school and their community.

I thank especially the parents, the coaches, the teachers, and the mentors who have dedicated their time to making their season successful.

Congratulations, Simley.

SENATOR SCHUMER'S UNBECOMING COMMENTS TO SUPREME COURT JUSTICES

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

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, last week in the Senate, a resolution was introduced to censure Senate Majority Leader CHUCK SCHUMER for his threatening comments directed at Supreme Court Justices on the steps of the Court during an abortion-related case.

These comments were not only unbecoming of a Senator, but they were simply egregious. They crossed the line.

As representative leaders, we are held to a higher standard of conduct, and Senator SCHUMER failed to meet that standard. I call on my colleagues on the other side of the Capitol to support this censure for the preservation of this institution, for the preservation of the constitutionally separate branches of government, and for the health of our Republic.

FEED YOUR MIND

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, this week the USDA, EPA, and FDA have partnered to announce a new public education campaign aimed at helping consumers better understand what is in their food.

The Feed Your Mind initiative was developed to answer the most common questions that consumers have about genetically modified foods, commonly referred to as GMOs. This study will include what GMOs are, how and why they are made, how they are regulated, and it will address health and safety questions that consumers may have about these products.

Biotechnology has allowed important advances in crop technologies and improved our farmers' ability to continue to provide safe, nutritious, and affordable food. Unfortunately, some consumers have fallen victim to untrue or totally misleading rumors about what GMOs do for our food, creating confusion and stifling innovation in the agriculture industry.

I want to applaud the Trump administration for taking on the important task of providing factual information and important information about the food we grow right here in Kansas and across the United States. No consumer should have to fear their food or question the technology that goes into making their meals possible.

The United States has the single safest, most reliable, and most affordable food source in the entire world, and our farmers work daily to inform the public about what they do in the field. These resources will be an important supplement to their outreach efforts.

PRESIDENT TRUMP'S CORONAVIRUS LEADERSHIP PLAN

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, the Wuhan coronavirus is certainly on the front of Americans' minds these days, but before I speak about the virus, I would like to talk about leadership.

I often tell the kids I work with that leadership is doing the right thing when it is not popular. Here in Washington, I have learned that doing the right thing is when you know over 90 percent of the press and 90 percent of the media is going to disagree with you.

Leadership is when President Trump banned travel from China on February 2. While some people went so low as to call this xenophobic, as a physician, this early decision, I believe, has saved thousands of American lives.

By now, we have millions of test kits distributed out across the country. I want to just reassure Americans that this testing is covered by Medicare, by Medicaid, and by most every one of their insurance companies.

I also want to reassure Americans that antivirals and vaccines are in early phases of trials, way ahead of development. We are very optimistic that these antivirals may soon be available for those who are impacted the most by this Wuhan virus. We are also optimistic that these vaccines will be available by this next winter.

We have a plan. The President has given us a plan. Let's stick to this plan. We are implementing this plan, and it is working.

Again, as a physician who has worked with health departments, I am truly impressed by how we have contained this virus and how our local health departments are working so hard to minimize the spread of this virus. I am absolutely amazed that we only have approximately 1,000 Americans impacted by the Wuhan viruses at this time.

In the meantime, again, let's go back to our plan. It is not a time to panic. This is a time to wash your hands, limit your travel, and, by the way, open your windows and doors when you are at home and let some of this fresh air come in which this virus does not like a bit.

So, thanks, Mr. President, for delivering on your plan. We are truly impressed as physicians in Congress by the great job that you are doing and the leadership you are showing.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH:
MARGARET HUDSON

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, every March, we honor the extraordinary contributions of women who have shaped our Nation's history and those who continue to pave the way for the next generation. This year also marks the 100th year since the 19th Amendment granted women the right to vote.

Think about it, just in the last 100 years. Our Nation is now going on 245 years old. A century later, the women who have done so much for our country throughout our Nation's entire history continue to make a difference.

I am proud, today, to say that I serve with a record number of women in Congress as we continue to fight for issues that are so important: equal pay, reproductive freedom, and so much more.

Mr. Speaker, as we use this opportunity to celebrate the incredible women who have changed the world in your life and in my life, I would like to pay tribute to an iconic woman, an artist in my home of Fresno, California, Margaret Hudson.

Ms. Hudson passed away last month, but her legacy lives on in her clay sculptures of California wildlife that can be seen on display throughout the valley. It is incredible work.

From a young age, Margaret loved to spend time outdoors hiking in such places as Sequoia National Park. Her appreciation for the beautiful landscape of the Central Valley would later influence so much of her artwork that we enjoy today.

She attended college in New England and served as a missionary in Japan and South Korea for several years. Her love for art blossomed years later, when she began sculpting from memories of her time in South Korea. She became one of the first female art entrepreneurs in Fresno when she opened up her own studio in 1972.

Through the years, Margaret expanded her interest in the arts to painting and held many of her own art shows to display her work and to encourage young artists such as herself, especially women. Margaret's artwork is a fixture throughout the Central Valley, with permanent works on display at our Valley Children's Hospital and Fresno Chaffee Zoo.

Her work continues to inspire us, and I think it is a reflection of her appreciation and respect for the natural beauty and landscapes that we have in California and throughout our country. Certainly, the Sierra Nevada and the San Joaquin Valley were among many of the reflections and renderings of the creation of the art that she was so proud of and that we so much enjoy today.

So I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the life and the contributions of Margaret Hudson. Her artwork continues to inspire and is cherished as a part of all of those who know it and who enjoy it.

God bless you, Margaret. You made a difference.

RECOGNIZING JOSH SPEIDEL

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Josh Speidel, an extraordinary young man from my hometown of Columbus, Indiana.

Josh was an Indiana All-Star high school basketball player when he was in a tragic car accident. Josh spent many months in hospitals and rehab learning how to walk and talk again. It was a difficult journey, but Josh's family never lost hope.

The University of Vermont honored Josh's basketball scholarship he achieved before the accident and welcomed him back with open arms. I am proud to say that Josh recently scored his first point in his college basketball career and will soon be graduating from the university.

I wish Josh the best of luck in his future. He is an inspiration to all of us.

□ 1030

IVY TECH CC FLIGHT PROGRAM

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Hoosier State's first community college flight program and to commend the partnership between Ivy Tech Community College and the Columbus Municipal Airport.

Since 2017, Ivy Tech Columbus has been offering Ivy Tech's first aviation associate's degree and an aviation management program.

This program is designed to give students hands-on pilot training. In addition to flight time, students also train on a flight simulator at the Columbus Municipal Airport.

I look forward to seeing more skill-based programs like this to help our youth in their careers.

WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as we celebrate the importance of Women's History Month. I would like to take this opportunity to celebrate women throughout the Sixth District who make a difference in our everyday lives.

I think of women business leaders, humanitarians, and activists in our communities, like Jeanie Hahn, Jean Ann Harcourt, Sue Saunders, Lisa Fisher and Celeste Calvitto.

We recognize Linda Ostewig, who leads a faith-based nonprofit for struggling teens to learn healthy lifestyle patterns in our own Hancock County.

I am reminded of the example set by Susan Stahl, who has led Girls Inc. in Madison for over three decades.

We recognize leaders like Wendy Elwood in my hometown of Columbus, who last year was named "Woman of the Year" by The Republic newspaper.

Indiana's First Lady, Janet Holcomb, is also from our district in Muncie.

The people of Indiana's Sixth District are blessed to have so many women helping lead and inspire our communities.

We celebrate and honor them as part of Women's History Month.

INCLUSION OF POULTRY IN U.S.-U.K. TRADE
NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my support for one of the biggest industries in my district—the poultry industry.

I urge the administration and Ambassador Lighthizer to include poultry in any U.S.-U.K. trade deal.

As the second largest exporter of chicken and the largest exporter of turkey, the U.S. will continue to gain momentum in this industry if the U.K. is added as a new market.

Indiana is the fifth largest turkey producer and second largest egg producer in the United States. A U.K. trade agreement will boost our Hoosier poultry farmers, who are an essential part of our Indiana economy.

As Indiana's Sixth District Representative, I will continue to support our Hoosier farmers and fight for their access to free markets.

FARMING AND CARBON SEQUESTRATION

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the great impact that

farming and the agriculture community has on carbon sequestration.

The use of cover crops increased by 15 percent per year since 2012. This means that 20 million acres across the U.S. are likely to be planted in cover crops this year with the potential to sequester about 60 million metric tons of CO₂, equal to the emissions of over 12 million cars.

The use of ethanol and biodiesel is notably reducing greenhouse gas emissions, the same amount as if 17 million cars were taken off the road in 2018.

Mr. Speaker, I will continue to support the agriculture community and its leadership in being stewards of our environment.

BLACK MATERNAL HEALTH MOMNIBUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to speak about the Black Maternal Health Momnibus, an historic and comprehensive package that tackles one of the greatest public health crises of our time.

My work on Black Maternal Health began when my daughter, a Black mom herself, survived a complicated pregnancy that almost claimed her life. How many people my age aren't as lucky, and now have grandkids who grew up without a mommy?

I knew when I got to Congress, I had to make this a priority.

In 2018, Senator KAMALA HARRIS and I worked with the Black Mamas Matter Alliance to introduce resolutions honoring the first Black Maternal Health Week, as well as the Maternal CARE Act. That effort led to last April, when Congresswoman LAUREN UNDERWOOD and I launched the Black Maternal Health Caucus.

This issue was deeply personal for both of us. We wanted to raise awareness, educate our colleagues, and shine a bright spotlight on the maternal health crisis—of mothers needlessly dying during what should be one of the most joyous times of their lives.

Our caucus has grown to more than 100 members in less than a year, which I imagine might be a record feat, but it speaks to the importance of this issue and how it resonates so deeply within Congress and across party lines.

Black maternal health is not a partisan issue. It is a life-and-death issue. The main goal of the caucus is to develop and advance evidence-based policy solutions.

The Black Maternal Health Momnibus Act of 2020 builds upon existing maternal health legislation by filling gaps through nine new bills to comprehensively address every aspect of the Black maternal health crisis. Throughout the process, we were very intentional about centering the voices of Black women and ensuring that Black women-led organizations were consulted early and often.

The Momnibus makes investments in social determinants of health, community-based organizations, the growth and diversification of the perinatal workforce, improvements in data collection and quality measures, digital tools like telehealth and innovative payment models.

In addition to direct efforts to improve Black maternal health outcomes, the Momnibus focuses on high-risk populations, including women veterans, incarcerated women, and Native Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to take a moment to speak about the bill that I am leading within the package: The Kira Johnson Act.

Kira was an entrepreneur, she traveled the world, and she was a mother to a healthy, little boy.

On April 12, 2016, she checked into a hospital with her husband, Charles, to give birth to their second child, Langston.

Despite being in excellent health, despite being a successful businesswoman, despite having health insurance, and doing everything right, Kira did not make it out alive. She died from hours of neglect and severe hemorrhaging, nearly 12 hours after safely delivering her second son.

Kira Johnson mattered.

Kira deserved better.

And this legislation says, unequivocally, that Black Mamas matter. It makes investments in community-based organizations that are leading the charge to protect moms: By supporting maternal mental health conditions and substance use disorders; by supporting doulas and perinatal health workers; and addressing social determinants of health, like housing, transportation, and nutrition.

It also supports research, bias and racism training programs, and the establishment of Respectful Maternity Care Compliance offices to address bias and racism.

At its core, this bill is about accountability and empowering our community health partners who have been providing safe and culturally-sensitive care to Black moms for years.

Again, I am thrilled for the accumulation of nearly a year of research, information-gathering, and collaboration with key stakeholders.

For decades, the U.S. maternal mortality and morbidity rates have gotten worse for all mothers, but especially for Black women whose health outcomes are further compounded by systemic and structural racism.

The Black Maternal Health Momnibus is an historic piece of legislation that not only targets failures in maternal healthcare, but also addresses pervasive maternal health disparities through solutions that are culturally competent and proven effective.

It provides a roadmap so that our healthcare systems, our providers, and society will finally make Black maternal and infant health a priority. No one

should have to lose another friend, auntie, sister, daughter, or mommy to this crisis.

Mr. Speaker, let's get it done for all of the moms out there.

CELEBRATING BRIGADIER GENERAL SHAWN MANKE

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

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Shawn Manke from Cambridge, Minnesota, for his recent promotion to the rank of brigadier general in the Minnesota National Guard.

Shawn grew up on the shores of Spectacle Lake in southwestern Isanti County, and spent his summers working at his family's resort. He is a proud graduate of Cambridge-Isanti High School.

Upon graduation from the ROTC program at the University of North Dakota, Shawn was commissioned as an Army aviator in 1991. After being released from Active Duty, Shawn knew he was not ready to give up his life of service and enlisted as an officer in the Minnesota National Guard.

During his time with the Minnesota National Guard, Shawn has held many leadership positions, including director of Army aviation, commander of the 34th Combat Aviation Brigade, and commander of the 2nd Battalion 147th Assault Helicopter.

Shawn's exemplary leadership has earned him numerous military awards, such as the Legion of Merit, Bronze Star Medal, and the Meritorious Service Medal with four bronze oakleaf clusters.

Brigadier General Shawn Manke is an accomplished officer with the knowledge and experience necessary for his new role.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Minnesota's Eighth Congressional District, I thank him for his years of dedicated service, and congratulate him on his well-deserved promotion.

STANDING WITH THE GRAND RAPIDS COMMUNITY

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on the House floor to offer words of consolation and support to the Grand Rapids community in Minnesota's Eighth Congressional District as they mourn the loss of two local businesses from a tragic fire.

Last Saturday, a fire broke out in the basement at Lakeview Behavioral Health, and quickly spread to the VFW Post 1720 building next door.

While we are fortunate that no one was harmed in the fire, both businesses are a total loss.

I was deeply saddened by this news, as the VFW Post in Grand Rapids served as a place where combat veterans could gather for support and camaraderie since 1929. It also housed valuable historic memorabilia, much of which is now gone.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the brave firefighters and first responders who

quickly responded to this emergency and prevented this fire from spreading further. Your dedication to this community is greatly appreciated.

Mr. Speaker, my heart goes out to the veterans who frequented this VFW post, the patients who attended Lakeview Behavioral Health, and the entire Grand Rapids community as they recover from this loss.

Please know that I stand by ready to help in whatever way I can during this rebuilding process.

HONORING THE LIFE'S WORK OF HOWARD HEDSTROM

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the contributions of Howard Hedstrom of Grand Marais, Minnesota, and the entire Hedstrom family.

Last month, at the age of 71, Howard retired as president of Hedstrom Lumber Company, a business that his family built from the ground up and ran for over 100 years.

Howard's grandfather, Andrew Hedstrom, was a Swedish immigrant who pieced together a used sawmill to build a company that would employ three generations of Hedstroms.

While Hedstrom Lumber Company had humble origins, thanks to determination, leadership, and the foresight of company employees, like Howard, it evolved into one of the largest employers in Cook County, Minnesota.

Mr. Speaker, for generations, Minnesotans have worked in our forests, helping to support their families and boost rural economies. The Hedstrom family is a fine example of this great tradition.

I am incredibly grateful to Howard and his entire family for their dedication to the Grand Marais community and Minnesota as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, I wish Howard a relaxing retirement spent with his wife, Bonnie, and the rest of his loved ones.

HONORING THE LIFE AND MEMORY OF SUSIE SCHLOMANN

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

Mr. SMUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and memory of Mrs. Susie Schломann of Shrewsbury, Pennsylvania, who suddenly passed away unexpectedly last week.

Mr. Speaker, after Pennsylvania's Congressional District boundaries changed, I had the privilege to represent southern York County. I quickly came to know Susie. Susie was passionate and proud of her conservative, political beliefs, volunteering much of her time furthering the causes which she supported, and she was never shy to share her thoughts about what was happening here in Washington.

Susie came to Shrewsbury from Long Island, where she raised her family, including her three children, Tristan, Ted, and Rebecca, and where, in 1978, she married the love of her life, her

late husband, Rick. In addition to her three children, Susie is survived by five grandchildren, her brother Andrew, and her sister, Amanda.

Mr. Speaker, we wish all those who are grieving, comfort. And we give thanks for having had the opportunity to know Susie, who filled so many people's lives with happiness.

COMBATING THE INHUMANE PRACTICES AT PUPPY MILLS

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to the concerning issue of puppy mills throughout the State of Pennsylvania and across America. If we all care for our canine companions, we cannot continue to support the horrifying practices at puppy mills.

Mr. Speaker, it is well-documented that puppy mills supply pet stores with puppies. My home State of Pennsylvania is no exception.

Cutting off the puppy mill to pet store supply chain will decrease the demand for puppies raised in puppy mills. The inhumane practices at most puppy mills are shocking, appalling, and unacceptable. We have all seen the images on television.

Stores that sell commercially-raised puppies operate based on an outdated and socially unacceptable business model. We need to work to shift the pet markets towards humane sources, including shelters and rescues that are burdened with finding families for homeless pets, thousands of which have to be euthanized in Pennsylvania each year.

President Truman once said: If you want a friend in Washington, get a dog.

Mr. Speaker, let's show our best friends the love they deserve by combating the inhumane practice of puppy mills.

□ 1045

CELEBRATING HOUR OF CODE

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to the school-based initiative designed to increase student interest in the world of coding. The Hour of Code, which occurs every year during Computer Science Education Week, has the goal to teach students coding basics.

The Bristol Township School District is one of several around the world taking advantage of this program, and they are leading the way in our community. Bristol Township schools are known for their science, technology, engineering, art, and math initiatives, and they held multiple events to allow students to participate in the Hour of Code.

The introductory program uses games to teach younger children. By showing kids the basics of coding, it can spark an interest in computer science and engineering, which, as our

society becomes more technology based, can be incredibly valuable skills to have.

I applaud the Bristol Township schools for participating in this program, and I hope that other school districts across our community and across our Nation will follow the lead of Bristol Township schools.

CONGRATULATING ROOSEVELT ELEMENTARY'S MILLER MEAN MACHINES

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the champions of the Eleanor Roosevelt Elementary School's 10th annual Super Duper Bowl, the Miller Mean Machines.

Since 2010, Roosevelt Elementary, in Falls Township, has come together for a flag football tournament. The tournament consists of fifth-grade students and their teachers coming together for a fun day outside. The event also acts as a fundraiser, taking donations of both food and money for the Bucks County Emergency Homeless Shelter and the Children's Hospital of Philadelphia.

Mr. Speaker, any event that brings our community together for a day of fun, teamwork, and sportsmanship, while also helping those in need, should be celebrated by this House.

Congratulations again to the Mean Machines, and I thank Eleanor Roosevelt Elementary for being an educational leader in our community.

HONORING HEROES OF ROCK HILL POLICE DEPARTMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor two heroes of my local police department in Rock Hill, South Carolina.

In May of last year, Sergeants Cedric Stokes and Bruce Haire demonstrated the meaning of compassion when they used unconventional means to save the life of another man.

That day, the police department heard reports of a man seeking to commit suicide while streaming it live on social media. Without a moment's hesitation, these officers used social media to identify the man online and, upon identification, coordinated rapidly, with the help of Facebook employees, to ensure that the man was found and promptly cared for in a medical facility.

Ours is a brave new world, and the implications of new technology cut both ways. On this day, it was at once a morbid display of pain, but also a beacon signaling for help.

A quote came to mind when I read of these officers' heroic responses. In the words of Theodore Roosevelt:

Do what you can with all you have, wherever you are.

On behalf of the Fifth District, I commend the officers of the Rock Hill Police Department for their unwavering and adaptive dedication to protect and serve.

Without officers like Sergeant Cedric Stokes and Sergeant Bruce Haire, we would be one beautiful life shorter and our community all the lesser for it.

I think of the words of Winston Churchill, who said, when Great Britain was under siege by Germany:

There will be a time when doing your best isn't good enough. We must do what is required.

These officers did what was required. God bless.

REAUTHORIZING PATRIOT ACT

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

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, some of my colleagues today will offer a bill to reauthorize the PATRIOT Act.

It will have the thin varnish of reform on it, designed to whitewash the egregious constitutional violations that have been going on, but it is the Americans who are going to be shellacked by this legislation and the process used to pass it.

I want to read the Fourth Amendment and part of the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution here today on the floor.

"The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized."

The Fifth Amendment says: Nor shall any person be "deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law."

So, let's think about some of these words because they are being treated as if they are curse words or dirty words today. Warrant, due process, probable cause, these are all things that are guaranteed as rights for all Americans in the Constitution, and none of those can be guaranteed without transparency.

We can't have star chambers and kangaroo courts. This has to happen in daylight, and it has to be reviewable by the people in order to know that these things are true.

These things, they are inconvenient, a warrant, due process, probable cause. They are inconvenient for investigators. They are inconvenient for prosecutors. They sometimes get in the way. They make the job of finding the criminals, of finding the terrorists, a little bit harder. But they are guaranteed rights of all Americans, so we have to keep them in the process.

But let me talk about the legislative process here today, and I want to challenge the authors of this bill to come down here and defend what they have done.

This bill started out in a committee. This is how it is supposed to happen, as a base bill. Then, as the debate started getting underway, oh, it got inconven-

ient. Things were said that people didn't want to be said. Amendments were offered to make it more constitutional. They didn't like that.

What did they do? The chairman of the committee pulled the bill, canceled the hearing, and canceled the markup of this bill, and they took it behind closed doors. They took it into the back room to write it. They took it into the back room to draft it.

Why did they go into the back room? Because the lobbyists aren't in the committee, and the deep state doesn't get a vote on the committee, so they got them in the back room with them. The lobbyists and the deep state helped draft this bill that we are going to vote on today.

How much time do we have to review it? Less than 24 hours. Last night is when they made the text available.

There is a rule in this House that guarantees 72 hours to review a bill. They are going to suspend that rule here in a few minutes, and people will willingly vote to suspend that rule so they can ram this bill through, so that they can reauthorize the unconstitutional provisions of the PATRIOT Act.

Now, I understand terrorists, foreign terrorists, don't have constitutional rights, so that is why the PATRIOT Act and the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act were passed, so that those impediments wouldn't be in the way when you are going after terrorists, foreign terrorists. But everybody is presumed innocent until proven guilty, so we need to maintain that.

One of the worst things that has happened as a result of the FISA and the PATRIOT Act is that a Presidential candidate was spied on. He is now the President. He overcame that. But this bill should fix that.

A candidate, Presidential, congressional, city councilman, never again should they be spied on using these tools that are supposed to go after terrorists, after foreigners.

I urge my colleagues in the House—well, the ones who have offered this bill, I urge them to get down here and defend what they have done. I urge them to come down here and explain why they don't want us to have—they don't want you to have 72 hours to look at this bill. Come down and defend that.

Then, for all of my other colleagues here in the House, I urge you to vote "no." And for my friends in the Senate, vote "no" as well.

If this should make it to the President's desk, which I fear it is going to—I fear it is going to be on his desk, and he has some unwise or insincere counselors right now. I urge the President, if this should make it to his desk, to remember what they did to him with this legislation. Remember. And I urge him to veto this bill if this should get there this week.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 54 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. OMAR) at noon.

PRAYER

Reverend Jonathan Slavinkas, St. Bernard's Church of Our Lady of Providence Parish, Worcester, Massachusetts, offered the following prayer:

Eternal Word, we come to You with praise and thanksgiving for the many blessings that You bestow upon us. We thank You for the blessings of our faith, freedom, and Nation.

As we gather, we do so rejoicing, giving thanks for being able to live in a nation that provides us with the opportunity to freely elect the women and men within this assembly who have been called to assist in guiding our Nation.

Our prayer is that, through the Members of this assembly's diverse and unique gifts and talents that You have bestowed upon them, they might be woven together as one, continually championing the common good for all within our Nation.

We pray that, in moments of disagreements and debate, an authentic understanding and mutual respect might prevail, bearing witness to the gift of collaboration for the promotion of the common good.

We pray for Your continual blessings to flow upon this assembly and the works that come forth, and we pray for all of those who have been affected by illness and disease that they may find healing and comfort in this time of uncertainty.

We pray for all of this in Your name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

Mr. MORELLE. Madam 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. MORELLE. Madam 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 North Carolina (Mr. MURPHY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina 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.

WELCOMING REVEREND JONATHAN SLAVINSKAS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to welcome to the House floor my dear friend, Father Jonathan Slavinkas, who offered today's opening prayer.

Father Jonathan, as most of his parishioners call him, is the pastor of St. Bernard's Church of Our Lady of Providence Parish on Lincoln Street in Worcester, Massachusetts. A lifelong resident of Worcester, he is also the police chaplain for Worcester, Auburn, and Southbridge.

What makes Father Jon so extraordinary is his complete devotion to bettering the lives of his parish community, especially the young people. He hosts an annual Halloween party for hundreds of neighborhood kids so they have a safe place to go trick-or-treating.

Stories abound of his little acts of kindness, like buying pizza for kids hanging out on the church steps or opening up the church gym for youth basketball games or making it a point to walk around the neighborhood and simply say "hi."

Madam Speaker, Father Jon's compassion and commitment to making everyone feel welcome at St. Bernard's—no matter who they are—is truly remarkable. He is an inspiration to us all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

HONORING THE LIFE OF RON PETTENGILL

(Mr. MORELLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MORELLE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of my dear friend, Ron Pettengill, a pillar of the Rochester community, who passed away on February 28.

As head of the local carpenters union in Rochester and Monroe County building trades, Ron defined the Rochester labor movement, dedicating himself and his life's work to improving the lives of working people everywhere.

Our community is a better and more equitable place because of his tireless commitment to advocating for social change. Ron's work will continue to open doors for people in our community for generations to come. I am so proud to have been able to call him my friend.

I join all of Rochester in mourning his loss and extend my prayers and deepest sympathies to the Pettengill family.

TRUMP KEEPING AMERICANS SAFE

(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. Madam Speaker, I am grateful to President Donald Trump for focusing on the safety and health of American families since the beginning of his administration. Not only did President Trump immediately take action to address the coronavirus with a travel ban, he has increased funding for important disease research and preparedness efforts since he first took office.

President Trump has focused on a whole-of-government approach in combating the coronavirus by ensuring State, local, public, and private officials are prepared to keep families safe. He has made the swift decision to appoint Vice President MIKE PENCE head of the Coronavirus Task Force, who is skilled as a voice for this important service.

Since President Trump was elected, his administration has increased funding to the National Institutes of Health by 39 percent, the Centers for Disease Control by 24 percent, balanced biomedical research by 35 percent, Strategic National Stockpile by 32 percent, and infectious disease response by 70 percent. This administration is committed to keeping families safe while preparing our country for disease outbreaks.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

STAND UP AND BE COUNTED IN 2020 CENSUS

(Ms. PLASKETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PLASKETT. Madam Speaker, as we approach April, you will begin to hear more and more about the Census.

The Census is the most important count of people in our country, responsible for allocating nearly \$800 billion in Federal funding, and it takes place only once every decade.

By standing up and being counted in the 2020 Census, Madam Speaker, you are ensuring that your State or territory has access to the funding it needs for police and fire departments, healthcare, roads, and many other vital programs.

Madam Speaker, you don't need to be an inventor, a doctor, or even a Member of Congress to shape the future of your community. By being in the 2020 Census, you will help inform funding for local school programs and roads in our community.

We all count and we all get to shape our future by participating in the 2020 Census. You can make a difference in our community this year and respond to the 2020 Census, whether online, by mail, or by phone.

Be counted this April.

CHINESE ENTITIES RECEIVING AMERICAN INVESTMENTS

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, China considers the United States their biggest threat in their search for global dominance. However, the truth is that China's recent rise is being enabled by institutional and individual investors in the United States, including Federal, State, and public pension funds like the TSP and CalPERS in California.

A number of Chinese entities, which are receiving American investments, are engaged in activities that violate U.S. law and hurt our national security interests, especially our military, like China Telecom's social credit score system and their repression of the Uighurs, which the House voted to condemn earlier this year.

Our public pensions should not be allowed to become a new funding vehicle for Communist China, which serves as a threat to current and retired Federal and State employees who are unknowingly enabling their aggression against U.S. interests.

HONORING GUNNERY SERGEANT DIEGO PONGO AND CAPTAIN MOISES NAVAS

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

Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, last Sunday, March 8, Gunnery Sergeant Diego Pongo and Captain Moises Navas made the ultimate sacrifice while serving their country in north-central Iraq.

Both were marines and assigned to the 2nd Marine Raider Battalion, Marine Forces Special Operations Command, or MARSOC, which is located in

Camp Lejeune in eastern North Carolina in my district. They were both killed in action while supporting Iraqi forces in clearing out a tunnel of ISIS fighters.

Given the current coronavirus situation, it is easy to lose sight of the sacrifices of our servicemembers and their families, but we absolutely cannot allow this condition to make us forget about our men and women in uniform here and abroad.

The deaths of these two brave marines are a somber reminder that our servicemembers and their families sacrifice so much for us each and every day, no matter the circumstances, so that we can live in peace and freedom.

My thoughts and prayers are with MARSOC, Navas' and Pongo's brothers in arms, and especially their families and loved ones.

RECOGNIZING CROSSROADS QUARTET'S 60-YEAR ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Crossroads Quartet for their 60th anniversary of vocalizing Southern Gospel music throughout Kentucky and other States.

Founded in 1960 in Russell Springs, Kentucky, this fine group of constituents has now been active within the music world for 60 consecutive years. They have traveled thousands of miles, worn out four Dodge vans, and touched numerous lives.

While some of the names and faces have changed, the inspiring mission of Crossroads Quartet has remained a constant. Today founding member Vernie McGaha, alongside Brian McGaha, Dave Powell, and Randy Hart, continues to fulfill the original calling of Crossroads Quartet.

I am proud to be their voice in Washington and am confident that their musical ministry will be active for many years to come. Their decades of contributions are certainly deserving of recognition by this entire body.

BROOKWOOD COMMUNITY

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

Mr. OLSON. Madam Speaker, I rise to invite the entire Congress and all my fellow Texans, especially my neighbors in Texas 22, to the biggest Texas-size birthday party of 2020.

This picture to my left is pure Brookwood. They are turning 35 years old this year. Since 1985, citizens at Brookwood with mental and physical challenges are taught real job skills. They are infused with pride, self-worth, and Christian love.

Brookwood was started by Yvonne Streit. Her 1-year-old daughter, Vicki, had severe brain damage. Yvonne had a

mission. From her backyard to churches to the current two campuses with 230 or more citizens, Brookwood is making their citizens in Texas better every single day.

Their official birthday party is April 3 at 11 a.m. The catering is done by the Brookwood Cafe. If you want a belly full of food and a heart full of Christian love, come see us in Brookwood.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF BONNIE DUVALL

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Ms. Bonnie McWhorter Duvall. Bonnie recently lost her battle with cancer at just 61 years of age.

Bonnie was the matriarch of a strong farm family from Greensboro, Georgia. She was a member of the Green County Farm Bureau Women's Committee, a mother of four, and a wife to American Farm Bureau Federation President Zippy Duvall.

Bonnie and Zippy spent more than 40 years together, and she enjoyed traveling the country by his side to meet with many of our Nation's farmers over the years.

Though it is a comfort to know that Bonnie is no longer suffering, it is a great sadness that she was taken from her family and friends far too soon.

I would like to extend my deepest sympathies to Zippy and the rest of the Duvall family at this difficult time. They are, and will continue to be, in my prayers.

□ 1215

NATIONAL DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. TAYLOR. Madam Speaker, today, I rise to recognize the 33rd Anniversary of National Developmental Disabilities Awareness Month.

This important commemoration serves to raise awareness and promote respect for those with intellectual and developmental disabilities, while also highlighting the importance of inclusion.

It is estimated there are over 4.6 million individuals in the United States, and over 250,000 individuals in North Texas alone, with intellectual and developmental disabilities. Texas' Third Congressional District is home to incredible organizations, including Cornerstone Ranch, My Possibilities, and LifePath Systems.

Madam Speaker, I am honored to recognize these dedicated organizations, staff, and volunteers serving as steadfast advocates fostering opportunity for these individuals to realize their full potential.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in thanking these organizations for their hard work and recognizing those with developmental disabilities.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S.J. RES. 68, DIRECTING THE REMOVAL OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES FROM HOSTILITIES AGAINST THE ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN THAT HAVE NOT BEEN AUTHORIZED BY CONGRESS; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2486, FOSTERING UNDERGRADUATE TALENT BY UNLOCKING RESOURCES FOR EDUCATION ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6172, USA FREEDOM REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2020; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 891 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 891

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 68) to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran that have not been authorized by Congress. All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs; and (2) one motion to commit.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2486) to reauthorize mandatory funding programs for historically Black colleges and universities and other minority-serving institutions, with the Senate amendment thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on the Judiciary or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment with each of the two amendments specified in section 4 of this resolution. The Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except as specified in section 3 of this resolution.

SEC. 3. (a) The question of adoption of the motion shall be divided between the two House amendments specified in section 4 of this resolution. The two portions of the divided question shall be considered in the order specified by the Chair.

(b) Each portion of the divided question shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

SEC. 4. The amendments referred to in the second and third sections of this resolution are as follows:

(a) An amendment consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-52.

(b) An amendment consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-53.

SEC. 5. If only one portion of the divided question is adopted, that portion shall be engrossed as an amendment in the nature of a substitute to the Senate amendment to H.R. 2486.

SEC. 6. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 6172) to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to prohibit the production of certain business records, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary and the chair and ranking minority member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 7. On any legislative day during the period from March 13, 2020, through March 22, 2020—

(a) the Journal of the proceedings of the previous day shall be considered as approved; and

(b) the Chair may at any time declare the House adjourned to meet at a date and time, within the limits of clause 4, section 5, article I of the Constitution, to be announced by the Chair in declaring the adjournment.

SEC. 8. The Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 7 of this resolution as though under clause 8(a) of rule I.

SEC. 9. Each day during the period addressed by section 7 of this resolution shall not constitute a legislative day for purposes of clause 7 of rule XV.

SEC. 10. It shall be in order at any time through the calendar day of March 22, 2020, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV. The Speaker or her designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or his designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this section.

SEC. 11. The requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to any resolution reported through the legislative day of March 23, 2020.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. JUDY CHU of California). The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 hour.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, on Monday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 891, providing for consideration of Senate amendment to H.R. 2486, S.J. Res. 68, and H.R. 6172.

The rules provide for consideration of two House amendments to the Senate amendment to H.R. 2486, which contained the text of the NO BAN Act and the Access to Counsel Act.

It also provides for consideration of S.J. Res. 68 under a closed rule, with 1 hour of general debate controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. It also provides the joint resolution with one motion to commit.

The rule also provides for consideration of H.R. 6172 under a closed rule, with 1 hour of general debate equally divided among and controlled by the chairs and ranking minority members of the Committee on the Judiciary and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

Lastly, this rule self-executes a manager's amendment from Chairman NADLER to H.R. 6172 and provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Madam Speaker, we are now 3 years into a policy that is the antithesis of what this country stands for: the President's shameful and un-American Muslim ban. President Trump chose Holocaust Remembrance Day, of all days, to sign his first executive order on this. That shut the door to thousands of refugees fleeing war—the very people who had seen America as a beacon of hope and were trying to build a better life.

Instead, this administration turned its back on innocent women, children, and families desperate to escape violence. That is callous, that is wrong, and it goes against everything America is founded on.

President Trump has claimed his Muslim ban is all about national security. But let's be honest here, it was never about that.

It is about a President trying to fulfill offensive campaign promises and further his harmful rhetoric about Muslims.

As a candidate for President, Donald Trump said he would certainly look at closing mosques in the United States. He floated the idea of creating a database for all Muslim Americans. And he even suggested that Muslims in America were cheering as the World Trade Centers fell on September 11. What an ugly, ugly thing to say.

Madam Speaker, I could go on and on and on. This is truly offensive stuff—ideas that should be left somewhere in the darkest corners of the internet.

Then, in December of 2015, he called for, “a total and complete shutdown of Muslims entering the United States.”

This ban is his attempt at turning that campaign rhetoric into actual policy, however cruel and unnecessary.

My colleagues, Representatives CHU, JAYAPAL, and ROSE, put its impact best when they wrote in a recent op-ed piece: “That means more grandchildren who will never be able to kiss their grandparents, more loved ones unable to say good-bye at a funeral, more graduations where the proud student has no beaming parents cheering for them in the crowd, and more families forced to make impossible decisions under the most trying circumstances.”

I have met people impacted by the Muslim ban, Madam Speaker. It is people like Benham Partopour, a chemical engineering student getting his Ph.D. at Worcester Polytechnic Institute in my home district in central Massachusetts.

He is an Iranian national who was in Iran when President Trump's executive order went into effect. He had a visa, but no airlines were willing to sell plane tickets that would allow him to return to the United States. So, like many other people across the globe, he was stranded.

My office worked with school officials and the ACLU Massachusetts every day until he was able to return home to the United States a week later.

This is who the President is afraid of, Madam Speaker, a bright young man trying to study at a top American university. He is just one of the roughly 135 million people impacted by this policy.

This isn't about crafting sound national security policy; this is about something much more sinister. That is shown by the fact that the President kept drafting versions of his Muslim ban until a watered-down version was able to pass legal muster with conservatives on the Supreme Court. But even they required the administration to grant waivers proving the ban had a “legitimate national security interest.”

Yet, the State Department has approved just 10 percent of all waivers so far, just 10 percent.

Madam Speaker, does this President really believe that 90 percent of Muslims from impacted countries are terrorists? There is absolutely no evidence of that.

And it gets worse. According to reports, this administration is now considering expanding its travel ban to even more countries. Enough is enough.

Our country already had one of the strongest vetting systems anywhere in the world. We don't need any arbitrary and offensive bans. We can tell the difference between a real threat and the student traveling back to college.

That is why this underlying measure will reverse the bans the President has put in place over the last 3 years, and it will ensure people at ports of entry can seek legal advice during the screening process.

The principle that our diversity is our strength, and the idea that our country is strengthened by immigration, these are core values of this

Democratic majority. That is why we have made this a clear choice and provided a clean up-or-down vote. No stalling tactics. No partisan gimmicks. And I think it is an appropriate process because I want to prevent cynicism and ugliness from being celebrated here on the House floor.

The administration's rhetoric and, quite frankly, so many people here on this floor have often demonized immigrants. It is offensive, and it is not worthy of a debate.

Either you believe we are a nation defined by the Statue of Liberty welcoming immigrants or one that uses religious discrimination in immigration decisions. I think this is an easy call.

Also included in this rule, Madam Speaker, is a reauthorization of the USA FREEDOM Act, as well as a War Powers Resolution led by Senator KAINE that would require a vote in Congress authorizing the use of force before the President escalates hostilities in Iran.

Madam Speaker, this Democratic majority promised to take it up if it passed the Senate, and I am proud that it did, with broad bipartisan support. This is not a partisan measure. Eight Republicans joined with Senator KAINE in supporting this War Powers Resolution.

Passage here would send the Kaine resolution directly to the President's desk.

□ 1230

Madam Speaker, I don't support the FISA reauthorization bill. I appreciate the bipartisan work that went into trying to fashion a compromise, but in the final analysis, I, in good conscience, can't support it.

But on the other matters, make no mistake: This is a historic opportunity. Congress has a chance to reassert its constitutional authority over matters of war and peace; to live up to its Article I responsibility; and to truly respect our troops by giving them the debate on the future that they deserve, should tensions with Iran escalate again.

I hope all my colleagues seize it, and I urge a strong vote for this rule.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank Representative MCGOVERN for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Madam Speaker, the rule before us today, the Senate amendment to H.R. 2486, contains the text of two pieces of legislation, H.R. 2214 and H.R. 5581, along with the Senate version of the Affordable Prescriptions for Patients Act of 2019 as a pay-for.

Also included are S.J. Res. 68, a resolution to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran, and H.R. 6172, the USA FREEDOM Reauthorization Act.

By combining all of these bills together, Democrats have prohibited the

minority, meaning the Republicans, the ability to offer a motion to commit on the floor. The only thing I can think of is that I guess they are afraid we might pass our seventh MTR, as we passed one last week.

H.R. 2214 eviscerates the President's ability, under the law, to limit who may legally enter the United States. President Trump has utilized existing law to determine which countries fail to meet international standards of information sharing or identity management, or were at a high risk of terrorism or public safety concern, and the executive orders he issued reflected that determination. The majority is now seeking to prevent the President from ever using that authority again.

The bill terminates the executive orders currently in place and ceases "all actions taken pursuant to any proclamation or executive order terminated" by the bill, which means that all information sharing on terrorists, criminals, and other security threats would cease.

The seven countries specifically targeted with travel restrictions in Executive Order 13769 were actually countries that were determined by Congress and the Obama administration to be countries of particular concern for terrorism activity.

This bill contains onerous reporting and consultation requirements that would effectively prevent the President from acting quickly in the event quick action would be needed.

For example, H.R. 2214 requires consultation between only the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Homeland Security. However, this does not cover many emergencies the President needs to respond to.

For example, in the event of a disease outbreak, including the novel coronavirus, the Centers for Disease Control would need to be consulted with respect to suspending entry of certain populations.

The combined rule also includes H.R. 5581. This legislation would require the Department of Homeland Security to ensure that every individual who is subject to a secondary inspection would be guaranteed access to counsel or anyone of their choosing within an hour.

This definitely would have serious logistical and practical consequences for CBP's ability to quickly and efficiently screen travelers and carry out the mission of facilitating unlawful trade and travel. CBP conducts over 17 million secondary inspections each year.

Can you imagine that, for every car, a CBP officer is looking at a screen, when there is the X-ray machine of the car, and they radio over to the CBP officer at the port of entry and say: "Hey, look in the trunk"? Then, they would have to wait an hour if the person objects and says, "Oh, I want counsel," or, "I want my relative to come within an hour." I mean, this is just way onerous.

This combined rule also contains S.J. Res. 68, a resolution to direct the removal of the United States Armed Forces from hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran.

First, I want to note that Secretary Pompeo testified in front of the House Foreign Affairs Committee that "we are not" engaged in hostilities against Iran. Thus, the joint resolution is unnecessary.

While Congress has a constitutional duty to authorize the use of military force, we should not be issuing blanket prohibitions without taking the time to develop an appropriate Authorization for Use of Military for the Middle East.

The net effect of the bill may be to make many U.S. counterterrorism operations in the Middle East illegal. Rather than handcuffing our Armed Forces, we should be providing them with the tools they need to effectively combat terrorism against America and Americans abroad.

Lastly, this rule contains H.R. 6172, the USA FREEDOM Reauthorization Act. This bill reauthorizes expiring provisions necessary to defend the United States, while also including significant reforms to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act to restore accountability.

In order to ensure that past FISA abuses, like those against Carter Page, never happen again, numerous reforms are included to protect the American people from both terrorist threats and government overreach.

For example, the bill requires the Attorney General to transmit rules to ensure that FISA applications are accurate and complete. The Attorney General would also be required to approve, in writing, a FISA investigation of an elected official or a Federal candidate.

Also, the FISA court will now transcribe hearings, with DOJ giving FISA applications and relevant materials to Congress in a timely manner, to ensure we can conduct appropriate oversight.

It also creates a new division within DOJ, a compliance officer, that will specifically look at these FISA applications to make sure they are accurate.

Although I am pleased with much of the FISA reform bill, it is unfortunate that it is included with a lot of other bills in this rule, controversial bills that I don't like. Therefore, I urge opposition to the rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, for the record, I want my colleagues to know that pandemics and instances like the coronavirus are already covered by the legislation. Nothing in this bill prohibits the President from using authority under section 212(f) to contain the coronavirus.

This bill allows the President to suspend the entry of a class of individuals if it is determined that they would undermine the security or public safety of

the United States or the preservation of human rights, democratic processes or institutions, or international stability.

But out of an abundance of caution, the Judiciary Committee added a clarification clause on page 7 of the NO BAN Act, which clearly states that the term “public safety” includes efforts necessary to contain a communicable disease of public health significance, as defined in section 34(2)(b) of title 42, Code of Federal Regulations.

So, this has nothing to do with coronavirus. We are taking action on this bill basically to end the President’s discriminatory travel bans.

Madam Speaker, I am quoting from a letter from the ACLU that I will include in the RECORD.

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION,
March 10, 2020.

VOTE “YES” ON NO BAN ACT, VOTE “NO” ON ANY AMENDMENTS OR OTHER CHANGES

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), and our more than 8 million members, supporters, and activists, we write to express our support for the NO BAN Act, though we have concerns about language that has been added. As the NO BAN Act is scheduled for a floor vote this week, it is essential that no further changes be made to the bill—so that this authority cannot be used to ban whole communities.

We urge you to vote “YES” on the NO BAN Act in its current form and vote “NO” on any amendments or other changes. The ACLU will score this vote.

The ACLU continues to support the version of the NO BAN Act scheduled for a floor vote this week. However, we have concerns about recent language included in the bill defining public safety to address “communicable disease” in response to the current climate and fear around COVID-19 (coronavirus). These changes are unnecessary and further stigmatize immigrant communities where many are facing discrimination in the United States given the Trump administration’s stereotypes about communities of color and immigrants—including in reference to coronavirus. There is a long history in the United States of inaccurate connections between health risks and immigrants, which has resulted in irrational immigration policies and discrimination; we are not interested in repeating the mistakes of our past. Any restrictions related to coronavirus, such as those regarding China and Iran, must be based in science and public health, not politics or xenophobia.

The NO BAN Act continues to achieve the ultimate goals of the legislation, which are to rescind the Muslim ban, refugee Muslim ban, and asylum ban, and make critical changes to the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA) by putting in place a more stringent standard for presidents invoking any similar suspension or restriction. During the House Judiciary Committee markup, the bill was amended to rescind the President’s recently expanded Muslim ban which was issued on January 31st, and targets more African countries, and requires visa reporting related to this ban.

Under current law, the executive branch claims the authority to bar the entry of large groups of people without effective accountability and without regard for the policies codified in other parts of the INA. The NO BAN Act would strengthen limitations on this authority by raising the standard for invoking it. Rather than the current broad

and undefined standard, the proposed bill would require the executive branch to meet a more stringent standard—based on “specific and credible facts” that any suspension or of restriction from entry must be connected to “specific acts” that have actually occurred. Furthermore, the bill requires that any such suspension or restriction meet a compelling government interest and that the government use the least restrictive means in doing so.

The NO BAN Act would also establish a system of checks and balances whereby Congress would be routinely notified and briefed on the status, implementation and constitutional and legislative authority of the executive branch’s actions. Finally, the proposed legislation would expand the non-discrimination provision of the INA to prohibit discrimination based on religion. While language connecting these two critical changes to the INA has been removed, the bill now includes a rule of construction indicating that the President, Secretary of State, and Secretary of Homeland Security cannot use this authority to act in a manner that is inconsistent with other policy decisions in immigration law.

This bill is a significant step forward for Muslim communities and other communities that could be targeted discriminatorily or without good reason. By creating substantive standards and accountability, it greatly reduces the possibility of future bias-based bans.

The ACLU urges you to vote “YES” on the NO BAN Act in its current form and vote “NO” on any amendments or other changes. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

RONALD NEWMAN,
National Political Director.

MANAR WAHEED,
Senior Legislative and Advocacy Counsel.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, one of the things they point out here, which I want to agree with, is that they say: “There is a long history in the United States of inaccurate connections between health risks and immigrants, which has resulted in irrational immigration policies and discrimination; we are not interested in repeating the mistakes of our past. Any restrictions related to coronavirus, such as those regarding China and Iran, must be based in science and public health, not politics or xenophobia.”

What a radical idea, to actually base some of these decisions on science. Yet, we know that this administration doesn’t have any regard for science.

Madam Speaker, I will also include in the RECORD a May 20 Washington Post article titled “I think Islam hates us”: A timeline of Trump’s comments about Islam and Muslims.”

[From the Washington Post, May 20, 2017]

I THINK ISLAM HATES US: A TIMELINE OF TRUMP’S COMMENTS ABOUT ISLAM AND MUSLIMS

(By Jenna Johnson and Abigail Hauslohner)

President Trump is in Saudi Arabia this weekend to meet with Arab leaders, visit the birthplace of Islam and give a speech about religious tolerance with the hope of resetting his reputation with the world’s 1.6 billion Muslims. But it’s unclear if a two-day visit is enough to overshadow his past statements about Islam and its faithful, with his rhet-

oric becoming more virulent as he campaigned for president.

Here’s a look back at some of the comments that he has made:

March 30, 2011: For years, Trump publicly questioned then-President Barack Obama’s religious beliefs and place of birth. As he debated running for president in the 2012 election, Trump said in a radio interview: “He doesn’t have a birth certificate, or if he does, there’s something on that certificate that is very bad for him. Now, somebody told me—and I have no idea if this is bad for him or not, but perhaps it would be—that where it says ‘religion,’ it might have ‘Muslim.’ And if you’re a Muslim, you don’t change your religion, by the way.” (Obama is a Christian, and state records show he was born in Hawaii.)

Sept. 17, 2015: At a campaign town hall in New Hampshire, a man in the audience shouted out: “We have a problem in this country; it’s called Muslims. We know our current president is one.” The man mentioned Muslim “training camps” and asked: “When can we get rid of them?” Trump responded: “We’re going to be looking at a lot of different things. You know, a lot of people are saying that, and a lot of people are saying that bad things are happening out there. We’re going to be looking at that and plenty of other things.”

Sept. 20, 2015: On NBC News, Trump was asked if he would be comfortable with a Muslim as president; he responded: “I can say that, you know, it’s something that at some point could happen. We will see. I mean, you know, it’s something that could happen. Would I be comfortable? I don’t know if we have to address it right now, but I think it is certainly something that could happen.”

Sept. 30, 2015: At a New Hampshire rally, Trump pledged to kick all Syrian refugees—most of whom are Muslim—out of the country, as they might be a secret army. “They could be ISIS, I don’t know. This could be one of the great tactical ploys of all time. A 200,000-man army, maybe,” he said. In an interview that aired later, Trump said: “This could make the Trojan horse look like peanuts.”

Oct. 21, 2015: On Fox Business, Trump says he would “certainly look at” the idea of closing mosques in the United States.

Nov. 16, 2015: Following a series of terrorist attacks in Paris, Trump said on MSNBC that he would “strongly consider” closing mosques. “I would hate to do it, but it’s something that you’re going to have to strongly consider because some of the ideas and some of the hatred—the absolute hatred—is coming from these areas,” he said.

Nov. 20, 2015: In comments to Yahoo and NBC News, Trump seemed open to the idea of creating a database of all Muslims in the United States. Later, he and his aides would not rule out the idea.

Nov. 21, 2015: At a rally in Alabama, Trump said that on Sept. 11 he “watched when the World Trade Center came tumbling down. And I watched in Jersey City, N.J., where thousands and thousands of people were cheering as that building was coming down.”

Nov. 22, 2015: On ABC News, Trump doubled down on his comment and added: “It was well covered at the time. There were people over in New Jersey that were watching it, a heavy Arab population, that were cheering as the buildings came down. Not good.” (While there were some reports of celebrations overseas, extensive examination of news clips turn up no such celebrations in New Jersey.)

Nov. 30, 2015: On MSNBC, a reporter asked Trump if he thinks Islam is an inherently peaceful religion that’s been perverted by a small percentage of followers or if it is an inherently violent religion. Trump responded:

“Well, all I can say . . . there’s something going on. You know, there’s something definitely going on. I don’t know that that question can be answered.” He also said: “We are not loved by many Muslims.”

Dec. 3, 2015: The morning after Syed Rizwan Farook and Tashfeen Malik killed 14 people in San Bernardino, Calif., Trump called into Fox News and said: “The other thing with the terrorists is you have to take out their families, when you get these terrorists, you have to take out their families.” (Killing the relatives of suspected terrorists is forbidden by international law.) Later, in a speech to the Republican Jewish Coalition, Trump criticized Obama for not using the phrase “radical Islamic terrorism” and commented: “There’s something going on with him that we don’t know about.”

Dec. 6, 2015: On CBS News, Trump said: “If you have people coming out of mosques with hatred and death in their eyes and on their minds, we’re going to have to do something.” Trump also said he didn’t believe the sister of one of the San Bernardino shooters who said she was crestfallen for the victims, saying: “I would go after a lot of people, and I would find out whether or not they knew. I would be able to find out, because I don’t believe the sister.”

Dec. 7, 2015: Trump’s campaign issued a statement saying: “Donald J. Trump is calling for a total and complete shutdown of Muslims entering the United States until our country’s representatives can figure out what is going on.” Trump read this statement aloud at a rally in South Carolina.

Dec. 8, 2015: On CNN, Trump quoted a widely debunked poll by an anti-Islam activist organization that claimed that a quarter of the Muslims living in the United States agreed that violence against Americans is justified as part of the global jihad. “We have people out there that want to do great destruction to our country, whether it’s 25 percent or 10 percent or 5 percent, it’s too much,” Trump said.

Dec. 13, 2015: On Fox News, Trump was asked if his ban would apply to a Canadian businessman who is a Muslim. Trump responded: “There’s a sickness. They’re sick people. There’s a sickness going on. There’s a group of people that is very sick.”

Jan. 12, 2016: At a rally in Iowa, Trump shared his suspicions about Syrian refugees and then read the lyrics to Al Wilson’s 1968 song “The Snake,” the story of a “tender woman” who nursed a sickly snake back to health but then was attacked by the snake. Trump often read these lyrics at rallies.

Feb. 3, 2016: Trump criticized Obama for visiting a mosque in Baltimore and said on Fox News: “Maybe he feels comfortable there . . . There are a lot of places he can go, and he chose a mosque.” (It was Obama’s first visit to a mosque during his presidency, and it was made in an effort to encourage religious tolerance in light of growing anti-Muslim sentiment.)

Feb. 20, 2016: After Obama skipped the funeral of Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia, Trump tweeted: “I wonder if President Obama would have attended the funeral of Justice Scalia if it were held in a Mosque? Very sad that he did not go!” (Obama did pay his respects when Scalia’s body lay in repose in the Supreme Court.) That night at a rally in South Carolina, Trump told an apocryphal tale that he would return to repeatedly about U.S. Gen. John J. Pershing fighting Muslim insurgents in the Philippines in the early 1900s and killing a large group of insurgents with bullets dipped in pigs’ blood.

March 9, 2016: On CNN, Trump said: “I think Islam hates us. There’s something there that—there’s a tremendous hatred there. There’s a tremendous hatred. We have to get to the bottom of it. There’s an unbelievable hatred of us.”

March 22, 2016: Soon after three suicide bombings in Brussels tied to a group of French and Belgian Muslims, Trump told Fox Business: “We’re having problems with the Muslims, and we’re having problems with Muslims coming into the country.” Trump called for surveillance of mosques in the United States, saying: “You have to deal with the mosques, whether we like it or not, I mean, you know, these attacks aren’t coming out of—they’re not done by Swedish people.”

On NBC News, Trump added: “This all happened because, frankly, there’s no assimilation. They are not assimilating . . . They want to go by sharia law. They want sharia law. They don’t want the laws that we have. They want sharia law.”

March 23, 2016: In an interview with Bloomberg TV, Trump said that Muslims “have to respect us. They do not respect us at all. And frankly, they don’t respect a lot of the things that are happening throughout not only our country, but they don’t respect other things.”

March 29, 2016: During a town hall in Wisconsin, CNN’s Anderson Cooper asked Trump: “Do you trust Muslims in America?” Trump responded: “Do I what?” Cooper again asked: “Trust Muslims in America?” Trump responded: “Many of them I do. Many of them I do, and some, I guess, we don’t. Some, I guess, we don’t. We have a problem, and we can try and be very politically correct and pretend we don’t have a problem, but, Anderson, we have a major, major problem. This is, in a sense, this is a war.”

May 20, 2016: On Fox News, Trump said this of Muslims: “They’re going to have to turn in the people that are bombing the planes. And they know who the people are. And we’re not going to find the people by just continuing to be so nice and so soft.”

June 13, 2016: The day after the mass shooting at a gay nightclub in Orlando, Trump declared in a speech in New Hampshire that “radical Islam is anti-woman, anti-gay and anti-American.” He criticized his Democratic rival, Hillary Clinton, for refusing to use the term “radical Islam” and for speaking positively of Islam. “Hillary Clinton’s catastrophic immigration plan will bring vastly more radical Islamic immigration into this country, threatening not only our society but our entire way of life. When it comes to radical Islamic terrorism, ignorance is not bliss. It’s deadly—totally deadly,” Trump said. Later he added: “I want every American to succeed, including Muslims—but the Muslims have to work with us. They have to work with us. They know what’s going on.”

June 14, 2016: At a rally in North Carolina, Trump noted that the Orlando shooter’s parents are Muslim Americans who immigrated from Afghanistan. “The children of Muslim American parents, they’re responsible for a growing number for whatever reason a growing number of terrorist attacks,” he said, adding that immigration from Afghanistan has increased five-fold. “. . . Every year we bring in more than 100,000 lifetime immigrants from the Middle East and many more from Muslim countries outside of the Middle East. A number of these immigrants have hostile attitudes.”

June 15, 2016: On Fox News, Trump said this of Muslims who immigrate to the United States: “Assimilation has been very hard. It’s almost—I won’t say nonexistent, but it gets to be pretty close. And I’m talking about second and third generation. They come—they don’t—for some reason, there’s no real assimilation.”

July 21, 2016: In accepting the Republican Party’s presidential nomination, Trump focused heavily on “brutal Islamic terrorism” and promised: “I will do everything in my

power to protect our LGBTQ citizens from the violence and oppression of a hateful foreign ideology.”

July 24, 2016: On NBC News, Trump defended his proposal for a Muslim ban, despite some of his aides insisting he had rolled it back. “People were so upset when I used the word Muslim. ‘Oh, you can’t use the word Muslim,’” Trump said. “. . . But just remember this: Our Constitution is great, but it doesn’t necessarily give us the right to commit suicide, okay? Now, we have a religious—you know, everybody wants to be protected. And that’s great. And that’s the wonderful part of our Constitution. I view it differently. Why are we committing suicide? Why are we doing that?”

Aug. 11, 2016: At a meeting of evangelical leaders in Orlando, Trump said: “If you were a Christian in Syria, it was virtually impossible to come into the United States. If you were a Muslim from Syria, it was one of the easier countries to be able to find your way into the United States. Think of that. Just think of what that means.”

Aug. 18, 2016: During a rally in North Carolina, Trump said that “all applicants for immigration will be vetted for ties to radical ideology, and we will screen out anyone who doesn’t share our values and love our people.”

Sept. 19, 2016: At a rally in Florida, Trump reacted to explosions over the weekend in New York and New Jersey and said: “There have been Islamic terrorist attacks in Minnesota and New York City and in New Jersey. These attacks and many others were made possible because of our extremely open immigration system, which fails to properly vet and screen the individuals and families coming into our country. Got to be careful.”

Jan. 27, 2017: Within a week of becoming president, Trump signed an executive order blocking Syrian refugees and banning citizens of seven predominantly Muslim countries from entering the United States for 90 days. This order goes into effect immediately, prompting mass chaos at airports, protests and legal challenges. Rudolph W. Giuliani, a close adviser to the president, later said on Fox News: “So when [Trump] first announced it, he said, ‘Muslim ban.’ He called me up. He said, ‘Put a commission together. Show me the right way to do it legally.’”

Feb. 28, 2017: Despite urging from some of his Cabinet members, Trump continues to use the term “radical Islamic terrorism,” including in a speech to a joint session of Congress.

March 6, 2017: Trump issues a new travel ban for citizens from six majority-Muslim countries, which is also challenged in the courts.

April 29, 2017: At a rally celebrating his 100th day in office, Trump once again dramatically read “The Snake.”

May 17, 2017: At a commencement ceremony, Trump previewed his upcoming overseas trip and said: “I’ll speak with Muslim leaders and challenge them to fight hatred and extremism and embrace a peaceful future for their faith. And they’re looking very much forward to hearing what we, as your representative, we have to say. We have to stop radical Islamic terrorism.”

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, the President’s comments and tweets about Muslims are truly, truly offensive, and I could list everything he said here today, but it is a long, long list. I think repeating those words would be a mistake because they are unworthy of this floor.

President Trump’s Muslim ban continues a sad and unfortunate history of

policies that used immigration law to target people based on their backgrounds. We have had policies in our history that targeted immigrants from China, Japan, and Asia, and laws that qualified people of White descent for naturalization at the expense of everyone else.

Those policies are wrong. They are shameful. And they went against everything this country stands for. President Trump's Muslim ban belongs right beside them, in the dustbin of history, as well.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), my good friend.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Arizona, my good friend, for yielding time. And frankly, I want to associate myself with her remarks about the underlying legislation.

My remarks, Madam Speaker, will focus on the manner in which the bills that are before us are being brought to the floor.

It is, frankly, very disappointing to me, Madam Speaker, that this even needs to be said. But given the grave consequences of what the majority is proposing to do procedurally, I cannot condemn today's rule strongly enough.

In today's measure, what the majority is proposing amounts to a de facto change to the House rules, one that will trample on the rights of the minority and deny any opportunity to amend the bill on the floor.

Rather than bringing up the two immigration items as the standalone bills that they actually are, the majority has instead chosen the procedural gimmick of using a Senate-amended House bill to package these items together. This has the same effect of denying the minority the more than 100-year-old right to make a motion to recommit, or MTR, as they are commonly known, before moving to final passage.

This is because, under House rules, the minority is not allowed to offer an MTR on any House measures that have been amended by the Senate. Of course, for the majority, the denial of the minority's traditional rights to an MTR is the whole point of this procedural exercise. These underhanded procedural shenanigans are specifically intended to deny the minority the right to an MTR on these bills.

Before my friend, the chairman, responds with the number of times a Republican majority used this procedure, let me be perfectly clear. As he knows, we never, never did that as a means to deny the minority an MTR. In fact, we did it in consultation with the minority and with the sole goal of accelerating passage of key bipartisan legislation in the Senate.

So, why does the Democratic majority insist on these procedural gymnastics? I can think of only one reason: The majority is embarrassed that the minority has now passed an MTR six

times in this Congress, including one just last week.

Madam Speaker, this is now the second time in the past 6 weeks that the majority is explicitly adopting a procedure to deny the minority our rights.

□ 1245

I think that if the majority is really so frightened of the motion to recommit and they really want to do away with MTRs, then they should change the standing rules of the House, and that needs to happen on a vote on the House floor so that everyone can see what the majority is actually doing and how it operates.

When Republicans were in the majority, the thought of limiting the use of the MTR to silence minority voices never once crossed our minds, and that is because we recognized the importance of the MTR to this institution. It has been around since the very beginning of the institution, and it has been in its present form since 1909.

In fact, in 1919, Representative Abraham Garrett of Tennessee was quoted as saying: "The motion to recommit is regarded as so sacred it is one of the few things protected against the Committee on Rules by the general rules of the House."

Evidently, not anymore.

The present majority is not content with that state of affairs, which is why they are trying, once again, to do an end run around the House rules and adopt a procedural gimmick specifically to stop the minority from exercising its right to an MTR. It is beyond disappointing, Madam Speaker.

It is shocking that the majority would feel the need to rig the entire system to shut us up. My goodness, they have a 35-seat majority. But we all know why that is. It is because the majority cannot effectively defend its own policies.

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

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COLE. So, today, Madam Speaker, I call on all Members to vote "no" on this rule. I ask that my colleagues, regardless of party, reject this rigged process, reject this rule, and act to protect the rights of every Member of this Chamber. The future of the institution depends on it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I have high regard for my ranking member, Mr. COLE, and I know he and I both share enormous respect for this institution, but I am going to say for the Record that this process that we are using is not unusual. It is a process that was used by Republicans numerous times during their majority, including 15 times during the past two Republican-led Congresses, to send bills over to the Senate for their expedited consideration.

And I will say, with respect to the gentleman, he mentioned that we were

consulted about these processes in the past. I was never consulted when the Republicans used this process. In fact, I remember a time when the Republicans basically hijacked a Democratic bill to attach something to it, without even consulting the sponsor of the bill. So I am not sure what the gentleman was alluding to, and I don't know what my friend's intentions were when they utilized this process.

Madam Speaker, I can't speak to the motivations of the previous majority when they used this process over a dozen times, but what I can speak to is the impact. Each time this process was used by the Republican majority, the Democratic minority was unable to offer a motion to recommit. That is just a fact.

Republicans used this process 15 times over the past two Congresses, and, you know, I get it. My Republican friends want to have an opportunity to try to politicize this debate even more around immigration. But I just want to remind everybody why we are here.

The offensive things that this President has said about immigrants and about Muslims are unconscionable. These travel bans serve no purpose other than to discriminate against Muslims and people from predominantly Muslim countries.

President Trump issued these baseless travel bans under the guise of national security. But we all know what they are really about. They fulfill Trump's offensive campaign promise calling for a "total and complete shutdown of Muslims entering the United States."

Those are the President's words.

These discriminatory bans have a real impact on real people's lives and have already affected more than 135 million individuals. So that is why we are debating whether to terminate the travel bans and to stand up against discrimination and hate without any distractions, without any political gimmicks.

I know my friends are not happy with that, but we are going to do the right thing. We are going to stand up to hate and bigotry and discrimination, and we are going to move this legislation forward, and everybody will have an up-or-down vote.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, before I yield time to my friend, I want to point out again that Mr. COLE has been here a long time, and when he says to the public on the floor that when Republicans used this process of combining the bills together in a rule that it was to expedite it over to the Senate, I believe him. And so I believe that their motivation is different, and that is to prevent the minority from having a motion to recommit.

Madam Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL), my good friend.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend from Arizona for yielding.

I want to stipulate, Madam Speaker, that I have seen the gentleman from Massachusetts, the leader of our committee, do some things on that committee that no one else has tried to do.

I was in this institution for a decade as a chief of staff, now a decade as a Member of Congress, and he has done some amazing things that I believe will serve this institution and serve the committee, not just this Congress, but next Congress and for decades to come. And I applaud him and his very capable team for pushing those initiatives forward.

But, today, Madam Speaker, we are talking about the exact opposite side of that coin, things that are done in the name of expediency today that may well do damage to this institution, not just this Congress and next Congress, but for decades to come. Habits happen in this institution, Madam Speaker. Habits happen.

My friend from Massachusetts used to work for a great leader in this institution, Mr. Joe Moakley. In fact, his picture hangs on the wall as a former chairman of the Rules Committee.

I used to work for a great Member of this institution as well, Madam Speaker, Mr. John Linder, out of the great State of Georgia. He also served on the Rules Committee.

As we come down to the floor today, for my friends of the majority to defend for the second time in 6 weeks taking away the minority's right to have any input on the process whatsoever, I thought I would go back 20 years from today, back to the year 2000, when the gentleman from Massachusetts' former boss and my former boss sat in these very same chairs.

At that time, Madam Speaker, Republicans were in the majority. I will go back to October 3 of 2000 when Mr. Linder took to the floor and said:

And the rule provides a motion to recommit, as is the right of the minority.

Republicans were in control, complete control, of this institution. They could jam anything through that they wanted to jam through. But it was the right of the minority to have at least a final voice and a final opportunity to amend the bill.

October 12, a week later, Mr. Linder and Mr. Moakley were on the floor again. Mr. Linder says:

And, finally, the rule provides for one motion to recommit, as is the right of the minority.

Again, Madam Speaker, October 19 of that same year, just a week after that, Mr. Linder and Mr. Moakley on the floor again:

The rule provides a motion to recommit, as is the right of the minority.

We will go a week after that, Madam Speaker. Same two gentlemen on the floor again, same Republican majority in charge. Mr. Linder, on the floor:

Resolution . . . as is the right of the minority.

A week after that, Madam Speaker:

Motion to recommit, with or without instructions, as is the right of the minority.

I will go on and on and on. Because 20 years ago, it was not a question of whether or not the minority would have a single voice. Remember, Madam Speaker, these bills that the gentleman from Massachusetts is talking about, these immigration bills, went through committee, no Republican amendments were adopted; went to the Rules Committee, no Republican amendments were made in order. There has been absolutely no minority input of any kind on these bills he is talking about. There is so much more in this underlying bill. But 20 years ago, the habit was we would recognize that the minority has a right.

In fact, I don't even need to go back 20 years, Madam Speaker. I serve on the Select Committee on Modernization. That is a bipartisan committee here in the House that is designed to look at the current rules and organization of the House and talk about how it is that we can do better.

I don't have to go back 20 years, Madam Speaker. I can go back to last year, March 13, 2019, a press release from the Speaker of the House, NANCY PELOSI, on the remarks that she made in front of that joint select committee looking at modernizing the institution. And she said: Some people have talked about changing the motion to recommit, this or that. But she said:

I am a big respecter of the rights of the minority in the Congress of the United States, and I believe as Speaker of the whole House that initiatives you put forth must come from the whole House.

We are looking at how to make the motion to recommit better, Madam Speaker. I will take us back to a prescription drugs bill just a few short weeks ago, where the minority traded away its right to a motion to recommit in favor of a complete substitute.

Let's debate the issues instead of the motion to recommit. The motion to recommit that passed last week, Madam Speaker, said let's not allow violent convicted criminals to serve as TSA agents.

This is what the majority is protecting America from: amendments from the minority that would protect TSA employees from working side by side with violent convicted felons. This isn't an adversarial idea, Madam Speaker. This is an idea that we all agreed on, which is why it passed with great bipartisan support.

You never know when the bad habits you get into are going to stick.

I will take you back to a time when my friend, Mr. MCGOVERN, and my ranking member, Mr. COLE, were on the floor just few short years ago, and my friend from Massachusetts said this. He said:

Mr. Speaker, I have nothing but the highest respect for my colleague from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), and I know he wants this House to run better. But the fact of the matter is I feel bad that he has to defend this lousy, restrictive, indefensible process. That is our job on the Rules Committee sometimes.

And I want to say to my friend from Massachusetts, as he said to our friend

from Oklahoma: I have nothing but the highest respect for my colleague from Massachusetts, and I know that he wants this House to run better. But the fact of the matter is I feel bad that he has to defend this lousy, restrictive, indefensible process.

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

Madam Speaker, let me just say for the record, nobody is changing the MTR. We are using a process that my Republican friends used over a dozen times in the past, in the last Congress.

Yes, the Rules Committee has an obligation to try to make sure that we bring important legislation to the floor in a fair and reasonable process, and we are doing that.

But we also have an obligation—

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I would prefer not to be interrupted. I am in the middle of—Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia, because he keeps on interrupting me.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I don't think of it as interrupting. I apologize to Chairman MCGOVERN. I think of it as elucidating.

What my friend has said is absolutely right. This process has been used before, just not for this purpose, which is why *Politico* ran—

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I reclaim my time.

Do you know what? The result, when my friends used this process, is the same. We were not allowed to offer an MTR to any of the bills when they utilized this process.

□ 1300

And so, I just state that that is just a fact. But the Rules Committee also has an obligation, and I believe everybody in this House has an obligation to stand up against bigotry and hate and racism and religious discrimination, and that is what these underlying bills deal with.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a February 16, 2020, The Guardian article, titled; "Trump is deciding who is American": how the new travel ban is tearing families apart."

[From the Guardian, Feb. 16, 2020]

TRUMP IS DECIDING WHO IS AMERICAN: HOW THE NEW TRAVEL BAN IS TEARING FAMILIES APART

(By Sean Levin)

It started out as a joyous day for Olumide. On 31 January, the 32-year-old Nigerian American learned in an email that the US was finally processing the visa applications of his wife and daughter in Nigeria.

Hours later, Donald Trump shattered their celebration, announcing that he was adding six countries to the travel ban, including Nigeria. The decision cuts off pathways to permanent US residency for Nigerians, throwing Olumide's case into limbo at the final stage of the process. It leaves his wife and 11-year-old girl stuck across an ocean with little hope of making it to the US.

"This is inhuman," said Olumide, a systems analyst and US military veteran who

served in Afghanistan and lives in Washington DC. He asked to use his middle name out of fear he might jeopardize his case. "As a soldier, I understand the need to protect the country. But to completely shut the doors . . . it's just plain wrong."

MILLIONS OF AFRICANS NOW BANNED: 'WE ARE NOT CRIMINALS'

Trump's January order builds on the 2017 travel ban that has continued to target five Muslim-majority countries, and significantly restricts permanent residency for nationals from Eritrea, Kyrgyzstan, Nigeria and Myanmar. It also blocks people from Tanzania and Sudan from obtaining green cards through the "diversity visa" lottery.

Just like the 2017 restrictions, it blocks permanent immigration from the targeted countries, making limited exceptions if applicants prove that denials would cause "undue hardship" and that granting them visas would support "national interest".

The original ban already resulted in denied visas for more than 42,000 people, the majority from Iran. The addition of the new countries has doubled the number of Muslims targeted across the globe to roughly 320 million, advocates estimate. Roughly one-quarter of all Africans are now affected. The restrictions now apply to 13 countries, including Nigeria, home to Africa's largest population and economy. It cuts off countries where some are fleeing violence. Some estimate the new ban, which goes into effect on 21 February, could hinder more than 12,000 immigrants seeking to resettle in the US and reunite with family in the next year.

The restrictions are a signature component of Trump's aggressive anti-immigrant agenda, which has included curbs on legal migration, a destruction of the American asylum system, an all-time low cap on refugees, expanded detention and mass deportations.

"Trump started out by scapegoating Muslims in 2017," said Javeria Jamil, attorney with Asian Americans Advancing Justice's Asian Law Caucus, who has been fielding calls from families affected by the new ban. "Now, it's not just the Muslim ban. It has turned into an African ban."

The Trump administration has claimed that the ban, which blindsided some diplomats, is a national security measure, and that the added countries failed to meet US security and information-sharing standards.

But immigrant rights groups said the policy is a political maneuver amid Trump's reelection campaign—and one that will have profound consequences.

"People are in turmoil," said Audu Kadiri, a 43-year-old community organizer who left Nigeria in 2014. He had planned to bring his mother to the US, but the ban may make that impossible. The activist, who now lives in the Bronx, hasn't yet told his mother about Trump's order, because he doesn't know how to break the news. "There is so much collateral damage, it's hard to quantify."

In Nigeria, Kadiri was an LGBTQ+ rights advocate who worked on HIV prevention and other human rights issues. He was forced to flee due to his activism and sought asylum in the US. It's now unsafe for him to return to Nigeria, which is why he wants his 68-year-old mother to come to the US.

He hasn't seen her since 2014 and, if Trump is re-elected, he fears it will be at least another five years before they reunite. She'll probably miss the birth of his third child.

"Nigerians have contributed to the development of this country, like every immigrant community," he said. "We are not criminals."

TORN APART, WITH DWINDLING OPTIONS

Before the January announcement, the Trump administration had already clamped

down on travel from Africa, including hikes in visa fees, and new obstacles and increased denials for Nigerians seeking approval for short-term visits. The US further suspended visitor visas from Eritrea in 2017.

That means families have been fighting for years to use the dwindling avenues available to them to reunite, and for those who have invested significant time and money into the process, the sudden news of an outright ban was particularly brutal.

"There's nothing you can do, and it makes you feel so helpless," said Olumide, the veteran. Olumide arrived in the US from Nigeria when he was 10 years old. He met his wife in Nigeria in 2012 after he left the military, and the two got married last year.

US Citizenship and Immigration Services approved the petition for his wife and daughter in January, just before the announcement of the ban. But they don't yet have their visas—and the ban may make it impossible to get them.

Olumide had hoped they would be starting their lives together in the US by now, and said he was pained by feelings of guilt: "I made promises to her." The couple hasn't fully processed the news, he added: "We don't want to think about not being together."

He noted that his daughter has typhoid and his wife has malaria, and he constantly fears for their health and safety.

Hana Mohamed, a 20-year-old student in San Diego, who grew up in Sudan, said she was eager for her grandparents to come to the US, especially so her grandmother could get medical care in California: "It's just so sad and frustrating. They are getting older, and I want to see them before anything happens."

Mohamed said it was difficult to accept that the US was banning large groups of Muslims in the name of safety while seeming to do little about the ongoing terror threat of American mass shootings: "It's just so shocking that we have come to this day where a whole nation of people are getting discriminated against. Isn't the purpose of the United States to stand up for everyone who is getting hurt and treat them right?"

One Eritrean American who works as an engineer in Silicon Valley, and requested anonymity for fear of hurting his family's case, has petitioned for his mother to come live with him in the US and was hoping she would soon get an interview date at the embassy. Then the new ban was unveiled.

"We've waited our turn. We've followed the law. I'm a tax-paying citizen contributing to the economy," he said, noting that his mother is 69 years old and lives alone in Eritrea. "This is just pure evil."

He said he felt Trump was implementing the ban as a "soundbite for the campaign" while disregarding that it would leave Eritreans like his mother with no options: "This was our only hope to get her here."

For Eritreans, the ban comes as the Trump administration has ramped up deportations of Eritrean asylum seekers, despite the US government's own acknowledgment of the torture and arbitrary detention Eritreans are currently facing.

Abraham Zere, an Eritrean journalist who was granted asylum in the US and now lives in Ohio, said it seemed some Eritreans were reluctant to speak out about the ban and live in fear of potential repercussions from both governments: "People are scared to even discuss it."

Zere's own family is affected: his mother is still in Eritrea, separated from her children. She can't even video chat with her family because of the poor internet in Eritrea, which means she never gets to see her granddaughter, an eight-year-old she hasn't yet met, he said.

Some warn the ban may have life-or-death consequences. For queer and transgender migrants in the targeted countries, it could lead them to embark on perilous journeys to escape to the US as they run out of options, said Zack Mohamed, who is Somali American and a member of the Black LGBTQIA+ Migrant Project: "This is a big 'not welcome' sign in front of our faces."

In response to questions about the impact on migrants fleeing violence, a US state department spokesperson said the ban was not meant to "limit the ability of an individual to seek asylum", adding: "Our first priority remains national security. We continue to work with our dedicated consular officers in the field to identify and expedite those individuals with urgent travel needs."

Asked about charges that the ban is discriminatory, the spokesperson said the restrictions are based on "nationality" and "visa category" and that "consular officers do not adjudicate based on religion". The spokesperson said there were specific criteria to determine which countries are restricted and noted that Chad was on the original list but removed in 2018.

FIGHTING TO END THE BAN

With the first travel ban upheld by the US supreme court, there are few recourses left to challenge the policy. Advocates are hoping a Democratic president will immediately repeal the ban and have also recently renewed the push for Congress to pass the No Ban Act, which would end the ban and prevent discriminatory immigration policies.

Until then, Trump will continue to use his executive power to try to redefine what it means to be a citizen, advocates warned.

"The president of the United States, the US government is explicitly trying to decide who gets to be an American," said Eric Naing, who is Burmese American and works with Muslim Advocates, a group that has challenged the ban. His family would not have been able to come to the US if the ban on Myanmar had been in place. "He's saying I shouldn't be American. My parents shouldn't be American. It's deeply upsetting."

Olumide noted that the ban was punishing countless American citizens like him: "It's hurting the exact people you're trying to protect."

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, the President's travel ban isn't just bad policy, it is cruel. And it is tearing families apart.

That includes veterans who have served our Nation, some of whom were in the middle of the process of bringing their families to America when this policy came down. Now they worry their loved ones may never be able to join them here in the United States, all because of a completely arbitrary Muslim ban.

One veteran said in this piece, "As a soldier, I understand the need to protect the country. But to completely shut the doors . . . it's just plain wrong."

These veterans aren't trying to endanger our country, Madam Speaker, they put their lives on the line to protect it. But this is the kind of real-life impact we are seeing. The President's ban is not just offensive, it is actively separating loved ones, including those who have served this country on the battlefield. I mean, it is time to say: "Enough."

My friends like to talk about how they support our troops and our veterans. Well, this policy is adversely impacting so many of our veterans.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a February 2, 2020, New York Times article, titled, "New U.S. Travel Ban Shuts Door on Africa's Biggest Economy, Nigeria."

[From the New York Times, Feb. 2, 2020]

NEW U.S. TRAVEL BAN SHUTS DOOR ON AFRICA'S BIGGEST ECONOMY, NIGERIA

(By Ruth Maclean and Abdi Latif Dahir)

The newlyweds had already been apart for half their yearlong marriage. Miriam Nwegbe was in Nigeria. Her husband was in Baltimore, and until she could join him, everything was on hold: finding a home together, trying for their first baby, becoming an American family.

Then, on Friday, their lives were thrown into disarray by the expansion of President Trump's ban on immigration to include six new countries, including four in Africa. Nigeria, the continent's most populous nation, was one of them.

"America has killed me," Ms. Nwegbe's husband, Ikenna, an optometrist, texted her when he heard. "We are finished."

A year after the Trump administration announced that a major pillar of its new strategy for Africa was to counter the growing influence of China and Russia by expanding economic ties to the continent, it slammed the door shut on Nigeria, the continent's biggest economy.

The travel restrictions also apply to three other African countries—Sudan, Tanzania, and Eritrea—as well as to Myanmar, which is accused of genocide against its Muslim population, and Kyrgyzstan, a former Soviet state.

The ban will prevent thousands of people from being able to move to the United States.

The initial ban, which was put into effect in 2017, restricted travel from some Muslim-majority countries as part of Mr. Trump's plan to keep out "radical Islamic terrorists." It has already affected more than 135 million people—many of them Christians—from seven countries.

With the new expansion, the ban will affect nearly a quarter of the 1.2 billion people on the African continent, according to W. Gyude Moore, a visiting fellow at the Center for Global Development, a research group, potentially taking a heavy toll on African economies—and on America's image in the region.

"Chinese, Turkish, Russian, and British firms, backed by their governments, are staking positions on a continent that will define the global economy's future," he said, adding, "One hopes that the United States would follow suit and fully engage with the continent—but that hope fades."

The rationale for the new restrictions varies depending on country, but the White House announcement said that most of the six countries added to the list did not comply with identity-verification and information-sharing rules.

And Nigeria, it said, posed a risk of harboring terrorists who may seek to enter the United States. The country has been hit brutally by the Islamist group Boko Haram, though the extremists have shown little sign that they have the capability to export their fight overseas.

Critics, many of whom also denounced the initial ban, saw something far more venal at play.

"Trump's travel bans have never been rooted in national security—they're about discriminating against people of color," Sen-

ator Kamala Harris, the former Democratic presidential candidate, declared on Sunday. "They are, without a doubt, rooted in anti-immigrant, white supremacist ideologies."

Two Democrats still in the race also weighed in. Elizabeth Warren described the measure as a "racist, xenophobic Muslim ban." Former Vice President Joseph R. Biden Jr. called it "a disgrace."

And Nancy Pelosi, the house speaker, said Democratic lawmakers would push ahead with a measure to forbid religious discrimination in immigration policy.

Beyond those people who may now never make it across American borders, the new ban could also affect millions who have no plans to travel to the United States themselves but may have benefited from the billions of dollars in remittances visa holders send home each year.

The United States may also emerge a loser, studies suggest. Nigerians are among the most successful and highly educated immigrants to America. (Mr. Trump, demanding to know why immigration policies did not favor people from countries like Norway, once disparaged those from Africa and Haiti, and said Nigerians would never go back to their "huts" if they were allowed in.)

Hadiza Aliyu lives in Borno, the Nigerian state at the epicenter of the Boko Haram crisis that has left tens of thousands dead. But she thought she had found a way out.

Ms. Aliyu was preparing to apply to move to the United States, where she once studied and where her two brothers live.

She was furious when she heard about the extended ban.

"Trump has been looking for a way to get at us Africans for a very long time, and finally got us," Ms. Aliyu said. "To hell with Republicans and their supremacist ideas."

Mika Moses moved to Minnesota from Nigeria nine years ago to join his mother and siblings, who were allowed entry after the family was attacked in religious riots in their northern city of Kaduna in 1991. His wife, Juliet, and their daughter were planning to join him, but are stuck in Kaduna, where Ms. Moses sells soda in a small store.

She said they were heartbroken by the news that the move would now be impossible.

"I have been struggling to raise our daughter alone," she said. "Why would Trump do this to us, after we have waited for nine years?"

Nigerians already living in the United States have been calling lawyers to try to figure out whether they will have to leave. Marilyn Eshikena, a biomedical research ethicist, has lived in the United States for the past seven years, but her visa expires this year. Her employer sponsored her application for a green card.

"If it turns out that everything needs to stop, they will feel cheated, because they spent a lot of money on this process," Ms. Eshikena said. "I will also feel cheated, because all the time that I spent working here will ultimately be for nothing. I can't even imagine what packing up and leaving will mean for me."

Her departure may also have serious consequences for her brother, who is studying in Canada. Ms. Eshikena has been sending part of her earnings to help pay his rent.

Some Nigerians praised Mr. Trump for his decision, arguing it might make it more difficult for those responsible for stealing government money back home to find cover in the United States, and force the country's leaders to be more honest and work harder to develop Nigeria.

In 2018, 7,922 immigrant visas were issued to Nigerians. Of these, 4,525 went to the immediate relatives of American citizens, and another 2,820 to other family members. An

estimated 345,000 people born in Nigeria were living in the United States in 2017, according to the census bureau.

If the visas are coveted in Nigeria, they are just as prized in African countries like Eritrea, where government repression is rampant and those who try to leave face obstacles and danger. With more than 500,000 refugees living outside the country, Eritrea was the ninth-largest source of refugees in the world in 2018, according to the United Nations, but fewer than 900 Eritreans received immigrant visas to the United States that year.

Abraham Zere, a journalist who moved to the United States from Eritrea in 2012, had dreamed of living in the same country as his mother since leaving home. On Saturday, he said his plans to bring her to the United States had been thrown into disarray. His family has been in constant communication on the messaging platform WhatsApp trying to understand what the ban will mean for them.

"This decision complicates everything and creates fear," said Mr. Zere, 37, a doctoral candidate at the School of Media Arts and Studies at Ohio University.

Mr. Zere and other Eritreans say they can't go back. They fear they will be punished for criticizing the government or leaving without approval.

"If I can't be reunited with my mother," Mr. Zere said, "it nullifies the whole notion of protection and punishes innocent citizens for reasons they had no slightest part in."

With nine siblings scattered across Europe, Africa, and the United States, Mr. Zere said their family has never had a full family portrait taken.

The economic consequences of the ban could be far-reaching, experts said.

"Being cut off from the largest economy in the world systematically is problematic," said Nonso Obikili, a Nigerian economist.

The biggest impact, he said, could be on remittances.

Nigerians abroad send home billions of dollars each year, \$24 billion in 2018 alone, according to the accounting firm PwC. With Nigeria's economy highly dependent on oil and its unemployment rate at 23 percent, this money provides a lifeline for millions of its citizens.

The new restrictions come at a time when the United States says it wants to jockey for power in Africa, particularly through its "Prosper Africa" initiative announced last summer, which aims to double two-way trade and investment.

"If on the one hand you're trying to make a push into Africa, and on the other hand you're barring the largest African country by population from moving to your country, then it does send mixed signals," Mr. Obikili said.

In January 2017, Mr. Trump's travel ban targeted several other African nations, including Chad, Libya, and Somalia. Chad was later removed from that list, but the executive order halted the plans of thousands of Somali refugees living in camps in Kenya who were about to travel to the United States and start new lives.

According to the United States Department of Homeland Security, nearly 30,000 Nigerians overstayed their nonimmigrant visas in 2018. The number of Nigerians visiting the United States dropped sharply after the Trump administration made it harder for visitors to obtain visas last summer.

The new restrictions affect those who want to move to the United States, not visit it.

The six countries newly added to the immigration ban are not easily categorized together by religion. Nigeria, for example is thought to be home to more than 200 million people, roughly half of them Muslim and half Christian. Of the four African countries

newly singled out, only Sudan has a significant majority of Muslims.

The United States has left Sudan on a list of state sponsors of terrorism, even as the country works to reverse decades of authoritarian rule under President Omar Hassan al-Bashir, who was deposed in April.

"This ban contributes to the overall impression that Sudan remains a very fragile state," said Cameron Hudson, a senior fellow with the Atlantic Council, a research group.

Many people from the countries newly targeted by the ban said the uncertainty was the hardest thing to bear. Ms. Nwegbe, the newlywed, who works as the chief operating officer of a tourism company that tries to encourage people to visit Africa, said the ban came as she and her husband were building their future.

"We're in limbo and our relationship is suffering," she said. "This is unnecessary hardship."

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, the President's ban is not about national security, it is about targeting immigrants from predominantly Muslim countries.

In 2017, the President issued an executive order that banned foreign nationals from seven Muslim-majority countries from entering the United States. Then earlier this year, he went even further, expanding the travel ban to six more countries.

This is affecting over 300 million people on the African Continent and refugees from Myanmar, where the Muslim minority is facing a genocide—genocide, Madam Speaker.

This administration is closing the door on the very people who are struggling to survive. That is not the America that I know. That is not an American value. We need to act to defend our values.

Madam Speaker, I just want to point out to my colleagues that what is in place right now, what this White House has done, I think by any objective or reasonable measure, is wrong. It reflects badly on who we are as a country. It is not just. It is not fair. It is so wrong.

And we all—I don't care what our political persuasion may be, I don't care whether you support the President in his reelection bid or not—I mean, we have to do what is right for our country. This is doing great damage to who we are. It represents the kind of closed-mindedness, and the kind of bigotry that we should all be fighting against.

Madam Speaker, I hope my friends will vote for the rule and vote for this legislation. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY).

Mr. MCCARTHY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. And I apologize if I jumped ahead in any way, shape, or form. I appreciate the opportunity to speak.

Madam Speaker, with all that is going on this week, Democrats have still found time for their favorite pastime, voting on partisan legislation that would actually make our country weaker.

Democrats could not have picked a worse week to try to undermine American travel restrictions.

President Trump's quick decision to restrict travel to countries like Iran and China; now that was smart. It was a smart response, and it is helping to keep America safe. The President's actions, then and now, are clearly within his rights.

But today, I want to talk about the rights of this Congress, of this body, and how Democrats want to take those away.

For the second time this Congress, the House is considering two important pieces of legislation by attaching them to completely unrelated shell vehicles, thereby preventing the minority from offering a motion to recommit.

Now, the last time this occurred, Representative RO KHANNA actually admitted the maneuver was intentionally designed to silence dissenting opinions. He didn't just admit it, he bragged about it, that they would be able to deny the voice of Congress.

And now, with last week's passage of the sixth motion to recommit this Congress, Democrat leadership is once again choosing to restrict debate on an issue of national security. It is not only that this is bad for America, it is bad for the tradition of fairness and free debate that, you know what, Democrats promised to uphold.

Don't take my word for it. I listened to my friend, Chairman MCGOVERN of the Rules Committee say, in September 2018, and I quote, Madam Speaker, he boasted on this very floor: "If Democrats are trusted with the majority, we will have a more accommodating process. This place will be run like professionals. Ideas will be allowed to come forward, and the House of Representatives will actually debate again."

If there is one thing we know about this Democrat majority, it is that they overpromise and under-deliver. Today is no exception.

The right that Democrats want to take away is an important right, maybe one of the most important in all of Congress. It is the last chance for a minority party to offer amendments on legislation. It is called the motion to recommit.

As you know, the motion to recommit has been a hallmark of the House for more than 100 years. It was created to give the minority party the right "to have a vote upon its position upon great public questions."

I have got to be very clear. Eliminating this would be a nuclear option.

That is why I sent a letter—actually two letters—to Democrat leadership to stop this madness. Unfortunately, my last letter to Leader HOYER on this subject went unanswered, so did my letter this week to Leader HOYER and Chairman MCGOVERN.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD both of the letters at this time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 27, 2020.

Hon. STENY H. HOYER,
Majority Leader of the House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MAJORITY LEADER HOYER: I am writing to request that you suspend consideration of this week's Iran-related legislation until basic and essential rights of the minority are observed.

As we both can agree, the decision to go to war is the most significant choice Congress can make, followed only by impeachment. No matter what one thinks of the 2002 AUMF, there are weighty consequences—both real and symbolic—when the House debates overturning military authorization and possibly cutting funding for American troops serving in a volatile theater. I would hope that such an extraordinary step would be taken with a careful eye towards promoting full and thorough deliberation.

Unfortunately, the manner in which you intend to bring these measures to the floor is anything but full and thorough. Specifically, by attaching these items to an unrelated Gold Medal bill, you purposefully eliminated the last opportunity afforded to the minority party to amend legislation—the Motion to Recommit—a maneuver Representative Ro Khanna recently admitted was intentionally designed to silence dissenting opinions.

Simply put, this is wrong—and I believe you know it to be in bad faith. In fact, we are unaware of the House ever debating matters of war and peace in such an unprecedented, irregular, and restrictive way.

From its inception in 1909, the Motion to Recommit was created with the stated purpose of giving the minority party the right "to have a vote upon its position upon great public questions." Certainly, the issue before us this week meets the standard of a great public question.

More recently, you, yourself, stated: "More members, from across the ideological spectrum, need to have input into the work we do." I would respectfully ask that we strive towards that standard and immediately remedy this overreach so the minority may be allowed to offer input on the legislation before us, as has been tradition for over one hundred years in the House.

It had been my hope that in this new year, we would begin to move on from the numerous abuses or power we witnessed on the part of the House majority during the impeachment proceedings. If, however, we can no longer count on fundamental safeguards to minority rights being guaranteed, I fear your decision this week will only serve to further erode trust, fairness, and comity in this institution moving forward.

I look forward to your response on this critical matter.

Sincerely,

KEVIN MCCARTHY,
House Republican Leader.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 9, 2020.

Hon. STENY H. HOYER,
Majority Leader of the House,
Washington, DC.

Hon. JIM MCGOVERN,
Chairman, House Committee on Rules,
Washington, DC.

LEADER HOYER AND CHAIRMAN MCGOVERN: I am writing to request that you suspend consideration of this week's Judiciary legislation until basic and essential rights of the minority are fairly observed.

For now the second time this Congress, it appears the House will consider two pieces of legislation by attaching them to a completely unrelated shell vehicle, thereby precluding the minority from offering a motion to recommit.

The last time this occurred, Representative Ro Khanna admitted the maneuver was intentionally designed to silence dissenting opinions. Coming on the heels of the 6th motion to recommit being adopted this Congress, it serves to reason that Democrat Leadership is once again willfully choosing to restrict debate, rather than promote a full and thorough deliberation of these measures.

My last letter to Leader Hoyer on this subject regrettably went unanswered. Given the gravity of this new precedent you are setting for our institution, I believe all members deserve a public response to the following questions:

Will you commit to ending this practice, which has been pursued without any consultation or sign-off from our side of the aisle?

If not, are you contemplating using any Republican-sponsored vehicles in this ploy, which presumably would be done without their approval?

What is the status of the request by freshmen Democrats to consider ending the use of the motion to recommit entirely?

As you both know, the motion to recommit has been a hallmark of the House for over one hundred years. It was created with the stated purpose of giving the minority party the right "to have a vote upon its position upon great public questions."

In my view, eliminating the motion to recommit would be akin to the "nuclear option" in the House. I sincerely believe neither of you seeks to have that ignominious distinction on your resumes. However, your actions thus far in the 116th Congress sadly do not inspire confidence.

Though we may not serve in the majority at present, our members still represent millions of Americans across the country who lend us their voice and count on us to fight for their priorities in Washington. In that spirit, I would respectfully ask that we not proceed on these measures until the minority is allowed to offer meaningful input on the matters before us through a motion to recommit, as has been tradition in the House since 1909.

We look forward to your response on this critical matter.

Sincerely,

KEVIN MCCARTHY,
House Republican Leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Madam Speaker, I believe the Members of this House deserve a public response about this situation. Will Democrats commit to ending this abusive practice, or do they plan to follow the lead of their freshmen and end the use of the motion to recommit entirely, to end a 100-year history of the body of this House?

MTRs not only promote full and thorough deliberation, but they also improve legislation. Think for a moment, just within this Congress, 6 out of 60 MTRs have been adopted by this Congress. Think about that.

That means a bipartisan majority of this House felt the need to improve 10 percent of the bills put forward on which MTRs were offered. That should show you how vital the last amendment is and always should be.

Madam Speaker, though we may not serve in the majority right now, our Members still represent millions of Americans who lend us their voice and count on us to fight for their priorities in Washington.

Madam Speaker, the last 8 years this House had a different majority. I hap-

pened to have the privilege of serving as majority leader. Not once did we ever consider taking away the MTR, because we believed in the minority's rights and the traditions of the institution in which we are privileged to serve.

We believed that the power of the idea should win. We believed in the promises that we made and that is why we kept them. We would not make promises while in the minority, and when we captured the majority, in less than a year, break them time and again. We would not go unanswered, a question from the minority as well.

There is something bigger than politics. It is the voice of the American public—to use the sheer power of politics to silence millions of Americans is just wrong; to change a tradition that has been around more than 100 years; to make sure a bill cannot become better simply because you want the partisan side; or to be so afraid of the debate to deny it to happen, we are so much better than that—the rights and the traditions of this institution in which we have always been privileged to serve. I wish I could say the same for this new Democrat majority.

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

Madam Speaker, I just want to remind the distinguished minority leader that in the last Congress my Republican friends used this exact same process 15 times, and it ended up denying us a motion to recommit.

But I also want to say, I don't need any lectures about how this House should be run from the distinguished gentleman from California. I remind my friends on both sides of the aisle that in the last Congress when the Republicans were in charge, it was the most closed Congress in the history of the United States of America.

No other Congress in our history had more closed rules where Members were denied the ability to offer anything on the House floor. And my friends somehow take that as a great sign of—I don't want to go back to those days.

Madam Speaker, I will just say one other thing. The distinguished minority leader made the statement that somehow this bill that we are trying to bring forward somehow would make this country less safe.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD an article that appeared in the New York Times, titled "Trump's Travel Ban, Aimed at Terrorists, Has Blocked Doctors."

[From the New York Times, Feb. 6, 2017]

TRUMP'S TRAVEL BAN, AIMED AT TERRORISTS,
HAS BLOCKED DOCTORS

(By Donald G. McNeil Jr.)

The Trump administration has mounted a vigorous defense of its ban on travel from seven majority-Muslim nations, saying it is necessary to prevent terrorists from entering the United States. But the ban, now blocked by a federal judge, also ensnared travelers important to the well-being of many Americans: doctors.

Foreign-born physicians have become crucial to the delivery of medical care in the United States. They work in small towns where there are no other doctors, in poor urban neighborhoods and in Veterans Affairs hospitals.

Foreign-born physicians "are the doctors in small towns in Maine and Iowa," said Dr. Patricia F. Walker, the associate director of the University of Minnesota's Global Health Pathway, which helps refugee doctors practice in the United States.

"They go to the places where graduates of Harvard Medical School don't want to go," she said.

Across the United States, more than 15,000 doctors are from the seven Muslim-majority countries covered by the travel ban, according to The Medicus Firm, a firm that recruits doctors for hard-to-fill jobs. That includes almost 9,000 from Iran, almost 3,500 from Syria and more than 1,500 from Iraq.

Dr. Hooman Parsi, an oncologist so talented that he has an O-1 visa granted to individuals with "extraordinary ability or achievement," was to start seeing patients on Wednesday in San Bernardino, Calif.

A federal judge in Seattle lifted the administration's travel ban on Friday, and a federal appeals court has declined to restore it. Yet Dr. Parsi is still stuck in Iran, waiting for a delayed visa amid the confusion while his American employer fumes.

"We need him desperately," said Dr. Richy Agajanian, the managing partner of the Oncology Institute of Hope and Innovation, which had just hired him. "We had an office completely constructed—we spent three months on it, and it was supposed to open Feb. 1. Now we can't open it. This is really sad and frustrating."

The 30-doctor practice does a lot of work in the Inland Empire, in San Bernardino and Riverside Counties, Dr. Agajanian noted. "It's very sparse in doctors out there—many miles between oncologists," he said. "The patients he would be seeing have to travel another 25 miles now. Our doctors are already overworked, and now they'll have to be on call more often."

The United States has a persistent doctor shortage, even though 31 new medical schools have opened since 2002 and many existing ones have increased class sizes, according to Merritt Hawkins, a Dallas-based medical recruiting firm.

It also noted that there are 22 percent more residencies available each year than there are American graduates to take them. Graduates of foreign medical schools now fill that gap; the largest number come from India, followed by Pakistan, China, the Philippines, Iran and Israel.

(Iran is on Mr. Trump's exclusion list; Pakistan, a Muslim-majority country with a history of internal and external terror attacks, is not.)

Many foreign graduates have J-1 visas, which give them about three years to complete their residencies. "They must pass licensing exams and they must do a residency to practice here, even if they're superstars where they come from," said Phillip Miller, a Merritt Hawkins spokesman.

Foreign-born graduates have often worked at world-class institutions and have published academic papers, so they have higher average scores than American graduates on the medical knowledge portions of the licensing examinations, according to Merritt Hawkins research—though most initially score lower on the clinical skills portions, which include English and communication skills.

"I had to work my butt off to get here," said Dr. Abdelghani el Rafei, a first-year resident at the University of Minnesota. "They only take the top graduates from schools in countries like mine."

Such foreign-born graduates must return home when their visas expire, but they can get extensions if they agree to work in an area that the Department of Health and Human Services considers “medically underserved,” which is roughly defined as having less than one primary care doctor for every 3,000 people.

Those who practice in an underserved area for several years can apply for green cards. “After that, they can practice anywhere, but at least you’ve had three or four years of a physician in your town, and that’s pretty significant,” Mr. Miller said.

Citing figures from the Iowa Board of Medicine, The Des Moines Register reported last week that 172 doctors practicing in Iowa were from the seven countries subject to Mr. Trump’s travel ban, and that 23 percent of the state’s 13,000 practicing doctors were born outside the United States.

Andrea Clement, a spokeswoman for Medicus, said that 76 percent of the foreign doctors it placed last year had gone to areas with fewer than 25,000 people or to small to medium-size cities of 25,000 to 500,000.

It placed more foreign doctors in Wisconsin than in any other state, she said, followed by California, Texas, Maryland, Oregon, Missouri, Tennessee, Ohio and Arizona.

Some urban areas are medically underserved, too. While Manhattan’s Upper East Side has five times the number of doctors it needs to be adequately served under federal guidelines, parts of the Bronx and Brooklyn have acute doctor shortages.

More than 150,000 residents of Brooklyn’s Bedford-Stuyvesant section, for example, are rated as medically underserved under federal guidelines. One of the doctors stranded overseas last week, according to Pro Publica, was Dr. Kamal Fadlalla, an internal medicine specialist from Sudan who is a second-year resident at Interfaith Medical Center, which serves Bedford-Stuyvesant and Crown Heights.

Many foreign-born doctors, experts said, go into family medicine, pediatrics, internal medicine, general surgery and other front-line specialties where they see thousands of patients a year, including many on Medicare and Medicaid, rather than pursuing lucrative urban specialties like plastic surgery.

As an oncologist, Dr. Parsi was an exception. He moved to the United States in 2007 for postdoctoral work in molecular biology. Then, after passing his medical exam, he completed his residency at the University of Cincinnati and a fellowship in hematology and oncology at the University of Pittsburgh Medical Center.

Because he had to leave the country to get his new visa stamped into his passport, he had flown to Dubai, in the United Arab Emirates. He cleared a security vetting there, he said, but had to wait a few days for the visa, so he flew to Tehran to see his father.

But the new court ruling affects only those who had current visa stamps in their passport, so even though he is being issued a new visa, he still cannot return to the United States, he said on Saturday.

“Everyone, including me, would like to keep the bad people out,” said Dr. Naeem Moulki, a Syrian citizen who is finishing his medical residency in Minneapolis and plans to begin a cardiology fellowship in Chicago in the fall. “But this is not the best way to do it. If I have to leave, it affects my patients.”

Dr. El Rafei said that the ban, which means he cannot go home to see his family, had depressed him.

“I felt like I was back in Syria again,” he said. “You feel hunted there, as if you did something wrong, even if you didn’t. Now I feel the same way here.”

He sees patients one day a week at the V.A. Hospital in Minneapolis, where he is sometimes asked where he is from.

“One of my patients, he was a veteran in his 60s, said to me, ‘Why do you people hate us?’” he said. “I told him about Syria. I said: ‘We don’t hate you. The bad people you see on TV are the same people who make us suffer, too.’”

“I love this country,” he added. “There’s a time in our residency when we can work in Africa or someplace. I want to work in a small American town, to show people that we’re not all bad. The U.S. gives us a lot, so we want to give back what we can.”

Correction: Feb. 6, 2017

An earlier version of this article misattributed a quotation about the preparation necessary for a foreign doctor to get work in the United States. It was said by Dr. Abdelghani el Rafei, a first-year resident at the University of Minnesota, not Dr. Naeem Moulki, a Syrian citizen who is finishing his medical residency in Minneapolis.

Correction: Feb. 25, 2017

An article on Feb. 6 about the effect of the Trump administration’s ban on travel from seven majority-Muslim nations on foreign-born doctors in the United States described incorrectly the physicians seeing patients in rural settings. Forty-two percent of doctor visits in these areas are handled by family physicians, not by foreign-born physicians. (The figure for foreign-born physicians is not known.)

Mr. MCGOVERN. It says: “Foreign-born physicians have become crucial to the delivery of medical care in the United States. They work in small towns where there are no other doctors, in poor urban neighborhoods and in Veterans’ Affairs hospitals.”

It also says: “Across the United States, more than 15,000 doctors are from the seven Muslim-majority countries covered by the travel ban, according to The Medicus Firm, a firm that recruits doctors for hard-to-fill jobs. That includes almost 9,000 from Iran, almost 3,500 from Syria, and more than 1,500 from Iraq.”

I didn’t hear a single word about that. I didn’t hear a single word about how denying doctors the ability to come here is somehow in our national interest. Not a single word objecting to the hate-filled rhetoric coming out of this White House denigrating Muslims.

We have a President who bragged about trying to put in place a Muslim ban. I mean, we have a lot of talk on this floor about the need for religious freedom and to speak out against discrimination against individuals based on their religion, and yet, not a word about that.

So, what we are doing by bringing these bills to the floor, we are standing up for American values, we are rejecting bigotry, we are rejecting hate, we are rejecting intolerance.

Madam Speaker, I hope all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will support our effort.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY).

Mr. MCCARTHY. Madam Speaker, my dear friend raised an issue that is very interesting, because he knows

this. At any time that it was used it was in consultation with the minority. Even when it was taken away, you know what we did, we added back an amendment so you could have the debate on the floor. It was only during appropriations consultation with you to be able to move something in a timely manner. He understands that.

Madam Speaker, my only question to my friend on the other side is: Will the gentleman answer the letter? When the minority leader of the House sent the Rules Committee chairman a letter—the simple question is—with three simple questions: Will the gentleman take this opportunity to answer the letter? That is all I ask.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the distinguished minority leader’s question. I would just say to him that the letter that he referred to, I read about it in the press. I didn’t receive it until last night.

I will also say to him, again, this consultation that he talks about is something that none of us have any recollection of.

In fact, I remember when the Republicans hijacked the Democratic bill to basically deny us a motion to recommend. We were never consulted about that.

I would simply say to my friends on the other side of the aisle that this is about whether or not we are going to stand and tolerate a policy that I think by any measure is bigoted and, quite frankly, undermines our values.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1315

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We have obviously had a heated debate today, and it has been interesting. Of course, we disagree on a number of things.

Madam Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will amend the rule to immediately bring to the floor Leader MCCARTHY’s bill, H.R. 6177, which would require Members of Congress to disclose delinquent tax liabilities and wage garnishments.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) to further explain the amendment and the leader’s bill.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As my friend said, if we defeat the previous question, we will offer H.R. 6177. Leader MCCARTHY’s bill, H.R. 6177, is simple. It requires Members of Congress to disclose unpaid tax liabilities

and garnishments in their annual financial disclosure reports.

As we approach tax season, where, under a penalty of fine or prison, we expect every American to file their taxes, those same hardworking Americans deserve to know whether their Representatives are doing the same.

And, like the American public, if a Member of this body fails to meet their tax obligations, my bill requires their pay be placed into escrow until their tax obligation is met. This is responsible governing that informs the public and holds all of us accountable.

The House should advance this legislation today.

This bill falls under the jurisdiction of the Committee on House Administration, and, as ranking member, I am prepared to work with the Chief Administrative Officer to execute this legislation. Also, as ranking member of the committee, I have seen legislation run through this committee that tried to use the tax dollars of hardworking Americans to fund their own congressional campaigns. Every member of the majority in this room, in this Chamber, cosponsored that bill when it was introduced.

This 6-to-1 small dollar match of campaign dollars would have created a mandatory donation from the American taxpayer to each congressional candidate, meaning, for every \$200 donated to a campaign, the Federal Government—the taxpayers—would give \$1,200 to that Member of Congress' campaign.

Imagine if every Member of Congress—not counting all the candidates in each congressional race, just the current 435 Members—received just \$1 million in matched funds from the Federal Government, from the taxpayers. That is close to half a billion dollars going just to the campaigns, the political coffers of Members of Congress.

If it is the position of the majority party to force Americans to support politicians with their tax dollars and raise the taxes of hardworking families, we should at least let those same Americans know which of us in this body are even paying their own taxes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. In addition to the NO BAN bill, there is also a War Powers Resolution bill that will be made in order if this rule passes.

I include in the RECORD a February 14 New York Times article, titled: "White House Memo Justifying Suleimani Strike Cites No Imminent Threat."

[From The New York Times, Feb. 14, 2020]

WHITE HOUSE MEMO JUSTIFYING SULEIMANI STRIKE CITES NO IMMINENT THREAT

(By Catie Edmondson)

WASHINGTON.—The White House told Congress on Friday that President Trump authorized the strike last month that killed Iran's most important general to respond to attacks that had already taken place and deter future ones, contradicting the president's claim that he acted in response to an imminent threat.

In a legally mandated, two-page unclassified memo to lawmakers, the White House asserted that the strike that killed Maj. Gen. Qassim Suleimani was "in response to an escalating series of attacks in preceding months" by Iran and Iran-backed militias.

"The purposes of this action were to protect United States personnel, to deter Iran from conducting or supporting further attacks against United States forces and interests, to degrade Iran's and Quds Force-backed militias's ability to conduct attacks, and to end Iran's strategic escalation of attacks," said the report, which was transmitted on Friday to the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

The document confirmed what lawmakers had privately suspected as the Trump administration has offered a shifting set of justifications for the strike against General Suleimani in Baghdad—taken with no congressional consultation—which brought the United States and Iran to the brink of war.

"This official report directly contradicts the president's false assertion that he attacked Iran to prevent an imminent attack against United States personnel and embassies," Representative Eliot L. Engel of New York, the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, said in a statement. "The administration's explanation in this report makes no mention of any imminent threat and shows that the justification the president offered to the American people was false, plain and simple."

In the days after the strike that killed General Suleimani, administration officials gave a variety of rationales for the action as they confronted questions about why the president undertook such a provocative move that could incite an escalation with a dangerous rival. Mr. Trump and other top officials, including Secretary of State Mike Pompeo, said the strike was conducted in response to imminent threats to American lives, but they declined to provide any evidence, leaving lawmakers in both parties irate.

Pressed over several days, Mr. Pompeo conceded that the United States did not have specific intelligence on where or when an attack would take place. Mr. Trump claimed that four American embassies had been targeted for attacks, but under questioning during a television interview, Mark T. Esper, the secretary of defense, said he had seen no evidence of that.

Mr. Trump later insisted on Twitter that General Suleimani had, in fact, been planning an imminent attack on United States forces, but added, "it doesn't really matter because of his horrible past!"

Representative Michael McCaul of Texas, the top Republican on the Foreign Affairs Committee, said in a statement that "U.S. intelligence indicated Soleimani was plotting more attacks on Americans and he was an authorized target in Iraq because of the ongoing threat he posed to Americans there."

"The administration would have been 'culpably negligent' if they hadn't acted," Mr. McCaul said, quoting Gen. Mark A. Milley, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. "It is unfortunate that Democrats continue to criticize the president for a successful U.S. military strike of this brutal terrorist with American blood on his hands."

The report on Friday came a day after the Senate passed a resolution aimed at restraining Mr. Trump's war-making powers with Iran. The rare bipartisan vote illustrated the depth of the skepticism in both parties about the president's strategy, and lawmakers' frustration with the administration's refusal to consult Congress on military matters. The House is expected to pass the measure soon, sending it to the president's desk. Mr. Trump's advisers have said he will veto it.

The White House infuriated lawmakers in early January when it sent Congress a formal notification of the drone strikes required under the War Powers Act. Lawmakers had expected it to lay out a legal justification for the strike, but the entire document was classified, and officials who read it said it contained no information on future threats or an imminent attack.

Lawmakers were further angered by a series of briefings delivered by top administration officials that they described as insulting and demeaning, complaining that they were dismissed for questioning the administration's strategy.

Friday's report also only discussed previous acts of aggression by Iran. It cited as a legal framework the president's constitutional powers as commander in chief and the authorization for the use of military force in Iraq that Congress passed in 2002, using two justifications the administration has previously mentioned.

"Iran's past and recent activities, coupled with intelligence at the time of the airstrike, indicated that Iran's Quds force posed a threat to the United States in Iraq," the report said.

Congressional Democrats have coalesced behind a new push to repeal the 2002 law, which was passed to authorize a military response to Saddam Hussein and his government. They said Mr. Trump's broad reading of it illustrated how the statute has been stretched and distorted to accommodate missions that Congress never envisioned when it was debated.

"To suggest that 18 years later this authorization could justify killing an Iranian official stretches the law far beyond anything Congress ever intended," Mr. Engel said.

The House last month voted to repeal the 2002 law, with lawmakers in both parties arguing that the authorization had become outdated and been abused by presidents as a blank check to circumvent Congress in taking military action. During negotiations on the annual defense policy bill, the White House, focused on creating the Space Force as the sixth branch of military and maintaining the ability to divert military construction funds to pay for the border wall, was initially open to repealing the 2002 law, but the Pentagon intervened.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, Congress has been clear, we did not authorize the President's, in my opinion, reckless actions, nor have we provided any authorization for the use of force against Iran.

What we are hearing from the administration, on the other hand, has been about as clear as mud. Initially, President Trump and other administration officials claimed the January strike was in response to an imminent threat.

Now we have confirmed through a legally mandated report to Congress from the administration that that was not the case.

This report made no mention of imminent threat, confirming the fact that President Trump was legally required to come to Congress for approval before carrying out the strike.

The President may not like it, but the Constitution is clear: The President must seek specific authorization from Congress for any use of force against Iran, period.

And I would just simply say that this shouldn't be controversial because, whether you support the President extending military operations against

Iran or not, we should all agree that Congress has a constitutional responsibility here.

I want to commend my friends in the Senate for passing the Kaine resolution, and I thank the eight Republicans who stood up for the institution and for Congress' constitutional authorities. I point that out, as well, and I hope that my colleagues will support the rule and support the Kaine resolution when it comes up for a vote.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

In closing, I urge my Democratic colleagues to bring to the floor border security measures that will help us help those who are truly in danger and in need of asylum. We can all agree these are issues that need to be fixed. Now let's work together for all our constituents to get things fixed.

Madam Speaker, I urge "no" on the previous question, "no" on the underlying measure, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, my friends on the other side of the aisle want us to get lost on the process, but we can't lose sight of the policy. This is about whether Congress should repeal President Trump's Muslim ban, and we don't agree—I would say, respectfully, to my colleague—on the Rules Committee.

This is about whether we should prevent this administration from putting in place more discriminatory travel bans in the future, whether individuals deserve access to legal advice during the screening process at ports of entry, and whether Congress should vote before any escalation in hostilities with Iran.

That is what is before us in the rule today. These are incredibly important issues. They go to the heart of what America is supposed to be about.

Now, some on the other side are upset that they can't use certain parliamentary procedures to debate all kinds of divisive issues. Instead, they want to make this debate about anything other than the President's reckless foreign policy. I get that, but we are not going to get distracted here.

This President is already looking at expanding his cruel travel ban. His approach abroad is totally unpredictable, and either you are going to stand up for America and stand up for our values, or you are going to stand by the President. That is the choice before us.

For us, the choice is clear. I have constituents who have been adversely impacted, whose lives have been ripped apart by this President's immigration policies. It is heartbreaking. It is not who we are. And, for whatever reason, the President continues down this road

of dividing this country along racial lines, along religious lines, I mean, you name it—constant division.

Enough. Enough. We are better than that. We are better than that.

I hope that there is a strong bipartisan vote in support of the No Muslim Ban Act. This is not who we are. We can't let this be who we are.

I strongly urge a "yes" vote on the rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, when the Committee on Rules filed its report (H. Rept. 116-415) to accompany House Resolution 891, the Committee was unaware that the waiver of all points of order against consideration of the H.R. 6172 included a waiver of Clause 9 of rule XXI, which requires a list of all earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits contained in the measure, or a certification that the measure does not contain any of those items. However, per Chairman SCHIFF's statement submitted for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on March 11, 2020, the provisions that warranted a referral to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence in H.R. 6172 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in Clause 9 of rule XXI.

The text of the material previously referred to by Mrs. LESKO is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 891

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 12. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall resolve into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6177) to require Members of Congress to disclose delinquent tax liabilities and wage garnishments, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. When the committee rises and reports the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 13. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 6177.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

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

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

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Adoption of the resolution, if ordered; and

The motion to suspend the rules and pass S. 760.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 186, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 95]

YEAS—226

Adams	Golden	O'Halleran
Aguilar	Gomez	Ocasio-Cortez
Allred	Gonzalez (TX)	Omar
Axne	Gottheimer	Pallone
Barragán	Green, Al (TX)	Panetta
Bass	Grijalva	Pappas
Beatty	Haaland	Pascrell
Bera	Harder (CA)	Payne
Bishop (GA)	Hastings	Peters
Blumenauer	Hayes	Peterson
Blunt Rochester	Heck	Phillips
Bonamici	Higgins (NY)	Pingree
Boyle, Brendan F.	Himes	Pocan
Brindisi	Horn, Kendra S.	Porter
Brown (MD)	Horsford	Pressley
Bustos	Houlihan	Price (NC)
Butterfield	Hoyer	Quigley
Carbajal	Huffman	Raskin
Cárdenas	Jackson Lee	Rice (NY)
Carson (IN)	Jayapal	Richmond
Cartwright	Jeffries	Rose (NY)
Case	Johnson (GA)	Rouda
Casten (IL)	Johnson (TX)	Roybal-Allard
Castor (FL)	Kaptur	Ruiz
Castro (TX)	Keating	Ruppersberger
Chu, Judy	Kelly (IL)	Rush
Ciilline	Kennedy	Ryan
Cisneros	Khanna	Sánchez
Clark (MA)	Kildee	Sarbanes
Clarke (NY)	Kilmer	Scanlon
Clay	Kim	Schakowsky
Cleaver	Kind	Schiff
Clyburn	Kirkpatrick	Schneider
Cohen	Krishnamoorthi	Schrier
Connolly	Kuster (NH)	Schrier
Cooper	Lamb	Scott (VA)
Correa	Langevin	Scott, David
Costa	Larsen (WA)	Serrano
Courtney	Larson (CT)	Sewell (AL)
Cox (CA)	Lawrence	Shalala
Craig	Lawson (FL)	Sherman
Crist	Lee (CA)	Sherrill
Crow	Lee (NV)	Sires
Cuellar	Levin (CA)	Sitkin
Cunningham	Levin (MI)	Smith (WA)
Davids (KS)	Lieu, Ted	Soto
Davis (CA)	Lipinski	Spanberger
Davis, Danny K.	Loeb sack	Stanton
Dean	Lofgren	Stevens
DeFazio	Lowenthal	Suozi
DeGette	Lowe	Swalwell (CA)
DeLauro	Luján	Takano
DelBene	Luria	Thompson (CA)
Delgado	Lynch	Thompson (MS)
Demings	Malinowski	Titus
DeSaulnier	Maloney,	Tlaib
Deutch	Carolyn B.	Tonko
Dingell	Maloney, Sean	Torres (CA)
Doggett	Matsui	Torres Small
Doyle, Michael F.	McAdams	(NM)
Engel	McBath	Trahan
Escobar	McCollum	Trone
Eshoo	McEachin	Underwood
Espallat	McGovern	Vargas
Evans	McNerney	Veasey
Finkenauer	Meeks	Vela
Fletcher	Meng	Velázquez
Foster	Moore	Vislosky
Frankel	Morelle	Wasserman
Fudge	Moulton	Schultz
Gabbard	Mucarsel-Powell	Waters
Gallego	Murphy (FL)	Watson Coleman
Garamendi	Nadler	Welch
Garcia (IL)	Napolitano	Wexton
Garcia (TX)	Neal	Wild
	Neguse	Wilson (FL)
	Norcross	Yarmuth

NAYS—186

Abraham Gooden Olson
 Aderholt Granger Palmer
 Allen Graves (LA) Pence
 Amash Graves (MO) Perry
 Amodei Green (TN) Posey
 Armstrong Griffith Reed
 Arrington Grothman Reschenthaler
 Babin Guest Rice (SC)
 Bacon Guthrie Rigglesman
 Baird Hagedorn Roby
 Balderson Harris Roe, David P.
 Banks Hartzler Rogers (AL)
 Barr Hern, Kevin Rogers (KY)
 Bergman Herrera Beutler Rose, John W.
 Biggs Hice (GA) Rouzer
 Billrakis Higgins (LA) Roy
 Bishop (NC) Hill (AR) Rutherford
 Bishop (UT) Holding Scalise
 Bost Hollingsworth Schweikert
 Brady Hudson Scott, Austin
 Brooks (AL) Huizenga Sensenbrenner
 Brooks (IN) Hurd (TX) Shimkus
 Buchanan Johnson (LA) Simpson
 Buck Johnson (OH) Smith (MO)
 Bucshon Johnson (SD) Smith (NE)
 Budd Jordan Smith (NJ)
 Burchett Joyce (OH) Smucker
 Burgess Joyce (PA) Spano
 Byrne Katko Stauber
 Calvert Keller Stefanik
 Carter (GA) Kelly (MS) Steil
 Carter (TX) Kelly (PA) Steube
 Chabot King (IA) Stewart
 Cheney King (NY) Stivers
 Cline Kinzinger Taylor
 Cloud Kustoff (TN) Thompson (PA)
 Cole LaHood Thornberry
 Comer LaMalfa Timmons
 Conaway Lamborn Tipton
 Cook Latta Turner
 Crawford Lesko Upton
 Crenshaw Long Van Drew
 Curtis Loudermilk Wagner
 Davidson (OH) Lucas Walberg
 Davis, Rodney Luetkemeyer Walden
 DesJarlais Marchant Walker
 Diaz-Balart Marshall Walorski
 Duncan Massie Waltz
 Dunn Mast Watkins
 Emmer McCarthy Weber (TX)
 Estes McCaul Webster (FL)
 Ferguson McClintock Wenstrup
 Fitzpatrick McHenry Westerman
 Fleischmann McKinley Williams
 Flores Meuser Wilson (SC)
 Foxx (NC) Mitchell Wittman
 Fulcher Moolenaar Womack
 Gallagher Mooney (WV) Woodall
 Gianforte Murphy (NC) Wright
 Gibbs Newhouse Yoho
 Gohmert Norman Young
 Gonzalez (OH) Nunes Zeldin

NOT VOTING—17

Beyer Graves (GA) Perlmutter
 Brownley (CA) Lewis Ratcliffe
 Collins (GA) Meadows Rodgers (WA)
 Fortenberry Miller Rooney (FL)
 Gaetz Mullin Speier
 Gosar Palazzo

□ 1348

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

Ms. MOORE changed her vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 223, nays 188, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 96]

YEAS—223

Adams Garcia (TX) O'Halleran
 Aguilar Gomez Omar
 Allred Gonzalez (TX) Pallone
 Axne Gottheimer Panetta
 Barragan Green, Al (TX) Pappas
 Bass Grijalva Pascrell
 Beatty Haaland Payne
 Bera Harder (CA) Perlmutter
 Bishop (GA) Hastings Peters
 Blumenauer Hayes Peterson
 Blunt Rochester Heck Phillips
 Bonamici Higgins (NY) Pingree
 Boyle, Brendan Himes Pocan
 F, Horn, Kendra S. Porter
 Brindisi Horsford Pressley
 Brown (MD) Houlihan Price (NC)
 Bustos Hoyer Quigley
 Butterfield Huffman Raskin
 Carbajal Jackson Lee Rice (NY)
 Cárdenas Jayapal Richmond
 Carson (IN) Jeffries Rouse (NY)
 Cartwright Johnson (GA) Rouda
 Case Johnson (TX) Roybal-Allard
 Casten (IL) Kaptur Ruiz
 Castor (FL) Keating Rush
 Castro (TX) Kelly (LL) Ryan
 Chu, Judy Kennedy Sánchez
 Cicilline Khanna Sarbanes
 Cisneros Kildee Scanlon
 Clark (MA) Kilmer Schakowsky
 Clarke (NY) Kim Schiff
 Clay Kind Schneider
 Cleaver Kirkpatrick Schrader
 Clyburn Krishnamoorthi Schrier
 Cohen Kuster (NH) Scott (VA)
 Connolly Lamb Scott, David
 Cooper Langevin Serrano
 Correa Larsen (WA) Sewell (AL)
 Costa Larson (CT) Shalala
 Courtney Lawrence Sherman
 Cox (CA) Lawson (FL) Sherrill
 Craig Lee (CA) Sires
 Crist Lee (NV) Slotkin
 Crow Levin (CA) Smith (WA)
 Cuellar Levin (MI) Soto
 Cunningham Lieu, Ted Spanberger
 Davids (KS) Lipinski Stanton
 Davis (CA) Loeb sack Stevens
 Davis, Danny K. Lofgren Suozzi
 Dean Lowenthal Swalwell (CA)
 Loney Takano
 Luján Thompson (CA)
 Luria Thompson (MS)
 Lynch Titus
 Malinowski Tlaib
 Maloney, Tonko
 Carolyn B. Torres (CA)
 Maloney, Sean Torres Small
 Matsui (NM)
 McBath Trahan
 McCollum Trone
 McEchin Underwood
 McGovern Vargas
 McNerney Veasey
 Meeks Vela
 Meng Velázquez
 Moore Visclosky
 Morelle Wasserman
 Moulton Schultz
 Mucarsel-Powell Waters
 Murphy (FL) Watson Coleman
 Nadler Welch
 Napolitano Wexton
 Neal Wild
 Neguse Wilson (FL)
 Norcross Yarmuth

NAYS—188

Abraham Brady Comer
 Aderholt Brooks (AL) Conaway
 Allen Brooks (IN) Cook
 Amash Buchanan Crawford
 Amodei Buck Crenshaw
 Armstrong Bucshon Curtis
 Arrington Budd Davidson (OH)
 Babin Burchett Davis, Rodney
 Bacon Burgess DesJarlais
 Baird Byrne Diaz-Balart
 Balderson Calvert Duncan
 Banks Carter (GA) Dunn
 Barr Carter (TX) Emmer
 Bergman Chabot Estes
 Billrakis Cheney Ferguson
 Bishop (NC) Fitzpatrick
 Bishop (UT) Fleischmann
 Cole Flores

Foxx (NC) LaMalfa Schweikert
 Fulcher Lamborn Scott, Austin
 Gallagher Latta Sensenbrenner
 Gianforte Lesko Shimkus
 Gibbs Long Simpson
 Gohmert Loudermilk Smith (MO)
 Golden Lucas Smith (NE)
 Gonzalez (OH) Luetkemeyer Smith (NJ)
 Gooden Marchant Smucker
 Granger Marshall Spano
 Graves (LA) Massie Stauber
 Graves (MO) Mast Stefanik
 Green (TN) McAdams Steil
 Griffith McCaul Steube
 Grothman McCarty Stewart
 Guest McClintock Stivers
 Guthrie McHenry Taylor
 Hagedorn McKinley Thompson (PA)
 Harris Meuser
 Hartzler Mitchell Thornberry
 Hern, Kevin Moolenaar Timmons
 Herrera Beutler Mooney (WV) Tipton
 Hice (GA) Newhouse Turner
 Higgins (LA) Norman Upton
 Hill (AR) Nunes Van Drew
 Holding Wagner
 Hollingsworth Ocasio-Cortez Walberg
 Hudson Olson Walden
 Huizenga Palmer Walker
 Hurd (TX) Perry Pence
 Johnson (LA) Posey Walorski
 Johnson (OH) Reed Waltz
 Johnson (SD) Reschenthaler Watkins
 Jordan Rice (SC) Weber (TX)
 Joyce (OH) Rigglesman Wenstrup
 Joyce (PA) Roby Westerman
 Katko Rodgers (WA) Williams
 Keller Roe, David P. Wilson (SC)
 Kelly (MS) Rogers (AL) Wittman
 Kelly (PA) Rogers (KY) Womack
 King (IA) Rose, John W. Woodall
 King (NY) Rouzer Wright
 Kinzinger Roy Yoho
 Kustoff (TN) Rutherford Young
 LaHood Scalise Zeldin

NOT VOTING—18

Beyer Gosar Murphy (NC)
 Biggs Graves (GA) Palazzo
 Brownley (CA) Lewis Ratcliffe
 Collins (GA) Meadows Rooney (FL)
 Fortenberry Miller Ruppertsberger
 Gaetz Mullin Speier

□ 1358

So the resolution was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPORT FOR VETERANS IN EFFECTIVE APPRENTICESHIPS ACT OF 2019

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 760) to enable registered apprenticeship programs to better serve veterans, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Nevada (Mrs. LEE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote. The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 412, nays 0, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 97]
 YEAS—412

Abraham Allen Armstrong
 Adams Allred Arrington
 Aderholt Amash Axne
 Aguilar Amodei Babin

Bacon Engel
 Baird Escobar
 Balderson Eshoo
 Banks Espallat
 Barr Estes
 Barragán Evans
 Bass Ferguson
 Beatty Finkenauer
 Bera Fitzpatrick
 Bergman Fleischmann
 Biggs Fletcher
 Bilirakis Flores
 Bishop (GA) Foster
 Bishop (NC) Foxx (NC)
 Bishop (UT) Frankel
 Blumenauer Fudge
 Blunt Rochester Fulcher
 Bonamici Gabbard
 Bost Gallagher
 Boyle, Brendan Gallego
 F. Garamendi
 Brady Garcia (IL)
 Brindisi Garcia (TX)
 Brooks (AL) Gianforte
 Brooks (IN) Luján
 Brown (MD) Gohmert
 Buchanan Golden
 Buck Gomez
 Bucshon Gonzalez (OH)
 Budd Gonzalez (TX)
 Burchett Gooden
 Burgess Gottheimer
 Bustos Granger
 Butterfield Graves (LA)
 Byrne Graves (MO)
 Calvert Green (TN)
 Carbajal Green, Al (TX)
 Cárdenas Griffith
 Carson (IN) Grijalva
 Carter (GA) Grothman
 Carter (TX) Guest
 Cartwright Guthrie
 Casten (IL) Haaland
 Castor (FL) Hagedorn
 Castro (TX) Harder (CA)
 Chabot Harris
 Cheney Hartzler
 Chu, Judy Hastings
 Cicilline Hayes
 Cisneros Heck
 Clark (MA) Hern, Kevin
 Clarke (NY) Herrera Beutler
 Clay Hice (GA)
 Cleaver Higgins (LA)
 Cline Higgins (NY)
 Cloud Hill (AR)
 Clyburn Himes
 Cohen Holding
 Cole Hollingsworth
 Comer Horn, Kendra S.
 Conaway Horsford
 Connolly Houlihan
 Cook Hoyer
 Cooper Hudson
 Correa Huffman
 Costa Huiizenga
 Courtney Hurd (TX)
 Cox (CA) Jackson Lee
 Craig Jayapal
 Crawford Jeffries
 Crenshaw Johnson (GA)
 Crist Johnson (LA)
 Crow Johnson (OH)
 Cuellar Johnson (SD)
 Cunningham Johnson (TX)
 Curtis Jordan
 Davids (KS) Joyce (OH)
 Davidson (OH) Joyce (PA)
 Davis (CA) Kaptur
 Davis, Danny K. Katko
 Davis, Rodney Keating
 Dean Keller
 DeFazio Kelly (IL)
 DeGette Kelly (MS)
 DeLauro Kelly (PA)
 DelBene Kennedy
 Delgado Khanna
 Demings Kildee
 DeSaulnier Kilmer
 DesJarlais Kim
 Deutch Kind
 Diaz-Balart King (IA)
 Dingell King (NY)
 Doggett Kinzinger
 Doyle, Michael Kirkpatrick
 F. Krishnamoorthi
 Duncan Kuster (NH)
 Dunn Kustoff (TN)
 Emmer LaHood

LaMalfa
 Lamb
 Lamborn
 Langevin
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Latta
 Lawrence
 Lawson (FL)
 Lee (CA)
 Lee (NV)
 Lesko
 Levin (CA)
 Levin (MI)
 Lieu, Ted
 Lipinski
 Loebsack
 Lofgren
 Long
 Loudermilk
 Lowenthal
 Lowey
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Luján
 Luria
 Lynch
 Malinowski
 Maloney,
 Carolyn B.
 Maloney, Sean
 Marchant
 Marshall
 Massie
 Mast
 Matsui
 McAdams
 McBath
 McCarthy
 McCaul
 McClintock
 McCollum
 McEachin
 McGovern
 McHenry
 McKinley
 McNeerney
 Meeks
 Meng
 Meuser
 Mitchell
 Moolenaar
 Mooney (WV)
 Moore
 Morelle
 Moulton
 Mucarsel-Powell
 Murphy (FL)
 Murphy (NC)
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Neguse
 Newhouse
 Norcross
 Norman
 Nunes
 O'Halleran
 Ocasio-Cortez
 Olson
 Omar
 Pallone
 Palmer
 Panetta
 Pappas
 Pascrell
 Payne
 Pence
 Perlmutter
 Perry
 Peters
 Peterson
 Phillips
 Pingree
 Pocan
 Porter
 Posey
 Pressley
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Raskin
 Reed
 Reschenthaler
 Rice (NY)
 Rice (SC)
 Richmond
 Riggleman
 Roby
 Rodgers (WA)

Roe, David P.
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rose (NY)
 Rose, John W.
 Rouda
 Rouzer
 Roy
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruiz
 Ruppersberger
 Rush
 Rutherford
 Ryan
 Sánchez
 Sarbanes
 Scalise
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schneider
 Schrader
 Schrier
 Schweikert
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, Austin
 Scott, David
 Sensenbrenner
 Serrano
 Sewell (AL)
 Shalala
 Sherman
 Sherrill
 Shimkus
 Simpson
 Sires
 Slotkin

Smith (MO)
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (WA)
 Smucker
 Soto
 Spanberger
 Spano
 Stanton
 Stauber
 Stefanik
 Steil
 Steube
 Stevens
 Stewart
 Stivers
 Suzzo
 Swalwell (CA)
 Takano
 Taylor
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Timmons
 Tipton
 Titus
 Tlaib
 Tonko
 Torres (CA)
 Torres Small
 (NM)
 Trahan
 Trone
 Turner
 Underwood

Upton
 Van Drew
 Vargas
 Veasey
 Vela
 Velázquez
 Visclosky
 Wagner
 Walberg
 Walden
 Walker
 Walorski
 Waltz
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters
 Watkins
 Watson Coleman
 Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL)
 Welch
 Wenstrup
 Westerman
 Wexton
 Wild
 Williams
 Wilson (FL)
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Womack
 Woodall
 Wright
 Yarmuth
 Yoho
 Young
 Zeldin

(1) the Select Committee on Intelligence, the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate; and
 (2) the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 3. STRATEGY TO ENSURE SECURITY OF NEXT GENERATION WIRELESS COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS AND INFRASTRUCTURE.

(a) STRATEGY REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the President, in consultation with the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, the Secretary of Commerce, the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications and Information, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Director of National Intelligence, the Attorney General, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Energy, and the Secretary of Defense, and consistent with the protection of national security information, shall develop and submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a strategy—

(1) to ensure the security of 5th and future generations wireless communications systems and infrastructure within the United States;

(2) to provide technical assistance to mutual defense treaty allies of the United States, strategic partners of the United States, and other countries, when in the security and strategic interests of the United States, to maximize the security of 5th and future generations wireless communications systems and infrastructure inside their countries; and

(3) to protect the competitiveness of United States companies, privacy of United States consumers, and integrity and impartiality of standards-setting bodies and processes related to 5th and future generations wireless communications systems and infrastructure.

(b) DESIGNATION.—The strategy developed under subsection (a) shall be known as the “National Strategy to Secure 5G and Next Generation Wireless Communications” (referred to in this Act as the “Strategy”).

(c) ELEMENTS.—The Strategy shall represent a whole-of-government approach and shall include the following:

(1) A description of efforts to facilitate domestic 5th and future generations wireless communications rollout.

(2) A description of efforts to assess the risks to and identify core security principles of 5th and future generations wireless communications infrastructure.

(3) A description of efforts to address risks to the national security of the United States during development and deployment of 5th and future generations wireless communications infrastructure worldwide.

(4) A description of efforts to promote responsible global development and deployment of 5th and future generations wireless communications, including through robust international engagement, leadership in the development of international standards, and incentivizing market competitiveness of secure 5th and future generation wireless communications infrastructure options.

(d) PUBLIC CONSULTATION.—In developing the Strategy, the President shall consult with relevant groups that represent consumers or the public interest, private sector communications providers, and communications infrastructure and systems equipment developers.

NOT VOTING—17

Beyer
 Brownley (CA)
 Case
 Collins (GA)
 Fortenberry
 Gaetz
 Gosar
 Graves (GA)
 Lewis
 Meadows
 Miller
 Mullin
 Palazzo
 Ratcliffe
 Rooney (FL)
 Scanlon
 Speier

□ 1406

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SECURE 5G AND BEYOND ACT OF 2020

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 893) to require the President to develop a strategy to ensure the security of next generation mobile telecommunications systems and infrastructure in the United States, and to assist allies and strategic partners in maximizing the security of next generation mobile telecommunications systems, infrastructure, and software, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 893

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 “Secure 5G and Beyond Act of 2020”.

SEC. 2. APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.

In this Act, the term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

SEC. 4. STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION PLAN.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the President shall develop and submit to the appropriate committees of Congress an implementation plan for the Strategy (referred to in this Act as the "Implementation Plan"), which shall include, at a minimum, the following:

(1) A description of United States national and economic security interests pertaining to the deployment of 5th and future generations wireless communications systems and infrastructure.

(2) An identification and assessment of potential security threats and vulnerabilities to the infrastructure, equipment, systems, software, and virtualized networks that support 5th and future generations wireless communications systems, infrastructure, and enabling technologies, which shall, as practicable, include a comprehensive evaluation of the full range of threats to, and unique security challenges posed by, 5th and future generations wireless communications systems and infrastructure, as well as steps that public and private sector entities can take to mitigate those threats.

(3) An identification and assessment of the global competitiveness and vulnerabilities of United States manufacturers and suppliers of 5th and future generations wireless communications equipment.

(4) An evaluation of available domestic suppliers of 5th and future generations wireless communications equipment and other suppliers in countries that are mutual defense allies or strategic partners of the United States and a strategy to assess their ability to produce and supply 5th generation and future generations wireless communications systems and infrastructure.

(5) Identification of where security gaps exist in the United States domestic or mutual defense treaty allies and strategic partners communications equipment supply chain for 5th and future generations wireless communications systems and infrastructure.

(6) Identification of incentives and policy options to help close or narrow any security gaps identified under paragraph (5) in, and ensure the economic viability of, the United States domestic industrial base, including research and development in critical technologies and workforce development in 5th and future generations wireless communications systems and infrastructure.

(7) Identification of incentives and policy options for leveraging the communications equipment suppliers from mutual defense treaty allies, strategic partners, and other countries to ensure that private industry in the United States has adequate sources for secure, effective, and reliable 5th and future generations wireless communications systems and infrastructure equipment.

(8) A plan for diplomatic engagement with mutual defense treaty allies, strategic partners, and other countries to share security risk information and findings pertaining to 5th and future generations wireless communications systems and infrastructure equipment and cooperation on mitigating those risks.

(9) A plan for engagement with private sector communications infrastructure and systems equipment developers and critical infrastructure owners and operators who have a critical dependency on communications infrastructure to share information and findings on 5th and future generations wireless communications systems and infrastructure equipment standards to secure platforms.

(10) A plan for engagement with private sector communications infrastructure and systems equipment developers to encourage the maximum participation possible on standards-setting bodies related to such systems and infrastructure equipment stand-

ards by public and private sector entities from the United States.

(11) A plan for diplomatic engagement with mutual defense treaty allies, strategic partners, and other countries to share information and findings on 5th and future generations wireless communications systems and infrastructure equipment standards to promote maximum interoperability, competitiveness, openness, and secure platforms.

(12) A plan for diplomatic engagement with mutual defense treaty allies, strategic partners, and other countries to share information and findings on 5th and future generations wireless communications infrastructure and systems equipment concerning the standards-setting bodies related to such systems and infrastructure equipment to promote maximum transparency, openness, impartiality, integrity, and neutrality.

(13) A plan for joint testing environments with mutual defense treaty allies, strategic partners, and other countries to ensure a trusted marketplace for 5th and future generations wireless communications systems and infrastructure equipment.

(14) A plan for research and development by the Federal Government, in close partnership with trusted supplier entities, mutual defense treaty allies, strategic partners, and other countries to reach and maintain United States leadership in 5th and future generations wireless communications systems and infrastructure security, including the development of an ongoing capability to identify security vulnerabilities in 5th and future generations wireless communications systems.

(15) Options for identifying and helping to mitigate the security risks of 5th and future generations wireless communications systems and infrastructure that have security flaws or vulnerabilities, or are utilizing equipment sourced from countries of concern, and that have already been put in place within the systems and infrastructure of mutual defense treaty allies, strategic partners, and other countries, when in the security interests of the United States.

(16) A description of the roles and responsibilities of the appropriate executive branch agencies and interagency mechanisms to coordinate implementation of the Strategy, as provided in section 5(d).

(17) An identification of the key diplomatic, development, intelligence, military, and economic resources necessary to implement the Strategy, including specific budgetary requests.

(18) As necessary, a description of such legislative or administrative action needed to carry out the Strategy.

SEC. 5. LIMITATIONS AND BRIEFINGS.

(a) LIMITATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Strategy and the Implementation Plan shall not include a recommendation or a proposal to nationalize 5th or future generations wireless communications systems or infrastructure.

(2) FEDERAL AGENCY AUTHORITY.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to limit any authority or ability of any Federal agency.

(b) PUBLIC COMMENT.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the President shall seek public comment regarding the development and implementation of the Implementation Plan.

(c) BRIEFING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 21 days after the date on which the Implementation Plan is completed, the President shall direct appropriate representatives from the departments and agencies involved in the formulation of the Strategy to provide the appropriate committees of Congress a briefing on the implementation of the Strategy.

(2) UNCLASSIFIED SETTING.—The briefing under paragraph (1) shall be held in an un-

classified setting to the maximum extent possible.

(d) IMPLEMENTATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President and the National Telecommunications and Information Administration, in conjunction, shall—

(A) implement the Strategy;

(B) keep congressional committees apprised of progress on implementation; and

(C) not implement any proposal or recommendation involving non-Federal spectrum administered by the Federal Communications Commission unless the implementation of such proposal or recommendation is first approved by the Commission.

(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to affect the authority or jurisdiction of the Federal Communications Commission or confer upon the President or any other executive branch agency the power to direct the actions of the Commission, whether directly or indirectly.

(e) FORM.—The Strategy and Implementation Plan shall be submitted to the appropriate committees of Congress in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE
CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 11, 2020.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on March 11, 2020, at 9:49 a.m.:

That the Senate agrees to House amendments to the bill S. 1822.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

CHERYL L. JOHNSON.

DIRECTING THE REMOVAL OF
UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES
FROM HOSTILITIES AGAINST
THE ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN
THAT HAVE NOT BEEN AUTHORIZED
BY CONGRESS

Mr. ENGEL, Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 891, I call up the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 68) to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran that have not been authorized by Congress, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. JAYAPAL). Pursuant to House Resolution 891, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

S.J. RES. 68

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Congress has the sole power to declare war under article I, section 8, clause 11 of the United States Constitution.

(2) The President has a constitutional responsibility to take actions to defend the United States, its territories, possessions, citizens, service members, and diplomats from attack.

(3) Congress has not yet declared war upon, nor enacted a specific statutory authorization for use of military force against, the Islamic Republic of Iran. The 2001 Authorization for Use of Military Force (Public Law 107-40; 50 U.S.C. 1541 note) against the perpetrators of the 9/11 attack and the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (Public Law 107-243; 50 U.S.C. 1541 note) do not serve as a specific statutory authorization for the use of force against Iran.

(4) The conflict between the United States and the Islamic Republic of Iran constitutes, within the meaning of section 4(a) of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1543(a)), either hostilities or a situation where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances into which United States Armed Forces have been introduced.

(5) Members of the United States Armed Forces and intelligence community, and all those involved in the planning of the January 2, 2020, strike on Qasem Soleimani, including President Donald J. Trump, should be commended for their efforts in a successful mission.

(6) Section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1544(c)) states that “at any time that United States Armed Forces are engaged in hostilities outside the territory of the United States, its possessions and territories without a declaration of war or specific statutory authorization, such forces shall be removed by the President if the Congress so directs”.

(7) More than 100 members of the United States Armed Forces sustained traumatic brain injuries in the Iranian retaliatory attack on the Ain al-Assad air base in Iraq despite initial reports that no casualties were sustained in the attack.

(8) Section 8(c) of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1547(c)) defines the introduction of the United States Armed Forces to include “the assignment of members of such armed forces to command, coordinate, participate in the movement of, or accompany the regular or irregular forces of any foreign country or government when such military forces are engaged, or there exists an imminent threat that such forces will become engaged in, hostilities”.

(9) The United States Armed Forces have been introduced into hostilities, as defined by the War Powers Resolution, against Iran.

(10) The question of whether United States forces should be engaged in hostilities against Iran should be answered following a full briefing to Congress and the American public of the issues at stake, a public debate in Congress, and a congressional vote as contemplated by the Constitution.

(11) Section 1013 of the Department of State Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1984 and 1985 (50 U.S.C. 1546a) provides that any joint resolution or bill to require the removal of United States Armed Forces engaged in hostilities without a declaration of war or specific statutory authorization shall be considered in accordance with the expedited procedures of section 601(b) of the International Security and Arms Export Control Act of 1976.

SEC. 2. TERMINATION OF THE USE OF UNITED STATES FORCES FOR HOSTILITIES AGAINST THE ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN.

(a) **TERMINATION.**—Pursuant to section 1013 of the Department of State Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1984 and 1985 (50 U.S.C. 1546a), and in accordance with the provisions of section 601(b) of the International Security Assistance and Arms Export Control Act of 1976, Congress hereby directs the President to terminate the use of United States Armed Forces for hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran or any part of its government or military, unless explicitly authorized by a declaration of war or specific authorization for use of military force against Iran.

(b) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to prevent the United States from defending itself from imminent attack.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The joint resolution shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material in the RECORD related to S.J. Res. 68, 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. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this measure, a resolution that will allow Congress to stand up for its constitutional responsibilities over war powers, a resolution that will send a clear message that the American people don't want war with Iran and that Congress has not authorized war with Iran.

In the few months since the House last took up legislation to address the administration's policy toward Iran, much has shifted.

I think we are all relieved that tensions have ratcheted down. After the strike that took out Qasem Soleimani, we appeared to be on the brink of a direct conflict with Iran, but things have cooled off since. Some will say this resolution is no longer needed or has no legal effect because we are not shooting at Iran today. They say we are not in hostilities with Iran.

But that is not an accurate reading of the law. The drafters of the War Powers Resolution accounted for the situation we are in today. They were clear that Congress' powers are not as narrow as the administration would like us to believe and, apparently, as some Members of this body would like us to believe.

The committee report from 1973 says, “In addition to a situation in which fighting actually has begun, hostilities also encompasses a state of confrontation in which no shots have been fired but where there is a clear and present danger of armed conflict.” That sounds a lot like what we are facing today, except shots have been fired on both sides.

Further, the President had to send 6,000 additional troops to the Middle East after the Soleimani incident, precisely because there is a clear and present danger of armed conflict.

Congress doesn't have to wait until the President alone decides to use military force again. Indeed, it is our responsibility to do something because we know that tensions could flare up again at a moment's notice.

□ 1415

Iran has not been deterred, as the administration promised. Indeed, there have already been four attacks on American personnel after the President ordered Soleimani's killing, injuring more than 100 U.S. servicemembers.

This isn't deterrence. The regime is again pushing ahead with research into a nuclear weapon and expanding its stockpile of enriched uranium.

Now, I don't like the Iranian Government. I don't like what they stand for. I don't like what they do. But the reality is this: Following the strike, we are now closer to a war with a country that is closer to possessing a nuclear weapon.

The last few weeks have also shown the administration scrambling to come up with a legal justification for the strike. Contrary to the initial claims, it quickly became clear that there was no imminent threat.

In fact, when the administration sent a legally required report to Congress, laying out the legal and policy justifications, there was no mention of an imminent threat—none whatsoever.

What was in that report, however, was an alarming claim that underscores why it is so important to press ahead with this resolution. According to the administration, the strike on Soleimani was legally authorized by the 2002 Saddam Hussein war authorization. Let me say that again: the 2002 Saddam Hussein, Iraq war authorization.

Madam Speaker, I was here in 2002 when the House considered that resolution, and I can tell you: Congress did not intend for it to authorize a war against Iran. Read it. Nowhere will you find any mention of Iran.

Incidentally, the House has voted to repeal this out-of-date war authorization, thanks to Congresswoman LEE's efforts, which I have supported.

I have heard some arguments that the 2002 authorization wasn't just about Saddam, but was also about terrorism, because that legislation says Saddam Hussein might give al-Qaida weapons of mass destruction. That finding was debunked a long time ago, and it still has nothing to do with Iran.

Some also claim that because the forces in Iraq under the 2001 and 2002 war authorizations have acted in self-defense against Iraqi militias backed by Iran, that somehow means that the 2002 AUMF can be used to attack Iran directly.

Anyone who is confused about this needs to read the administration's legal rationale more closely. They have been all over the map, trying to untangle this confusion, but their official justification is clear. It distinguishes the Soleimani killing from the defensive actions taken against militias—apples and oranges.

The administration, and any administration, should not be relying on the 2002 AUMF for anything, but we should all be able to recognize that attacking Iran is very different from other uses of force in Iraq.

It is an absurd reading of the authorization, and if the administration is going to lean on that outdated law for this, what else do they plan to use it for?

Some executive branch officials, past and present, also argue that the Constitution gives the President sweeping unilateral power to use military force without coming to Congress. I will say that again: without coming to Congress. But even among this group, it is hard to find anyone who actually believes Congress authorized the strike against Soleimani.

What has me worried is that the President made a decision to escalate tensions with Iran; failed to consult Congress, even though he had ample opportunity to do so; misled the American people about why the strike was necessary; and then switched gears and conjured up this dubious, after-the-fact legal justification.

Here is the reality: The American people don't want war with Iran. The Congress has not authorized war with Iran. That should be crystal clear.

Congress has the right to declare war. It is in the Constitution. It doesn't say that the President has the right, any President. It doesn't say the President has the right; Congress has the right.

We are trying to fulfill the Constitution. We are trying to take the Constitution back to the way it was and the way it was interpreted. Congress has the power to declare war.

Many of us are very concerned that since December 7, 1941, when President Franklin Roosevelt stood up and declared war against Japan, we have not had a declared war since then. So, what has that done? It has really rendered Congress impotent. Congress, essentially, has no say, and the President is the one who decides unilaterally.

That cannot be. That should not be. It is going directly against the Constitution, and we should not stand for it any longer.

So, as I said, the American people don't want war. Congress has not authorized war. That should be crystal clear.

However, since the administration is somehow claiming that Congress has already authorized force against Iran, then it becomes that much more important for Congress to go on record saying otherwise, and that is what this joint resolution would do.

We passed a similar measure in January. At the time, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle argued that the House version was unenforceable because it was a concurrent resolution, that it would never go to the President's desk and wouldn't have the power of law.

I disagreed with that assessment. In my view, the House version was a clear exercise of Congress' authority over war powers. We don't have authority over war powers only if the President says so. We have authority over war powers because the Constitution says so.

The House and Senate have both acted, and the Supreme Court has made clear that the President's Article II war powers are at their lowest ebb when he acts against the express will of Congress. We have expressed our will. The President does not have authority for war with Iran.

But the legislation we are considering today takes a step further. It is a joint resolution, not a concurrent resolution, so it will go straight to the President's desk if it passes the House unamended.

It is important that Congress stands up for itself, but more important is that Congress stands up for its constitutional authorities and makes it clear that we don't want war and that we haven't authorized war with Iran.

Advancing this measure would be the right thing to do under any circumstances, but it is especially important in the face of an administration that, again and again, tries to brush Congress aside as though we are an annoyance rather than a constitutionally coequal branch of government.

Now, I will be honest and say that this has been done by subsequent administrations on both sides of the aisle. Well, we don't want it done by any administration. Congress has the power to declare war—not a President, Congress.

We are not an annoyance; we are a constitutionally coequal branch of government. I am glad to support this measure.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I just have to say, here we go again. This is the third time in 2 months that the Democrat leadership has put this divisive and irresponsible debate on the House floor.

I have to ask, Madam Speaker, what are we doing here today on this War Powers Resolution again?

Our constituents are concerned about the impact of coronavirus on American lives and the United States economy,

not partisan posturing. In fact, the WHO just declared that the coronavirus is now a pandemic.

Madam Speaker, that is what we should be focused on here today.

This political War Powers Resolution is based on a false premise. It orders the President to terminate hostilities against Iran. The problem is, for the other side, we are not engaged in hostilities in Iran.

I asked Secretary Pompeo that very question on February 28, 8 weeks after the Soleimani strike, before our Committee on Foreign Affairs: Are we engaged in hostilities against Iran? His response was: "We are not."

Our military commander in the Middle East agrees. General McKenzie was asked yesterday at the Armed Services Committee if we are engaged in hostilities against Iran or Iranian forces. He said, as Secretary Pompeo said: "No, we are not."

I am a strong supporter of our Article I powers, as I know the chairman is as well. If we were to launch strikes in Iran, I believe that the President would need to come before this body to ask for a new authorization.

But that, Madam Speaker, is not what we are facing. This text completely ignores the remarkable restraint that the President has shown over the past few months. He has used force only when necessary to protect American lives.

I was with the President at the White House when he was deciding how to respond to Iran's shooting down of our drone. He would have been justified, I believe, in taking out launch sites, but he decided to deescalate instead. He was very clear, saying: "I do not want to go to war with Iran."

The January 2 strike on Qasem Soleimani inside Iraq, not Iran, was not an escalation by the United States. It was an appropriate response to his deadly targeting of Americans and diplomats in Iraq.

Soleimani has the blood of hundreds of Americans on his hands. Most recently, he organized an escalating series of attacks in Iraq, an escalating series of these attacks which killed an American, wounded multiple U.S. servicemen, and involved the siege of our Embassy, an attack on our Embassy in Baghdad.

The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Milley, said the administration would have been "culpably negligent" had they not acted to take him out.

The strike on Soleimani in Iraq was totally justified as self-defense under the President's Article II constitutional powers.

Jeh Johnson, President Obama's general counsel at the Department of Defense and Secretary of Homeland Security, a person I have great, tremendous respect for and who I worked very closely with when I was chairman of the Homeland Security Committee, in his words, he stated that Soleimani "was a lawful military objective, and

the President, under his constitutional authority as Commander in Chief, had ample domestic legal authority to take him out without an additional congressional authorization.”

This is the man in the Obama administration who approved the airstrikes against the terrorists.

More importantly, the Soleimani strike was a success. Let me quote from a recent Washington Post article, where they said: The Revolutionary Guard “now finds itself on the back foot, a notable change after successfully projecting its power in the Middle East over recent years.”

The Quds Force—Quds, meaning Jerusalem—that is their ultimate objective, to annihilate the State of Israel. “The Quds Force has been significantly deterred from retaliating further against the United States.”

But the Democrats cannot admit anything good can come from this President, and that has consequences. In my judgment, we are wasting precious legislative days and setting a terrible precedent of abusing War Powers procedures.

This will be the fifth time that this Congress, and in this Congress, that we are considering a War Powers Resolution directing the President to withdraw U.S. forces from wars we are not actually fighting—three on Iran and two on Yemen.

Iran and its proxies are watching right now, as we spin our wheels. What they see, Madam Speaker, unfortunately, is not a united America, but a divided America that does not fully support the ability of our Commander in Chief to adequately respond to threats against Americans.

Now is not the time to tie our Commander in Chief's hands. Now is the time to support our troops and to support our diplomats.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1430

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

Mr. CONNOLLY. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend, the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, and I thank my friend, the ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, for their good work.

I understand we have a difference of opinion, and I do deeply respect my friend from Texas and his substantive and thoughtful contributions to our foreign policy debate in our committee, but I must disagree with the argument that we ought to be focused on only one thing right now.

As grave as the coronavirus crisis is—and I would be happy to talk about that and the missteps of this administration in making it worse—Congress is the people's body. We are here defending the legislative branch of government and its constitutional role on

matters of war and peace. What could be more serious?

The fact that we are here the third time doesn't make it any less grave or serious. It underlines the importance of the issue and the fact that many of us in this body are going to continue to be here on the floor until Congress reasserts the role the chairman outlined for us that is the constitutional role.

We have allowed way too much power to gravitate to the executive branch. We have abrogated our responsibilities here in Congress for decades. We like having it both ways. We tsk-tsk when the executive branch, we think, crosses the line, but we don't want to take responsibility for it.

This resolution asks Congress to do just that: stand up and take responsibility, while holding the executive branch accountable.

President Trump ordered a provocative and disproportionate drone strike that killed the Iranian Quds Forces commander, Major General Qasem Soleimani, a bad actor, but that begs the question: Should we have done it?

And, oh, by the way, what level of consultation and intelligence ought to be shared with the legislative branch that has constitutional responsibility for matters of war and peace?

We know the administration had to do some fast footwork to rationalize why now, why him, why there, and, oh, by the way, what are the consequences of doing that? In all of those questions, even with a formal briefing of Congress, the administration simply did not have good answers. In fact, they had contradictory answers.

Taking Soleimani out, my friend from Texas says, was a good thing. Well, it is not without consequences. We evacuated nonessential personnel from Iraq as a consequence of that move because of the terror threat. One hundred U.S. military personnel suffered brain damage or head damage because of the retaliatory strikes on the U.S. base in Iraq. These things have consequences.

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

Mr. ENGEL. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Madam Speaker, reining in the administration is the right thing to do until and unless we get answers and debate and intelligence provided to the legislative branch for justification as we move forward.

The idea that we are not at war with Iran so it is actually a redundant or unnecessary conversation, I think, is not an argument. In fact, now is precisely the time to constrain the executive branch, to set boundaries, to make sure they understand that Congress reasserting itself will set boundaries and legitimate barriers for proceeding down that road without first coming to the legislative branch as, indeed, Franklin Delano Roosevelt did in 1941, walking right down, with great dif-

ficulty, that aisle, asking Congress to declare war; and, indeed, Congress listened and responded. That is how it ought to work.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN), a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, who served in the United States Army and fought in Operation Iraqi Freedom.

Mr. ZELDIN. Madam Speaker, thank you to lead Republican MCCAUL for important words to start today's debate.

For the third time in 2 months, as he pointed out, we are here to debate an Iran War Powers Resolution. Once again, this resolution requires terminating the use of force against Iran, even though U.S. Forces are not engaged in hostilities against Iran.

As we stand here today, the President has repeatedly said in the past that he does not want a war with Iran. I don't. This body doesn't. My constituents don't.

The President, himself, as lead Republican MCCAUL has pointed out, has shown incredible restraint when opportunities have presented, when there was legal justification to strike back.

We must continue to pursue peace through strength. The military option is the last possible option that we should ever use, but we need Iran to understand that it is on the table.

My colleague from the other side of the aisle who just spoke used the term “disproportionate” to describe taking out Qasem Soleimani. As people listen to today's debate, and if you are one of the 600-plus families who lost your son or daughter, your husband or your wife, maybe your mother or father because of Qasem Soleimani, if you are one of the thousands of people who were injured because of Qasem Soleimani, U.S. troops—600 U.S. troops, thousands of U.S. troops were injured because of Qasem Soleimani, and, literally, in the days leading up to this attack, we had U.S. citizens who were killed and wounded because of Qasem Soleimani.

What is the justification? What was Qasem Soleimani doing in Iraq? How about we look at IRGC's own statement of January 3? The IRGC said that Soleimani was in Iraq to “plan a confrontation against the new scheme of the Americans to rebuild DAESH and the Takfiri groups in order to again disrupt Iraq's security.”

Anyone who wants to suggest that Soleimani was in Iraq to do anything that was good and not to be planning and engaged in hostilities has to ignore the IRGC's own words.

The IRGC is a designated foreign terrorist organization. Qasem Soleimani is a designated terrorist himself, as sanctioned by the United States and the EU and the U.N., and we took him out. And I say good.

To hear my colleague on the other side of the aisle call it disproportionate, my question is: How many more U.S. troops have to die at the hands of Qasem Soleimani before it is

proportionate? How many more have to lose arms and legs at the hands of Qasem Soleimani until my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will call it proportionate?

I salute the President for making a decision; it was well done.

I encourage all of my colleagues to vote “no” on this resolution.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. OMAR), a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Ms. OMAR. Madam Speaker, it is gratifying to see that Congress is becoming serious about restoring our authority over matters of war and peace. Our oversight responsibilities don't end when the news cycle changes. I hope that the outcome of this vote today will be another bipartisan rejection of war with Iran.

But let's be honest. We know that the eventual outcome will be a Presidential veto. We have been through this already with the Yemen War Powers Resolution when we passed it last year.

But despite the inevitable veto, it is critically important that we are here today voting to insist on our constitutional power. Our Founders understood that these decisions are too important to rest in the hands of one person.

The decision to assassinate General Soleimani was a reckless and badly considered decision that made Americans less safe, and it opened the door to a series of escalating retaliations that makes the world less safe.

But my vote today is not just about this particular strike or preventing a particular war. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle were eager to claim these authorities when there was a Democratic President in the Oval Office. Had I been in office then, I would have joined them in demanding congressional authorization for wars in Libya and Syria. It should not depend on what political power is in the White House.

We should be consistent in our principles. In my view, this means maintaining the momentum of this vote and our previous vote to repeal the 2002 AUMF. It means finally taking up BARBARA LEE's bill to repeal the 2001 AUMF as well.

Madam Speaker, I support this resolution.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WALTZ), a veteran of the war in Afghanistan and the first Green Beret elected to Congress.

Mr. WALTZ. Madam Speaker, I find this interesting and sad. Since the last time we were here, for all the handwringing, all of the hues and cries that the President was taking us to the brink of war, that he was a warmonger, that this was so reckless as we are still hearing today, well, what has actually happened?

The problem with my colleague's argument is that it flies in the face of what is actually happened in the Middle East.

What has happened is deterrence has been restored. It is relatively peaceful at this point.

I say, “relatively.” The fact is that we don't have thousands of boots on the ground in Teheran or in Iran.

What we all know who have actually fought against the Quds Force and fought against the Iranians is they are deterred by strength and emboldened by weakness.

So this bill seeks to restrain the President, who has shown incredible restraint.

Did he respond to the attacks on international shipping? No.

Did he respond to attacks on world energy supplies? No.

Did he respond to the attack on an American drone? No.

Only after another American was killed—yet another American was killed—and our Embassy was attacked did he finally respond. And what did he do? A limited, proportional, targeted strike in Iraq—not Iran—that had zero civilian casualties.

And every American, from the lowest private to the Commander in Chief, has the right to self-defense. It was his duty. It was the President's duty as Commander in Chief to stop the Iranian escalation and to respond.

And, by the way, what did he do? He took down the head of a terrorist organization who was declared, under the Obama administration, a terrorist, no different than Osama bin Laden, no different than al-Baghdadi. A terrorist is a terrorist.

In this case, Soleimani was a massive and serial human rights abuser, responsible for the deaths of tens of thousands of people across the Middle East, and the world is a better place for the fact that he is no longer on this Earth.

Madam Speaker, all this is doing is seeking to tie the President's hands; and the last thing I want is any Commander in Chief—and to my colleague—for any party having to come back to this body to defend Americans, to defend our diplomats, and to exercise his right to take terrorists off the face of this Earth.

I cannot encourage my colleagues more strongly to oppose this resolution. This is politics at its worst.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, I thank the Chairman for yielding and also for his consistent leadership on issues of war and peace and making sure that Congress does its job.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of S.J. Res. 68, which is a resolution terminating the use of U.S. Armed Forces from hostilities against Iran. This critical resolution helps put a check on the administration's reckless and irrational military action against Iran.

The American people do not want, nor can we allow, another unnecessary war of choice in the Middle East. This

resolution is an important step in our efforts to prevent that from happening.

Make no mistake: The assassination of Mr. Soleimani just a few months ago placed us on the brink of war. This did constitute an act of hostility against Iran, and, in fact, injured at least 100 of our brave troops. Also, it hurt our national security and made us less safe.

President Trump's continued and reckless military action without congressional approval or authorization caused this crisis. But we are here today to make clear that the President cannot launch a war with Iran without the explicit authorization of Congress.

Madam Speaker, we have been down this dangerous path before in Iraq, and we cannot afford another ill-advised, destructive, and costly war in the Middle East.

And, yes, I opposed the use of force without congressional authorization during the previous administration. This is not a partisan issue. Congress must do its job, and we must even go further to restore our constitutional duty over military action.

I hope the Senate takes up my bill, H.R. 2456, to repeal the 2002 Iraq AUMF, which the House passed in January, which the administration, mind you, used as the basis for the assassination of Soleimani and its military hostilities toward Iran.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California.

□ 1445

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, let me remind you that the 2002 Iraq resolution was introduced to address weapons of mass destruction purportedly in Iraq. Now, this was a lie, it was put forth by the Bush administration. And many of us who were here tried to halt the use of force and to allow the inspectors to complete their inspections. Unfortunately—and I had an amendment to do this—it received just 72 votes.

Now, regardless of how one voted, the 2002 authorization was specific to Iraq, not Iran, nor any other country. And so it is past time that Congress reassert our congressional authority on matters of war and peace. We must also return to diplomacy and peace and stop these endless wars.

So I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on this. It is time that we do our job. Congress has been missing in action.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. RIGGLEMAN), who served in the United States Air Force for over a decade and is a veteran of Operation Allied Force and Enduring Freedom.

Mr. RIGGLEMAN. Madam Speaker, I stand in strong opposition to H.R. Res. 68, which is a divisive resolution that ties President Trump's hands during a time when our Nation and regional allies like Israel need our support.

This resolution ignores efforts the President has made to avoid war, instead continuing the Democratic Party's fixation on the President's strike on Qasem Soleimani in Iraq.

My background does give me an expert perspective on the challenges in the Middle East, and an understanding of the current situation on the ground. Not only did I deploy directly after 9/11, I was the counter-IED team chief in 2006 and 2007 for the Counter-IED Operations Intelligence Integration Center. So our team saw firsthand what Iranian Quds Forces could do to U.S. forces based on IED deployment and technology transfer.

This was not some type of reckless assassination. This was a targeted elimination of a terrorist on our target list. President Trump's escalated air strikes against those planning to inflict harm on Americans are warranted responses against Iranian actions.

The United States reserves the right to defend itself, especially against bad actors like Soleimani and Iran. Instead of supporting a President who struck a terrorist, Democrats have retreated to partisan talking points and have flocked to this bill, which undermines the President's actions and shows a lack of American resolve to our enemies abroad. This legislation harms our ability to protect American interests. It harms our military preparedness.

Lines 20–25 of the resolution state that the President must terminate the use of United States Armed Forces for hostilities against Iran “or any part of its government or military?”

Does this include proxies in Iraq, Afghanistan, Lebanon, Algeria, Yemen, Bahrain, and Shia militia groups? The IRGC is a foreign terrorist organization, including its Quds Force.

Soleimani was with a person called al-Muhandis, the center of command and control against American forces, Shia militia groups, and an Iranian proxy. Do we consider force protection conditions? The Commander in Chief needs flexibility in this new Arab warfare.

And I do agree that it is time for Congress to update our authorizations for use of military force. I am eager to participate in this process during this time of asymmetric warfare and rapid response to terrorism. Let's provide solutions. Let's not provide political hyperbole.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL).

Ms. JAYAPAL. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of this War Powers Resolution to ensure that the President cannot start a war with Iran without Congress' approval.

I understand this is the fourth time that the House will vote to say “no” to war with Iran since President Trump ordered an unauthorized, illegal strike on Iranian General Soleimani. We passed our own war powers measure, led by Representative SLOTKIN.

We passed a bill with bipartisan support to cut off funding for unauthorized, offensive military operations against Iran. And we voted to repeal the 2002 Iraq war authorization that the Trump administration has inappropriately used to justify the strike on Soleimani and potential future strikes against Iranian targets.

Madam Speaker, we have to be clear that this is not about whether General Soleimani was a good guy or a bad guy. Nobody is really disputing that.

The question here is: What is Congress' authority to have a say on whether or not the United States is going to war? If we are going to send troops into war, then we have an obligation to vote on that, to debate that, and to make sure that we preserve the congressional authority.

And I think, Madam Speaker, that this is something that both Democrats and Republicans have consistently succumbed to. So we have consistently, Democrats and Republicans, given authority to the Chief Executive that is not theirs to start with. Congress has spoken again and again on this. We should have learned by now.

The American people have spoken. They don't want us in endless wars without authorization from Congress, without a debate here in Congress, without utilizing those Constitutional powers that our Founding Framers gave us. It is time for us to do this, and to ensure that the President listens.

So today, I am urging all of my colleagues to set aside partisanship, to think about this as something that we are reclaiming for ourselves as Congress, to support this resolution that has already passed the Republican-held Senate with bipartisan support.

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

Madam Speaker, I want to, again, state the main reason for us voting on this. I am no fan of the regime in Iran. And I certainly was no fan of Soleimani, who had blood on his hands and did all kinds of heinous things. I don't care so much about them.

What I care about is us. What I care about is the Constitution of the United States of America. It was drafted a certain way. It wasn't drafted to say that the President, no matter who that President is, no matter what party that President is from, the President has authority to do whatever he likes.

It clearly says—and I said this before, but I think it is worth repeating. It clearly says that Congress has the power to declare war. Congress. And what we are trying to do on this side of the aisle is trying to strike that balance, the checks and balances. We all learned them when we went to school, checks and balances.

The Constitution doesn't say the President can do anything he wants and the Congress must follow suit. It says that Congress has the sole right to declare war.

It is really disturbing to me that subsequent Presidents—and this isn't only

the fault of one President or one political party. This is a road that we all share blame for this—we have allowed our branch of government to wither on the vine when it comes to declaring war, when it comes to war powers.

We have essentially said that any President can just declare war, and Congress has got to go along with it. If you don't go along with it, somehow you are unpatriotic or you don't care about the country. Quite the opposite. Quite the opposite.

We care about the country and we are patriotic, and that is why we believe that the Constitution needs to be adhered to.

Now, I would also encourage my colleagues to look more closely at the facts, instead of just accepting what the executive branch is saying about reinterpreting the law.

As I said in my opening statement, the drafters of the War Powers Resolution were clear, that the situation we are in today is in a state of hostility. We are constantly today in a state of hostility.

The committee report passing the War Powers Resolution from 1973, in the Congress, says: “In addition to a situation in which fighting actually has begun, hostilities also encompasses a state of confrontation in which no shots have been fired, but where there is a clear and present danger of armed conflict.”

Certainly, we are in that situation now. That is exactly the situation we are in right now.

So Congress' powers are not as narrow as the administration would like us to believe. I don't care who is President, and I don't care about who is elected in Congress. What I care about is that Congress fulfill its duties; fulfill its duties as the Constitution says that we must.

So we are doing this again because the other body has not been cooperative and doesn't seem to want to make a move on anything. We are doing this because we have to do this. We are doing this because this is important.

And no matter, again, 10 years from now, 20 years from now, there will be other Members here, I would hope that whoever is President then—no matter what party, whoever controls the majority of Congress—no matter what party, this is not political. This is not about party. This is not about trying to do anything, as far as I am concerned, except reestablishing Congress' right to declare war.

I don't know what is more important than war and peace. I certainly don't think Congress ought to start giving away its responsibilities.

I have been in this body a long time, and we have constantly argued against the administration—no matter who was in that administration—from usurping the roles that Congress has, from taking away congressional power, not only on matters of peace and war, but on everything; earmarks or anything you want to say.

Congress has just sort of said to the President: Go ahead, you make the decision. We are just sort of along for the ride. We are kind of observers. We are observers.

Well, we are not observers. We are people who care very dearly about the Constitution.

And, again, I conclude by saying, Congress has the right to declare war. Only Congress has the right to declare war. That is what we are affirming today, and why I hope we get votes from both sides of the aisle. This is not a political discussion. It doesn't matter who is in the White House. It doesn't matter who is in Congress. What matters is that Congress not cede its responsibility to any other branch but its own.

Madam Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Madam Speaker, there was reference that the taking out of Soleimani was an assassination. I just want to remind this body of Jeh Johnson's words, President Obama's general counsel at the Department of Defense, Secretary of Homeland Security, who I have tremendous respect for. He signed off on airstrikes under the Obama administration, stating that Soleimani was a lawful military objective, and the President, under his Constitutional authority as Commander in Chief, had ample domestic legal authority to take him out without additional congressional authorization. I think that really puts this matter to rest.

But let me also say that the chairman and I are very bipartisan. We respect this committee. We respect the integrity of this committee. We both see the world very much in the same way. I know the chairman is not a supporter of Soleimani. I believe the chairman believes, as I do, that the world is safer without Mr. Soleimani in it.

The chairman and I are very staunchly pro-Israel, and are for Israel, and very much against the actions of the Ayatollah in Iran. So I don't question the chairman whatsoever.

In fact, I take great pride in the fact that the chairman and I work very well together. When we disagree—and sometimes we do—we agree to disagree, and we do so with civility, which I think has been lost at times in this body, in this town. And so I want to start with that.

I will say that all the hearings I have had, and briefings prove that Soleimani was a terrorist who actively engaged in a campaign of violence against Americans and our interests. And after not one, two, but three times debating this issue on the floor, I think we about said all we can say.

I think we can all agree he was a brutal terrorist and that the world is better off without him.

□ 1500

But I have to question, why now are we debating this? Our country is facing a public health emergency.

Madam Speaker, as I stated, the World Health Organization just announced in the time of this debate that the coronavirus is now a pandemic.

As of today, there are more than 121,000 reported cases of coronavirus worldwide, including over 1,000 right here in the United States. And while the CDC maintains the likelihood of a person catching the disease is low, the fallout from the fear caused by COVID-19 is real and is causing real damage.

Just 2 days ago, people were watching as their 401(k)s and retirement funds were disappearing and Wall Street saw the biggest drop in more than a decade. I know in my district, the city of Austin suffered a significant economic blow with the cancellation of South by Southwest, an event the chairman and I were actually scheduled to speak at regarding how we were the committee that works together and doesn't give in to toxic partisan politics.

Last year, this conference in my hometown brought more than \$350 million to Austin, making it the most profitable event for the city's hospitality industry. More communities are facing economic fallout, as well. And the fear is only rising as we continue to see more stories.

Several Members of Congress themselves, our colleagues, are currently self-quarantining after potentially being exposed to the virus, yet we are talking about this resolution today.

I would just close by saying, I was back in my district over the weekend talking to my constituents. They were really not concerned about the War Powers Resolution. Their number one concern right now is: My God, is my child going to get coronavirus? Am I going to get coronavirus? When is it going to impact my backyard, my neighbors? They want to be safe, and they want Congress to do something.

I am hopeful, Madam Speaker—I know they are in negotiations right now between the leadership of our two parties that we can come together, just as we did last week, in passing a \$7.8 billion supplemental to address this crisis—that we can come together as Republicans and Democrats to do good things for the American people and to protect the American people and to make them safe.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, before I close, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOULTON).

Mr. MOULTON. Madam Speaker, we are here today to fundamentally do our jobs. That is something that we ask of our troops every single day across the world on the front lines in places like Iraq, Syria, Afghanistan, and throughout Africa.

There is bipartisan concern, bipartisan recognition that Iran has ill will

towards the United States, that Iran is an enemy of the United States, that Iran wants nothing more than to see our country and our democracy die.

The most solemn responsibility that we have in ensuring that that doesn't happen is upholding the fundamental principles of our country and of our democracy, of showing that we have the courage here in Congress to uphold that oath, that same oath that we ask our troops to uphold in far more difficult circumstances every single day.

Iran is threatened by us because of the values that we represent and the power that those values carry in the world. It is when we abandon those values, when we undermine those principles, when we forget that oath to our Constitution that our enemies start to win.

I have fought Iranians on the ground in Iraq. I have seen Iranians kill Americans. I remember how much more accurate the Iranian mortars were than the Iraqi ones we were used to facing. I get this, but I also never forget that oath that we took, and this resolution, passing this resolution is about upholding that oath to our Constitution.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS), a member of the Armed Services Committee and the lead Republican of the Homeland Security Committee.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend from Texas for yielding.

Madam Speaker, today, we are dealing with legislation that didn't make sense on January 9, it didn't make sense on January 30, and it doesn't make sense today.

Today marks the third time the House has considered a version of this legislation in just 3 months. I am back to remind my colleagues that our conflict is not with the Iranian people, but with their tyrannical and murderous regime.

The Iranian Government, using agents like General Soleimani and the IRGC, has been arming Shia militias, including Hezbollah and others across the Middle East for decades. General Soleimani's organization was responsible for the deaths of nearly 600 Americans.

This resolution offers safe harbor to those killers.

It offers safe harbor to the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps, a designated foreign terrorist organization.

It offers safe harbor to terrorist groups receiving advanced weapons directly from the Iranian Government.

These forces are critical to the Ayatollah's clear goal of complete influence over the entire Middle East.

But the American people know the regime's legacy. They know the Ayatollah doesn't care about the bloody cost of its terrorism. The legislation before the House today only paves the way for new Iranian aggression.

Halting military operations and putting red tape on the Commander in

Chief does nothing to fix the problems in the Middle East.

I believe this resolution makes America less safe. It makes a mockery of years of dedicated counterterrorism efforts.

I urge my colleagues to vote “no” for the third time in 3 months on coddling Iranian terrorists.

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

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I believe I have said about everything I can say on this issue, so I won't take up more time of Congress, other than to say we are not at war with Iran. If we were, I would be the first one to say Congress has a responsibility to act. If Soleimani was taken out in Iran, I would be the first to say we need an Authorization for Use of Military Force.

Congress does have the power to declare war under the Constitution, and many colleagues on my side of the aisle agree with that concept, but it is just not factually what is happening on the ground today in Iran. If that day happens, we are fully prepared to have this discussion. This is what I would call a premature argument to make.

And I would say, with respect to updating the 2001 and 2002 AUMFs, I have had several meetings with Members on both sides of the aisle, many of whom were not here when those were passed by Congress in 2001 and 2002, who also agree that we should be working to modernize these Authorizations for Use of Military Force.

I think there is that consensus, Madam Speaker, here today. I would encourage my colleagues on the other side of the aisle—and I know Chairman ENGEL is also supportive of working together—to try to modernize these Authorizations for Use of Military Force.

But that is not the situation on the ground today, and I cannot support this resolution simply for the fact it is based on a false premise. It will tie the hands of our Commander in Chief to respond in self-defense to Americans, our diplomats serving over there very bravely, and our American soldiers who are over there very bravely—it ties his hands to defend from an attack launched by Iran.

And lastly, I say, Mr. Soleimani was not a good man. He was an evil mastermind of terror. For two decades he killed Americans. He brought the Russians into Syria. They slaughtered tens of thousands of innocent people in Syria. He is responsible for so much blood on his hands.

I would close by saying—and I do think there is consensus on this issue, as well—that the world is indeed a better place without this mastermind of terror, the greatest mastermind since bin Laden was removed from the face of this Earth.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I have said all along that this is not a partisan issue, and it isn't. Executive branch officials from both parties have tried to sideline Congress when it comes to war. It is time we said: “Enough.” It may be in the executive branch's interest to keep Congress out, but that doesn't make it legal or make it right.

Madam Speaker, no one in this body mourns Qasem Soleimani, certainly not me. No one doubts that he was a hardened terrorist with the blood of Americans and others on his hands. But that is not the issue before us today.

The issue is that the Trump administration decided to kill him without authorization from Congress, without any prior consultation with Congress, then misled the American people about why that was necessary. And then, when the administration's explanation couldn't withstand scrutiny, they tell us Congress had already authorized military action against Iran.

Madam Speaker, I think we would know if we had voted to authorize military action against Iran. Those aren't the kinds of votes you easily forget.

So, today, we will vote on this resolution and send it to the President's desk. And it carries with it a very clear, very important message: Congress has not authorized war, and Congress has not authorized war against Iran.

It is remarkable that we even need to say this, but as is often the case, up is down, down is up, laws don't matter, and Congress doesn't matter because the Constitution doesn't matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. JAYAPAL). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered on the joint resolution.

The question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of S.J. Res. 68 is postponed.

□ 1515

USA FREEDOM REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2020

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 891, I call up the bill (H.R. 6172) to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to prohibit the production of certain business records, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. DEGETTE). Pursuant to House Resolu-

tion 891, the amendment printed in House Report 116-415 is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 6172

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “USA FREEDOM Reauthorization Act of 2020”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. Amendments to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978.

TITLE I—FISA BUSINESS RECORDS

Sec. 101. Repeal of authority to access on an ongoing basis call detail records.

Sec. 102. Protection of certain information.

Sec. 103. Use of information.

Sec. 104. Limitation on retention of business record information.

Sec. 105. Effective date.

TITLE II—ACCURACY AND INTEGRITY OF FISA PROCESS

Sec. 201. Certifications regarding accuracy of FISA applications.

Sec. 202. Description of techniques carried out before targeting United States person.

Sec. 203. Investigations relating to Federal candidates and elected Federal officials.

Sec. 204. Removal or suspension of Federal officers for misconduct before Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court.

Sec. 205. Penalties for offenses related to FISA.

Sec. 206. Contempts constituting crimes.

Sec. 207. Effective date.

TITLE III—FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE COURT

Sec. 301. Declassification of significant decisions, orders, and opinions.

Sec. 302. Appointment of amici curiae and access to information.

Sec. 303. Effective and independent advice for Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court.

Sec. 304. Transcripts of proceedings and communications regarding applications.

Sec. 305. Information provided in annual reports.

TITLE IV—TRANSPARENCY, SUNSETS, AND OTHER MATTERS

Sec. 401. Congressional oversight.

Sec. 402. Establishment of compliance officers.

Sec. 403. Public reports on information obtained or derived under FISA and protection of First Amendment activities.

Sec. 404. Mandatory reporting on certain orders.

Sec. 405. Report on use of FISA authorities regarding protected activities and protected classes.

Sec. 406. Improvements to Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board.

Sec. 407. Sunsets.

Sec. 408. Technical amendments.

SEC. 2. AMENDMENTS TO THE FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE ACT OF 1978.

Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment

to, or a repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.).

TITLE I—FISA BUSINESS RECORDS

SEC. 101. REPEAL OF AUTHORITY TO ACCESS ON AN ONGOING BASIS CALL DETAIL RECORDS.

(a) CALL DETAIL RECORDS.—
 (1) REPEAL.—Subsection (b)(2) of section 501 (50 U.S.C. 1861) is amended—
 (A) by striking subparagraph (C);
 (B) in subparagraph (B)—
 (i) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “in the case of” and all that follows through “in subparagraph (C).”; and
 (ii) in clause (iii), by striking the semicolon at the end and inserting “; and”; and
 (C) by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (C).
 (2) PROHIBITION.—Section 501(a) (50 U.S.C. 1861) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:
 “(4) An application under paragraph (1) may not seek an order authorizing or requiring the production on an ongoing basis of call detail records.”
 (b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—
 (1) ORDERS.—Subsection (c) of section 501 (50 U.S.C. 1861) is amended—
 (A) in paragraph (1), by striking “with subsection (b)(2)(D)” and inserting “with subsection (b)(2)(C).”; and
 (B) in paragraph (2), by striking subparagraph (F) and inserting the following:
 “(F) in the case of an application for call detail records, shall direct the Government—
 “(i) to adopt minimization procedures that require the prompt destruction of all call detail records produced under the order that the Government determines are not foreign intelligence information; and
 “(ii) to destroy all call detail records produced under the order as prescribed by such procedures.”;
 (2) COMPENSATION.—Subsection (j) of section 501 (50 U.S.C. 1861) is amended to read as follows:
 “(j) COMPENSATION.—The Government shall compensate a person for reasonable expenses incurred for providing technical assistance to the Government under this section.”
 (3) DEFINITIONS.—Subsection (k)(4)(B) of section 501 (50 U.S.C. 1861) is amended by striking “For purposes of an application submitted under subsection (b)(2)(C)” and inserting “In the case of an application for a call detail record”.
 (4) OVERSIGHT.—Section 502(b) (50 U.S.C. 1862(b)) is amended—
 (A) by striking paragraph (4); and
 (B) by redesignating paragraphs (5) through (8) as paragraphs (4) through (7), respectively;
 (5) ANNUAL REPORTS.—Section 603 (50 U.S.C. 1873) is amended—
 (A) in subsection (b)—
 (i) by transferring subparagraph (C) of paragraph (6) to the end of paragraph (5);
 (ii) in paragraph (5)—
 (I) in subparagraph (A), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;
 (II) in subparagraph (B), by striking the semicolon and inserting “; and”; and
 (III) in subparagraph (C), as transferred by clause (i) of this subparagraph, by striking “any database of”;
 (iii) by striking paragraph (6) (as amended by clause (i) of this subparagraph); and
 (iv) by redesignating paragraph (7) as paragraph (6); and
 (B) in subsection (d)—
 (i) in paragraph (1), by striking “any of paragraphs (3), (5), or (6)” and inserting “either of paragraph (3) or (5).”; and

(ii) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking “Paragraphs (2)(B), (2)(C), and (6)(C)” and inserting “Paragraphs (2)(B) and (2)(C).”
 (6) PUBLIC REPORTING.—Section 604(a)(1)(F) (50 U.S.C. 1874(a)(1)(F)) is amended—
 (A) in clause (i), by striking the semicolon and inserting “; and”;
 (B) in clause (ii), by striking “; and” and inserting a period; and
 (C) by striking clause (iii).

SEC. 102. PROTECTION OF CERTAIN INFORMATION.

(a) PROTECTION.—Subsection (a) of section 501 (50 U.S.C. 1861), as amended by section 101, is further amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:
 “(5)(A) An application under paragraph (1) may not seek an order authorizing or requiring the production of a tangible thing under circumstances in which a person has a reasonable expectation of privacy and a warrant would be required for law enforcement purposes.
 “(B) An application under paragraph (1) may not seek an order authorizing or requiring the production of cell site location or global positioning system information.”
 (b) CLARIFICATION OF EMERGENCY AUTHORITY FOR CELL SITE LOCATION OR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM INFORMATION.—The Attorney General may treat the production of cell site location or global positioning system information as electronic surveillance rather than business records for purposes of authorizing the emergency production of such information pursuant to section 105(e) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1805(e)).
 (c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subsection (a) of section 501 (50 U.S.C. 1861) is further amended by striking “Subject to paragraph (3)” and inserting “Subject to paragraphs (3), (4), and (5).”

SEC. 103. USE OF INFORMATION.

Section 501(h) (50 U.S.C. 1861(h)) is amended—
 (1) by striking “Information acquired” and inserting the following:
 “(1) IN GENERAL.—Information acquired”; and
 (2) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:
 “(2) USE IN TRIALS, HEARINGS, OR OTHER PROCEEDINGS.—For purposes of subsections (b) through (h) of section 106—
 “(A) information obtained or derived from the production of tangible things pursuant to an investigation conducted under this section shall be deemed to be information acquired from an electronic surveillance pursuant to title I, unless the court or other authority of the United States finds, in response to a motion from the Government, that providing notice to an aggrieved person would harm the national security of the United States; and
 “(B) in carrying out subparagraph (A), a person shall be deemed to be an aggrieved person if—
 “(i) the person is the target of such an investigation; and
 “(ii) the activities or communications of the person are described in the tangible things that the Government intends to use or disclose in any trial, hearing, or other proceeding.”.

SEC. 104. LIMITATION ON RETENTION OF BUSINESS RECORD INFORMATION.

(a) REQUIREMENT.—Section 501(g) (50 U.S.C. 1861(g)) is amended—
 (1) in paragraph (2), by striking “In this section” and inserting “In accordance with paragraph (3), in this section”;
 (2) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and
 (3) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph (3):

“(3) LIMITATION ON RETENTION.—The minimization procedures under paragraph (1) shall ensure that tangible things, and information therein, received under this section may not be retained in excess of 5 years, unless—
 “(A) the tangible thing or information has been affirmatively determined, in whole or in part, to constitute foreign intelligence or counterintelligence or to be necessary to understand or assess foreign intelligence or counterintelligence;
 “(B) the tangible thing or information is reasonably believed to constitute evidence of a crime and is retained by a law enforcement agency;
 “(C) the tangible thing or information is enciphered or reasonably believed to have a secret meaning;
 “(D) retention is necessary to protect against an imminent threat to human life;
 “(E) retention is necessary for technical assurance or compliance purposes, including a court order or discovery obligation, in which case access to the tangible thing or information retained for technical assurance or compliance purposes shall be reported to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Intelligence and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate on an annual basis; or
 “(F) retention for a period in excess of 5 years is approved by the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, based on a determination that retention is necessary to protect the national security of the United States, in which case the Director shall provide to such committees a written certification describing—
 “(i) the reasons extended retention is necessary to protect the national security of the United States;
 “(ii) the duration for which the Director is authorizing retention;
 “(iii) generally the tangible things or information to be retained; and
 “(iv) the measures the Director is taking to protect the privacy interests of United States persons or persons located inside the United States.”.

(b) OVERSIGHT.—Section 502(b) (50 U.S.C. 1862(b)) is amended—
 (1) in paragraph (7), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;
 (2) in paragraph (8)(E), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and
 (3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:
 “(9) a description of each time that an exception to the 5-year limitation on the retention of information was made pursuant to any of subparagraphs (C) through (E) of subsection (g)(3) of section 501, including an explanation for each such exception.”.

SEC. 105. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this title shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply with respect to applications made under section 501 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1861) on or after such date.

TITLE II—ACCURACY AND INTEGRITY OF FISA PROCESS

SEC. 201. CERTIFICATIONS REGARDING ACCURACY OF FISA APPLICATIONS.

(a) TITLE I.—Subsection (a) of section 104 (50 U.S.C. 1804) is amended—
 (1) in paragraph (8), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;
 (2) in paragraph (9), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and
 (3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:
 “(10) a certification by the applicant that, to the best knowledge of the applicant, the

attorney for the Government and the Department of Justice has been apprised of all information that might reasonably—

“(A) call into question the accuracy of the application or the reasonableness of any assessment in the application conducted by the department or agency on whose behalf the application is made; or

“(B) otherwise raise doubts with respect to the findings required under section 105(a).”

(b) TITLE III.—Subsection (a) of section 303 (50 U.S.C. 1823) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (7), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (8), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(9) a certification by the applicant that, to the best knowledge of the applicant, the attorney for the Government and the Department of Justice has been apprised of all information that might reasonably—

“(A) call into question the accuracy of the application or the reasonableness of any assessment in the application conducted by the department or agency on whose behalf the application is made; or

“(B) otherwise raise doubts with respect to the findings required under section 304(a).”

(c) TITLE IV.—Subsection (c) of section 402 (50 U.S.C. 1842) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) a certification by the applicant that, to the best knowledge of the applicant, the attorney for the Government and the Department of Justice has been apprised of all information that might reasonably—

“(A) call into question the accuracy of the application or the reasonableness of any assessment in the application conducted by the department or agency on whose behalf the application is made; or

“(B) otherwise raise doubts with respect to the findings required under subsection (d).”

(d) TITLE V.—Subsection (b)(2) of section 501 (50 U.S.C. 1861), as amended by section 101, is further amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in subparagraph (C), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(D) a statement by the applicant that, to the best knowledge of the applicant, the application fairly reflects all information that might reasonably—

“(i) call into question the accuracy of the application or the reasonableness of any assessment in the application conducted by the department or agency on whose behalf the application is made; or

“(ii) otherwise raise doubts with respect to the findings required under subsection (c).”

(e) TITLE VII.—

(1) SECTION 703.—Subsection (b)(1) of section 703 (50 U.S.C. 1881b) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (I), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(B) in subparagraph (J), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(K) a certification by the applicant that, to the best knowledge of the applicant, the attorney for the Government and the Department of Justice has been apprised of all information that might reasonably—

“(i) call into question the accuracy of the application or the reasonableness of any assessment in the application conducted by the

department or agency on whose behalf the application is made; or

“(ii) otherwise raise doubts with respect to the findings required under subsection (c).”

(2) SECTION 704.—Subsection (b) of section 704 (50 U.S.C. 1881c) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (6), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(B) in paragraph (7), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(8) a certification by the applicant that, to the best knowledge of the applicant, the attorney for the Government and the Department of Justice has been apprised of all information that might reasonably—

“(A) call into question the accuracy of the application or the reasonableness of any assessment in the application conducted by the department or agency on whose behalf the application is made; or

“(B) otherwise raise doubts with respect to the findings required under subsection (c).”

(f) REVIEW OF CASE FILES TO ENSURE ACCURACY.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Attorney General, in consultation with the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, shall promulgate rules governing the review of case files, as appropriate, to ensure that applications to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court under titles I or III of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.) that target United States persons are accurate and complete.

SEC. 202. DESCRIPTION OF TECHNIQUES CARRIED OUT BEFORE TARGETING UNITED STATES PERSON.

(a) TITLE I.—Section 104(a)(6) (50 U.S.C. 1804(a)(6)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (D), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(F) with respect to a target who is a United States person, including a statement describing the investigative techniques carried out before making the application; and”

(b) TITLE III.—Section 303(a)(6) (50 U.S.C. 1823(a)(6)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (D), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(F) with respect to a target who is a United States person, includes a statement describing the investigative techniques carried out before making the application; and”

SEC. 203. INVESTIGATIONS RELATING TO FEDERAL CANDIDATES AND ELECTED FEDERAL OFFICIALS.

(a) TITLE I.—Section 104(a)(6) (50 U.S.C. 1804(a)(6)), as amended by section 202, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(G) if the target of the electronic surveillance is an elected Federal official or a candidate in a Federal election, that the Attorney General has approved in writing of the investigation;”

(b) TITLE III.—Section 303(a)(6) (50 U.S.C. 1823(a)(6)), as amended by section 202, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(G) if the target of the physical search is an elected Federal official or a candidate in a Federal election, that the Attorney General has approved in writing of the investigation;”

SEC. 204. REMOVAL OR SUSPENSION OF FEDERAL OFFICERS FOR MISCONDUCT BEFORE FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE COURT.

Section 103 (50 U.S.C. 1803) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(1) REMOVAL OR SUSPENSION OF FEDERAL OFFICERS FOR MISCONDUCT BEFORE COURTS.—An employee, officer, or contractor of the United States Government who engages in deliberate misconduct with respect to proceedings before the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court or the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review shall be subject to appropriate adverse actions, including, as appropriate, suspension without pay or removal.”

SEC. 205. PENALTIES FOR OFFENSES RELATED TO FISA.

(a) FALSE DECLARATIONS BEFORE FISC AND FISCR.—Section 1623(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting before “, or both” the following: “or, if such proceedings are before or ancillary to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court or the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review established by section 103 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1803), imprisoned not more than eight years”.

(b) INCREASED PENALTY FOR UNAUTHORIZED USE.—Section 109(c) (50 U.S.C. 1809(c)) is amended by striking “five years” and inserting “eight years”.

(c) UNAUTHORIZED DISCLOSURE OF APPLICATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 109 (50 U.S.C. 1809) is amended—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “intentionally”; and

(B) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by inserting “intentionally” before “engages in”; and

(ii) by striking “; or” and inserting a semicolon;

(C) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by inserting “intentionally” before “disclose or uses”; and

(ii) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(D) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) is an employee, officer, or contractor of the United States Government and intentionally discloses an application, or classified information contained therein, for an order under any title of this Act to any person not entitled to receive classified information.”

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subsection (b) of such section is amended by striking “under subsection (a)” and inserting “under paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a)”.

SEC. 206. CONTEMPTS CONSTITUTING CRIMES.

Section 402 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after “any district court of the United States” the following: “, the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court or the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review established by section 103 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1803).”

SEC. 207. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this title shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply with respect to applications made under section 501 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1861) on or after such date.

TITLE III—FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE COURT

SEC. 301. DECLASSIFICATION OF SIGNIFICANT DECISIONS, ORDERS, AND OPINIONS.

(a) TIMING OF DECLASSIFICATION.—Subsection (a) of section 602 (50 U.S.C. 1872) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: “The Director shall complete the declassification review and public release of each such decision, order, or opinion by not later than 180 days after the date on which the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court or the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review issues such decision, order, or opinion.”

(b) MATTERS COVERED.—Such subsection is further amended—

(1) by striking “Subject to subsection (b)” and inserting “(1) Subject to subsection (b)”;

(2) by striking “includes a significant” and all that follows through “, and,” and inserting “is described in paragraph (2) and,”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(2) The decisions, orders, or opinions issued by the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court or the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review described in this paragraph are such decisions, orders, or opinions that—

“(A) include a significant construction or interpretation of any provision of law, including any novel or significant construction or interpretation of—

“(i) the term ‘specific selection term’; or

“(ii) section 501(a)(5); or

“(B) result from a proceeding in which an amicus curiae has been appointed pursuant to section 103(i).”

(c) APPLICATION OF REQUIREMENT.—Section 602 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1872) shall apply with respect to each decision, order, or opinion issued by the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court or the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review before, on, or after the date of the enactment of such section. With respect to such decisions, orders, or opinions issued before or on such date, the Director of National Intelligence shall complete the declassification review and public release of each such decision, order, or opinion pursuant to such section by not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 302. APPOINTMENT OF AMICI CURIAE AND ACCESS TO INFORMATION.

(a) EXPANSION OF APPOINTMENT AUTHORITY.—Subparagraph (A) of section 103(i)(2) (50 U.S.C. 1803(i)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

“(A) shall appoint an individual who has been designated under paragraph (1) to serve as amicus curiae to assist such court in the consideration of any application for an order or review that, in the opinion of the court—

“(i) presents a novel or significant interpretation of the law, unless the court issues a finding that such appointment is not appropriate; or

“(ii) presents exceptional concerns about the protection of the rights of a United States person under the first amendment to the Constitution, unless the court issues a finding that such appointment is not appropriate; and”.

(b) AUTHORITY TO SEEK REVIEW.—Subsection (i) of section 103 (50 U.S.C. 1803) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (7) through (11) as paragraphs (8) through (12), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (6) the following new paragraph:

“(7) AUTHORITY TO SEEK REVIEW OF DECISIONS.—

“(A) FISA COURT DECISIONS.—Following issuance of an order under this Act by the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court, an amicus curiae appointed under paragraph (2) may petition the court to certify for review to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review a question of law pursuant to subsection (j). If the court denies such petition, the court shall provide for the record a written statement of the reasons for such denial. Upon certification of any question of law pursuant to this subparagraph, the Court of Review shall appoint the amicus curiae to assist the Court of Review in its consideration of the certified question, unless the Court of Review issues a finding that such appointment is not appropriate.

“(B) FISA COURT OF REVIEW DECISIONS.—An amicus curiae appointed under paragraph (2) may petition the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review to certify for review to the Supreme Court of the United States any question of law pursuant to section 1254(2) of title 28, United States Code.”.

(c) ACCESS TO INFORMATION.—

(1) APPLICATION AND MATERIALS.—Subparagraph (A) of section 103(i)(6) (50 U.S.C. 1803(i)(6)) is amended by striking clause (ii) and inserting the following new clause:

“(ii) may make a submission to the court requesting access to any particular materials or information (or category of materials or information) that the amicus curiae believes to be relevant to the duties of the amicus curiae.”.

(2) CONSULTATION AMONG AMICI CURIAE.—Such section is further amended—

(A) by redesignating subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D) as subparagraphs (C), (D), and (E), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following new subparagraph:

“(B) CONSULTATION.—If the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court or the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review determines that it is relevant to the duties of an amicus curiae appointed by the court under paragraph (2), the amicus curiae may consult with one or more of the other individuals designated by the court to serve as amicus curiae pursuant to paragraph (1) regarding any of the information relevant to any assigned proceeding.”.

(d) TERM LIMITS.—

(1) REQUIREMENT.—Paragraph (1) of section 103(i) (50 U.S.C. 1803(i)) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: “An individual may serve as an amicus curiae for a 5-year term, and the presiding judges may, for good cause, jointly reappoint the individual to a single additional term.”.

(2) APPLICATION.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall apply with respect to the service of an amicus curiae appointed under section 103(i) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1803(i)) that occurs on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, regardless of the date on which the amicus curiae is appointed.

SEC. 303. EFFECTIVE AND INDEPENDENT ADVICE FOR FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE COURT.

Section 103 (50 U.S.C. 1803), as amended by section 204, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(m) INDEPENDENT LEGAL ADVISORS.—

“(1) AUTHORITY.—The Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court and the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review may jointly employ legal advisors to assist the courts in all aspects of considering any matter before the courts, including with respect to—

“(A) providing advice on issues of law or fact presented by any application for an order under this Act;

“(B) requesting information from the Government in connection with any such application;

“(C) identifying any concerns with any such application; and

“(D) proposing requirements or conditions for the approval of any such application.

“(2) DIRECTION.—The legal advisors employed under paragraph (1) shall be subject solely to the direction of the presiding judges of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court and the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review.”.

SEC. 304. TRANSCRIPTS OF PROCEEDINGS AND COMMUNICATIONS REGARDING APPLICATIONS.

(a) TRANSCRIPTS.—Subsection (c) of section 103 (50 U.S.C. 1803) is amended—

(1) by striking “Proceedings under this Act” and inserting “(1) Proceedings under this Act”;

(2) by inserting “, and shall be transcribed” before the first period;

(3) by inserting “, transcriptions of proceedings,” after “applications made”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new sentence: “Transcriptions of proceedings shall be stored in a file associated with the relevant application or order.”.

(b) REQUIREMENT FOR WRITTEN RECORDS OF INTERACTIONS WITH COURT.—Such subsection, as amended by paragraph (1) of this section, is further amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(2) The Attorney General and the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court shall maintain all written substantive communications between the Department of Justice and the court, including the identity of the employees of the court to or from whom the communications were made, regarding an application or order made under this title in a file associated with the application or order.”.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subsection (i)(2) of section 103 (50 U.S.C. 1803) is amended by striking “subsection (c)” and inserting “subsection (c)(1)”.

SEC. 305. INFORMATION PROVIDED IN ANNUAL REPORTS.

(a) REPORTS BY DIRECTOR OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES COURTS.—Subsection (a)(1) of section 603 (50 U.S.C. 1873) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (E), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in subparagraph (F), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs:

“(G) the number of times the Attorney General required the emergency production of tangible things pursuant to section 501(i)(1) and the application under subparagraph (D) of such section was denied;

“(H) the number of certifications by the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review pursuant to section 103(j); and

“(I) the number of requests to certify a question made by an amicus curiae to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court or the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review pursuant to section 103(i)(7).”.

(b) REPORTS BY DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE.—Subsection (b)(5)(B) of such section, as amended by section 101, is amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: “, including information received electronically and through hardcopy and portable media”.

TITLE IV—TRANSPARENCY, SUNSETS, AND OTHER MATTERS

SEC. 401. CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 601 (50 U.S.C. 1871) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (f); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (d) the following new subsection (e):

“(e) CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT.—In a manner consistent with the protection of the national security, nothing in this Act or any other provision of law may be construed to preclude the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate from receiving in a timely manner, upon request, applications submitted under this Act to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court, orders of the court, and relevant materials relating to such applications and orders.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 602(a) (50 U.S.C. 1872(a)) is amended by striking “in section 601(e)” and inserting “in section 601(f)”.

SEC. 402. ESTABLISHMENT OF COMPLIANCE OFFICERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title VI (50 U.S.C. 1871 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 605. COMPLIANCE OFFICERS.

“(a) APPOINTMENT.—The head of each covered agency shall appoint a single Federal officer to serve as the Compliance Officer for that agency.

“(b) COMPLIANCE.—Each Compliance Officer appointed under subsection (a) shall be responsible for overseeing the compliance of the relevant covered agency with the requirements of this Act.

“(c) AUDITS.—Each Compliance Officer shall conduct routine audits of the compliance by the relevant covered agency with—

“(1) the requirements of this Act regarding submitting applications to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court, including with respect to the accuracy of such applications; and

“(2) the minimization, targeting, querying, and accuracy procedures required by this Act.

“(d) ASSESSMENTS.—Each Compliance Officer shall—

“(1) conduct on a routine basis assessments of the efficacy of the minimization, targeting, querying, and accuracy procedures adopted by the Attorney General pursuant to this Act; and

“(2) annually submit to the Assistant Attorney General designated as the Assistant Attorney General for National Security under section 507A of title 28, United States Code, and the head of the relevant covered agency the findings of such assessments, including any recommendations of the Compliance Officer with respect to improving such procedures.

“(e) REMEDIATION.—Each Compliance Officer shall ensure the remediation of any compliance issues of the relevant covered agency identified pursuant to this section or the rules of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court.

“(f) INSPECTOR GENERALS ASSESSMENT.—On an annual basis, and consistent with the protection of sources and methods, each Inspector General of a covered agency shall submit to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court and the appropriate congressional committees an assessment of the implementation of this section by the covered agency.

“(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ‘appropriate congressional committees’ means—

“(A) the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives; and

“(B) the Select Committee on Intelligence and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate.

“(2) COVERED AGENCY.—The term ‘covered agency’ means a department or agency of the United States Government that submits applications to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court under this Act.

“(3) FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE COURT.—The term ‘Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court’ has the meaning given that term in section 101.”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 604 the following new item:

“Sec. 605. Compliance officers.”

SEC. 403. PUBLIC REPORTS ON INFORMATION OBTAINED OR DERIVED UNDER FISA AND PROTECTION OF FIRST AMENDMENT ACTIVITIES.

(a) REPORTS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the

Attorney General shall make publicly available the following reports:

(1) A report explaining how the United States Government determines whether information is “obtained or derived” from activities authorized by the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.) for purposes of the notice requirements under such Act.

(2) A report explaining how the United States Government interprets the prohibition under section 501(a) of such Act (50 U.S.C. 1861(a)) on conducting an investigation of a United States person “solely upon the basis of activities protected by the first amendment to the Constitution”.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—The Attorney General shall ensure that the reports under subsection (a) are detailed and use hypothetical fact patterns to describe how the United States Government conducts the analyses covered by the reports.

(c) FORM.—The reports under subsection (a) shall be made publicly available in unclassified form.

SEC. 404. MANDATORY REPORTING ON CERTAIN ORDERS.

(a) REPORTING ON UNITED STATES PERSON QUERIES.—Subsection (b)(2) of section 603 (50 U.S.C. 1873), as amended by section 101, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B), by striking “the number of search terms concerning a known United States person” and inserting “the number of search terms that concern a known United States person or are reasonably likely to identify a United States person”; and

(2) in subparagraph (C), by striking “the number of queries concerning a known United States person” and inserting “the number of queries that concern a known United States person or are reasonably likely to identify a United States person”.

(b) MODIFICATION TO EXCEPTIONS.—Subsection (d)(2) of such section, as amended by section 101, is amended by striking “(A) FEDERAL” and all that follows through “(B) ELECTRONIC MAIL ADDRESS AND TELEPHONE NUMBERS.—”.

SEC. 405. REPORT ON USE OF FISA AUTHORITIES REGARDING PROTECTED ACTIVITIES AND PROTECTED CLASSES.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board shall make publicly available, to the extent practicable, a report on—

(1) the extent to which the activities and protected classes described in subsection (b) are used to support targeting decisions in the use of authorities pursuant to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.); and

(2) the impact of the use of such authorities on such activities and protected classes.

(b) ACTIVITIES AND PROTECTED CLASSES DESCRIBED.—The activities and protected classes described in this subsection are the following:

(1) Activities and expression protected by the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

(2) Race, ethnicity, national origin, religious affiliation, sex, and any other protected characteristic determined appropriate by the Board.

(c) FORM.—In addition to the report made publicly available under subsection (a), the Board may submit to the appropriate congressional committees a classified annex.

(d) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on the Judiciary and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committee on the Judiciary and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

SEC. 406. IMPROVEMENTS TO PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES OVERSIGHT BOARD.

Paragraph (4) of section 1061(h) of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 2000ee(h)) is amended to read as follows:

“(4) TERM.—

“(A) COMMENCEMENT.—Each member of the Board shall serve a term of 6 years, commencing on the date of the appointment of the member to the Board.

“(B) REAPPOINTMENT.—A member may be reappointed to one or more additional terms.

“(C) VACANCY.—A vacancy in the Board shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

“(D) EXTENSION.—Upon the expiration of the term of office of a member, the member may continue to serve, at the election of the member—

“(i) during the period preceding the reappointment of the member pursuant to subparagraph (B); or

“(ii) until the member’s successor has been appointed and qualified.”

SEC. 407. SUNSETS.

(a) USA PATRIOT IMPROVEMENT AND REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2005.—Section 102(b)(1) of the USA PATRIOT Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2005 (50 U.S.C. 1805 note) is amended by striking “March 15, 2020” and inserting “December 1, 2023”.

(b) INTELLIGENCE REFORM AND TERRORISM PREVENTION ACT OF 2004.—Section 6001(b)(1) of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (50 U.S.C. 1801 note) is amended by striking “March 15, 2020” and inserting “December 1, 2023”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the earlier of the date of the enactment of this Act or March 15, 2020.

SEC. 408. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.) is amended as follows:

(1) In section 103(e) (50 U.S.C. 1803(e)), by striking “702(h)(4)” both places it appears and inserting “702(i)(4)”.

(2) In section 105(a)(4) (50 U.S.C. 1805(a)(4))—

(A) by striking “section 104(a)(7)(E)” and inserting “section 104(a)(6)(E)”; and

(B) by striking “section 104(d)” and inserting “section 104(c)”.

(3) In section 501(a) (50 U.S.C. 1861(a)), by indenting paragraph (3) 2 ems to the left.

(4) In section 603(b)(2)(C) (50 U.S.C. 1873(b)(2)(C)), by inserting “and” after the semicolon.

(5) In section 702 (50 U.S.C. 1881a)—

(A) in subsection (h)(3), by striking “subsection (i)” and inserting “subsection (j)”;

(B) in subsection (j)(1), by striking “subsection (g)” each place it appears and inserting “subsection (h)”;

(C) in the subsection heading of subsection (m), by inserting a comma after “ASSESSMENTS”.

(6) In section 801(8)(B)(iii) (50 U.S.C. 1885(8)(B)(iii)), by striking “702(h)” and inserting “702(i)”.

(7) In section 802(a)(3) (50 U.S.C. 1885a(a)(3)), by striking “702(h)” and inserting “702(i)”.

(b) REFERENCES TO FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE COURT AND FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE COURT OF REVIEW.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—Section 101 (50 U.S.C. 1801) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsections:

“(q) The term ‘Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court’ means the court established under section 103(a).

“(r) The terms ‘Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review’ and ‘Court of Review’ mean the court established under section 103(b).”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.) is amended—

(A) in section 102 (50 U.S.C. 1802), by striking “the court established under section 103(a)” and inserting “the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court”;

(B) in section 103 (50 U.S.C. 1803)—

(i) in subsection (a)—

(I) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking “The court established under this subsection” and inserting “The Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court”; and

(II) by striking “the court established under this subsection” each place it appears and inserting “the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court”;

(ii) in subsection (g)—

(I) by striking “the court established pursuant to subsection (a)” and inserting “the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court”;

(II) by striking “the court of review established pursuant to subsection (b)” and inserting “the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review”; and

(III) by striking “The courts established pursuant to subsections (a) and (b)” and inserting “The Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court and the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review”;

(iii) in subsection (h), by striking “a court established under this section” and inserting “the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court or the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review”;

(iv) in subsection (i)—

(I) in paragraph (1), by striking “the courts established under subsections (a) and (b)” and inserting “the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court and the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review”;

(II) in paragraph (3)(B), by striking “the courts” and inserting “the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court and the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review”;

(III) in paragraph (5), by striking “the court” and inserting “the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court or the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review, as the case may be.”;

(IV) in paragraph (6), by striking “the courts” each place it appears and inserting “the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court or the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review”;

(V) by striking “a court established under subsection (a) or (b)” each place it appears and inserting “the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court or the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review”; and

(VI) by striking “A court established under subsection (a) or (b)” each place it appears and inserting “The Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court or the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review”;

(v) in subsection (j)—

(I) by striking “a court established under subsection (a)” and inserting “the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court”; and

(II) by striking “the court determines” and inserting “the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court determines”;

(vi) by striking “the court established under subsection (a)” each place it appears and inserting “the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court”; and

(vii) by striking “the court established under subsection (b)” each place it appears and inserting “the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review”;

(C) in section 105(c) (50 U.S.C. 1805(c))—

(i) in paragraph (2)(B), by striking “the Court” and inserting “the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court”; and

(ii) in paragraph (3), by striking “the court” each place it appears and inserting “the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court”;

(D) in section 401(1) (50 U.S.C. 1841(1)), by striking “, and ‘State’” and inserting “‘State’, ‘Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court’, and ‘Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review’”;

(E) in section 402 (50 U.S.C. 1842)—

(i) in subsection (b)(1), by striking “the court established by section 103(a) of this Act” and inserting “the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court”; and

(ii) in subsection (h)(2), by striking “the court established under section 103(a)” and inserting “the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court”;

(F) in section 501 (50 U.S.C. 1861)—

(i) in subsection (b)(1), by striking “the court established by section 103(a)” and inserting “the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court”;

(ii) in subsection (g)(3), by striking “the court established under section 103(a)” and inserting “the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court”; and

(iii) in subsection (k)(1), by striking “, and ‘State’” and inserting “‘State’, and ‘Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court’”;

(G) in section 502(c)(1)(E), by striking “the court established under section 103” and inserting “the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court (as defined by section 101)”;

(H) in section 801 (50 U.S.C. 1885)—

(i) in paragraph (8)(B)(i), by striking “the court established under section 103(a)” and inserting “the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court”; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(10) FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE COURT.—The term ‘Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court’ means the court established under section 103(a).”;

(I) in section 802(a)(1) (50 U.S.C. 1885a(a)(1)), by striking “the court established under section 103(a)” and inserting “the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court”.

(c) UPDATED REFERENCES TO CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS.—The Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 102(a) (50 U.S.C. 1802(a))—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking “him” and inserting “the Attorney General”; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking “his certification” and inserting “the Attorney General’s certification”;

(2) in section 103(a)(1) (50 U.S.C. 1803(a)(1)), by striking “his decision” and inserting “the decision of such judge”;

(3) in section 104(a) (50 U.S.C. 1804(a))—

(A) in the language preceding paragraph (1), by striking “his finding” and inserting “the Attorney General’s finding”; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking “his belief” and inserting “the applicant’s belief”;

(4) in section 105(a) (50 U.S.C. 1805(a)), by striking “he” and inserting “the judge”;

(5) in section 106 (50 U.S.C. 1806)—

(A) in subsection (e), by striking “he” and inserting “the person”; and

(B) in subsection (j), by striking “his discretion” and inserting “the discretion of the judge”;

(6) in section 109 (50 U.S.C. 1809)—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking “he” and inserting “the person”; and

(B) in subsection (b), by striking “his official duties” and inserting “the official duties of such officer”;

(7) in section 305 (50 U.S.C. 1825)—

(A) in subsection (f)(1), by striking “he” and inserting “the person”; and

(B) in subsection (j)(1), by striking “his discretion” and inserting “the discretion of the judge”;

(8) in section 307 (50 U.S.C. 1827)—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking “he” and inserting “the person”; and

(B) in subsection (b), by striking “his official duties” and inserting “the official duties of such officer”; and

(9) in section 403 (50 U.S.C. 1843), by striking “his designee” and inserting “a designee of the Attorney General”.

(d) COORDINATION WITH OTHER AMENDMENTS MADE BY THIS ACT.—For purposes of applying amendments made by provisions of this Act other than this section, the amendments made by this section shall be treated as having been enacted immediately before any such amendments by other provisions of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary and the chair and ranking minority member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN), the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF), and the gentleman from California (Mr. NUNES) each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, or FISA, authorizes the government to collect foreign intelligence in the United States under the supervision of a secret court.

It is one of the most complicated, technical statutes we handle, but the story of FISA and how Congress reacts to its use is really very simple.

Some measure of surveillance is necessary to keep our country safe. Left unchecked, however, the executive branch is all too willing to unleash its considerable surveillance capabilities on the American people.

Our job as Members of Congress is to make sure that our intelligence capabilities are robust, but also to provide that critical check, to claw back authorities that go too far, and to press for changes that protect our civil liberties to the maximum extent possible.

H.R. 6172, the USA FREEDOM Reauthorization Act, is one step in that ongoing project of protecting our civil liberties.

It is by no means a perfect bill. There are many other changes to FISA that I would have liked to have seen here, but this bill includes very important reforms.

First and foremost, it ends the NSA’s call detail records program, which

began as part of a secret and unlawful surveillance project almost 20 years ago. This experiment has run its course, and our responsibility is to bring it to its formal end. It should never have been permitted to start, but now at least we can finally end it.

This bill also prohibits the use of section 215 to acquire information that would otherwise require a warrant in the law enforcement context. Our understanding of the Fourth Amendment has come to recognize a privacy interest in our physical location, and this legislation provides new protections accordingly.

As the law continues to evolve, the public will see how the government applies these standards in the FISA court. This bill requires the government to disclose all significant opinions of the FISA court within 180 days.

The bill also requires a one-time historical review of all significant opinions issued by the court since its inception. The Department of Justice may have good cause to classify the details of any particular case, but there is no reason that important interpretations of the law should be kept secret. There never was, and we finally managed to get rid of it.

Now, since we circulated the original draft of this bill, we have heard from a wide range of stakeholders, from the most progressive Members of the Democratic Caucus to the staunchest supporters of President Trump, and they have convinced us to make yet additional changes.

To address the concerns of those who seek additional guarantees of privacy, we have added new retention limits, new reports to explain key legal issues, and an explicit prohibition on the use of section 215 to obtain GPS and cell site location information.

Other Members asked us to address the deep structural flaws in FISA identified by the inspector general in the report issued late last year. We have done just that. Working with our Republican colleagues, we have mandated additional transparency in FISA applications, created additional scrutiny for cases that involve elected officials, and elevated the consequences for misrepresenting information to the FISA court.

I should also address the Members on both sides of the aisle who urged opposition to this bill because it does not contain every reform we might have wanted.

Madam Speaker, I agree. It does not contain every reform that I want. I am no fan of the underlying authorities.

I represent Lower Manhattan. I was in Congress when the World Trade Center was hit. Then and now, I resented that the government exploited 9/11 to pass the PATRIOT Act, which was much too restrictive of civil liberties, and other measures that I find dangerous and overbroad.

For many years, I led the opposition to reauthorization of the business records provision of FISA, which we

are finally doing something about today.

I am a founding member of what was then called the PATRIOT Act Reform Caucus to reform the PATRIOT Act. I have voted against every FISA bill that did not contain significant reform.

But the measure before us today does contain significant reform—again, not every change we would like to see, certainly not many of the changes I would like to see, but very decisive steps in the direction of protecting our civil rights and our civil liberties.

We are taking that step as we should—together, in a bipartisan fashion, and in complete agreement that when it comes to safeguarding our civil liberties, we have done what we could do, and we still have a great deal of work to do.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

I rise in support of the reform legislation.

This bill is not perfect, as the chairman said. It does not contain every reform that I would like to see or the reforms that I advocated for and many others advocated for, but it is a start. Most importantly, this bill is an improvement over what currently exists, over the status quo.

The legislation begins to address the problems that we saw with the FBI's illegal surveillance of Trump campaign associate Carter Page.

On December 9, 2019, the nonpartisan Justice Department inspector general released a 400-page report detailing the FBI's misconduct and the failures in its warrantless surveillance of Mr. Page.

Congressman MEADOWS and I urged our Democratic chairman to hold hearings on this report, but they were not interested.

Still, I hope all of my colleagues had a chance to read the inspector general's report because it should concern every single American.

Remember, if our law enforcement agencies can do this to a President, imagine what they can do to you and me.

The Justice Department inspector general found 17 significant errors or omissions in the FISA warrant applications for Mr. Page. Said more plainly, they lied to the court 17 times.

They didn't tell the court important information, like the guy who wrote the dossier was being paid for by the opposition party's campaign. They didn't tell the court the guy who wrote the document, the dossier, that they used to get the warrant was "desperate" to stop Trump and had communicated that to the Justice Department.

The inspector general also found 51 factual assertions made to the FISA court that were wrong or unsupported. It detailed how the FBI was too eager

to rely on phony political opposition research conducted by Christopher Steele and, as I said, funded by the Democrats.

According to the inspector general: "The FISA request form drew almost entirely from Steele's reporting in describing the factual basis to establish probable cause to believe that Page was an agent of a foreign power," which was not true.

The inspector general determined that the FBI did not have corroborating information to support the specific allegations made against Mr. Page. In fact, Steele was feeding the FBI gossip and innuendo as proof of wrongdoing. Then, the FBI used that information, as I said, to spy on an American citizen, without corroborating the information.

This is a great misuse of immense power that our Federal Government agencies have, and it is a severe abuse of trust.

Now, there has been a lot of talk about accountability for this misconduct, and I absolutely agree. There needs to be accountability at all levels.

The inspector general found that an FBI attorney actually doctored a piece of evidence. An FBI attorney did this. He doctored a piece of evidence that he used to obtain the warrant to spy on Mr. Page.

The attorney took an email that would have cut against the surveillance order on Mr. Page and changed its meaning. He changed its meaning 180 degrees so that it would support the surveillance. This is totally unacceptable.

The same FBI lawyer who the inspector general found to have shared anti-Trump text messages with his colleagues, writing all kinds of things—"the crazies won finally," "viva la resistance"—this attorney went on to serve on Special Counsel Robert Mueller's team investigating the debunked allegations about Russian collusion.

The FBI's misconduct on FISA is not limited to junior staffers, as some of my colleagues have asserted. Such rampant and flagrant abuse can occur only because of senior leadership failures: Director Comey, Deputy Director McCabe, and General Counsel Jim Baker.

In fact, the inspector general said as much in his report. Here are his words: "In our view, this was a failure of not only the operational team, but also of the managers and supervisors, including senior officials, in the chain of command."

It is no coincidence that the two most senior FBI officials involved, Director Comey and Deputy Director McCabe, were both referred for criminal prosecution by the inspector general for wrongdoing related to the investigations.

We cannot forget this background because that is why this reform legislation—again, while not everything we hoped for—is a necessary first step.

This bill would add several requirements to ensure a FISA application is complete and accurate. It requires the Attorney General to sign off on a FISA investigation of an elected official or candidate for Federal office. It forces the Justice Department to fire anyone who knowingly hides information from the FISA court. And the bill enhances congressional oversight of the FISA process.

It also allows the FISA court to appoint an amicus in cases involving political activities of a U.S. person. Because the FISA process is *ex parte*—meaning, of course, the U.S. person is not represented—I hope the appointment of the amicus will help the FISA court to protect the civil liberties of U.S. persons.

Like I said, I think we can and should do more, and I look forward to working with the chairman toward that end. But right now, this bill would improve the civil liberty protections of U.S. citizens.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD this letter from the chairwoman of the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND REFORM,
Washington, DC, March 10, 2020.

Hon. JERROLD NADLER,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to you concerning H.R. 6172, the “USA Freedom Reauthorization Act.” There are certain provisions in the legislation which fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

In the interest of permitting your Committee to proceed expeditiously on this bill, I am willing to waive this Committee’s right to sequential referral. I do so with the understanding that by waiving consideration of the bill, the Committee on Oversight and Reform does not waive any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill which fall within its Rule X jurisdiction. I request that you urge the Speaker to name Members of this Committee to any conference committee which is named to consider such provisions.

Please place this letter into the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House floor. Thank you for the cooperative spirit in which you have worked regarding this matter and others between our respective Committees.

Sincerely,

CAROLYN B. MALONEY,
Chairwoman.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, as a senior member of the Judiciary Committee, I am delighted to be able to join our Republican colleagues and Democratic colleagues and those of us who have advocated for a progressive mindset as it relates to civil liberties in this country in support of the reauthorization of the USA FREEDOM Act.

With that backdrop, however, I want to say to my good friend, he knows that the inspector general’s report in-

dicated that there was no political motive to the beginning of the investigation. And even though referrals have been made, none of the individuals he mentioned have been criminally prosecuted.

That is behind us, to a certain extent, but it is a good backdrop to make sure that anything we do, no matter who the individuals are, that we do it with the impeccable credentials of the Constitution, civil liberties, civil justice, and equality.

That is why I rise to support this legislation, although I know that a more detailed review might have warranted some additional fixes.

But I think it is important to take note that we do have the prohibition of the government from using section 215 to collect any records that would require a warrant if the information being assessed was for law enforcement purposes.

We are trying to contain and constrain. The bill requires the government to provide notice to individuals whose information is collected pursuant to 215, and it strengthens First Amendment protections by requiring the FISA court and the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review to appoint an amicus curiae in any instance where an application by the government presents significant concerns about impinging on the First Amendment.

The bill also strengthens the amicus curiae’s ability to protect privacy in civil liberties cases. As well, it directs the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board to conduct a study of the way the government’s use of FISA authorities may be premised.

The bill improves transparency. The bill strengthens reporting requirements. It strengthens, as I said, the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board.

In further debates right after 9/11, I worked on a number of legislative initiatives, including one bill in 2013, the FISA Court and Sunshine Act, bipartisan legislation that provided much-needed transparency without compromising national security to the decisions, orders, and opinions of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court.

That language is in this bill, the opportunity to review those decisions and for those decisions to be able to be reviewed as well.

I am a longstanding supporter of the USA FREEDOM Act, particularly because section 301 of that bill, which is not in this bill, has protections against reversed targeting.

□ 1530

Each moment that we have an opportunity to provide security for this Nation we also have the equal opportunity of infringing on the civil liberties of our fellow citizens. It is important today to stand on this floor and say to the American people that we do believe in their constitutional rights and the Bill of Rights. This leg-

islation is to further contain those infringements and to protect the rights of our citizens.

Madam Speaker, I want my colleagues to support this legislation.

Madam Speaker, as a senior member of the Judiciary Committee and as an original cosponsor of the USA Freedom Act, which stands for “Uniting and Strengthening America by Fulfilling Rights and Ending Eavesdropping, Dragnet-collection, and Online Monitoring Act”, I rise in support of the “USA Freedom Reauthorization Act of 2020.”

I support the USA Freedom Reauthorization Act of 2020 for several reasons:

1. The bill continues to prohibit the NSA from collecting bulk phone records. By doing so, the government no longer has the authority to collect large amounts of call detail records on an ongoing basis. The Call Detail Records program not only resulted in the over-collection of records that the NSA did not have authority to receive but also resulted in several technical problems.

2. The USA Freedom Reauthorization Act prohibits the government from using Section 215 to collect any records that would require a warrant if the information being accessed were for law enforcement purposes. This provision ensures that Section 215 can keep pace with future developments in the law as courts interpret *Carpenter v. United States* and apply it to other contexts.

3. The bill requires the government to provide notice to individuals whose information is collected pursuant to Section 215 if the government plans to use that information, or any information derived from it, in a criminal case or other legal proceeding.

4. The USA Freedom Reauthorization Act strengthens First Amendment Protections by requiring the FISC and the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review to appoint an amicus curia in any instance where an application by the government presents significant concerns about impinging on the First Amendment activities of Americans.

5. The bill contains other measures to strengthen amicus curiae’s ability to protect privacy in civil liberties in cases to which they are appointed.

6. The USA Freedom Reauthorization Act directs the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board to conduct a study of the way the government’s use of FISA authorities may be premised on or may impact protected classes, including based on race, ethnicity, national origin, religion, or sex.

7. The bill improves transparency by requiring the declassification of significant FISC and FISC-R opinions within 180 days.

8. The USA Freedom Reauthorization Act strengthens the reporting requirement for Section 702 queries by eliminating an existing exemption for the FBI.

9. The bill strengthens the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board (PCLOB) by allowing members to be reappointed to consecutive terms and to continue serving after their terms have expired, should they so choose.

The USA Freedom Act was first passed in 2015 as the House’s unified response to the unauthorized disclosures and subsequent publication in the media in June 2013, regarding the National Security Agency’s collection from Verizon of the phone records of all of its American customers, which was authorized by the FISA Court pursuant to Section 215 of the Patriot Act.

Public reaction to the news of this massive and secret data gathering operation was swift and negative.

There was justifiable concern on the part of the public and a large percentage of the Members of this body that the extent and scale of this NSA data collection operation, which exceeded by orders of magnitude anything previously authorized or contemplated, may constitute an unwarranted invasion of privacy and threat to the civil liberties of American citizens.

To quell the growing controversy, the Director of National Intelligence declassified and released limited information about this program. According to the DNI, the information acquired under this program did not include the content of any communications or the identity of any subscriber.

The DNI stated that “the only type of information acquired under the Court’s order is telephony meta data, such as telephone numbers dialed and length of calls.”

The assurance given by the DNI, to put it mildly, was not very reassuring.

In response, many Members of Congress, including then Ranking Member Conyers, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and myself, introduced legislation in response to the disclosures to ensure that the law and the practices of the executive branch reflect the intent of Congress in passing the USA Patriot Act and subsequent amendments.

For example, I introduced H.R. 2440, the “FISA Court in the Sunshine Act of 2013,” bipartisan legislation, that provided much needed transparency without compromising national security to the decisions, orders, and opinions of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court or “FISA Court.”

Specifically, my bill required the Attorney General to disclose each decision, order, or opinion of a Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court (FISC), allowing Americans to know how broad of a legal authority the government is claiming under the PATRIOT ACT and Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act to conduct the surveillance needed to keep Americans safe.

These requirements were then incorporated in substantial part in the USA Freedom Act, which required the Attorney General to conduct a declassification review of each decision, order, or opinion of the FISA court that included a significant construction or interpretation of law and to submit a report to Congress within 45 days.

As I indicated, perhaps the most important reasons for supporting passage of the USA Freedom Act is the prohibition on domestic bulk collection, as well as its enhanced First Amendment protections, both of which seek to protect American citizens from the NSA’s abuse of power through unlawful collection of personal data.

I was also a longstanding supporter of the USA Freedom Act, particularly because Section 301 of the bill contained protections against “reverse targeting,” which became law when an earlier Jackson Lee Amendment was included in H.R. 3773, the RESTORE Act of 2007.

“Reverse targeting,” a concept well known to members of this Committee but not so well understood by those less steeped in the arcana of electronic surveillance, is the practice where the government targets foreigners without a warrant while its actual purpose is to collect information on certain U.S. persons.

One of the main concerns of libertarians and classical conservatives, as well as pro-

gressives and civil liberties organizations, in giving expanded authority to the executive branch was the temptation for national security agencies to engage in reverse targeting may be difficult to resist in the absence of strong safeguards to prevent it.

The Jackson Lee Amendment, preserved in Section 301 of the USA Freedom Act, reduced even further any such temptation to resort to reverse targeting by making any information concerning a United States person obtained improperly inadmissible in any federal, state, or local judicial, legal, executive, or administrative proceeding.

Madam Speaker, I noted in an op-ed published way back in October 2007, that as Alexis DeTocqueville, the most astute student of American democracy, observed nearly two centuries ago, the reason democracies invariably prevail in any military conflict is because democracy is the governmental form that best rewards and encourages those traits that are indispensable to success: initiative, innovation, courage, and a love of justice.

I support the USA Freedom Reauthorization Act of 2020 because it will help keep us true to the Bill of Rights and strikes the proper balance between cherished liberties and smart security.

I urge my colleagues to support the USA Freedom Reauthorization Act.

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

I will just real quickly say that the gentlewoman is exactly right. People should be prosecuted. It was so bad in the Carter Page application. Here is what the former chief judge of the FISA court said:

The frequency with which representations made by FBI personnel turned out to be unsupported or contradicted by information in their possession and with which they withheld information detrimental to their case calls into question whether information contained in other FBI applications is reliable.

Put in plain English: You lied so much, how can we trust any other representation you have made to the court?

That is what this legislation is designed to begin to address and protect American citizens who will be in front of this court.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), who has been a strong advocate in this area and former chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I am no stranger to this debate. In the aftermath of 9/11, I stood on this floor to advance the USA PATRIOT Act. I still believe, as I did at the time, in its necessity to protect our country from terrorist attacks.

In 2015, after abuses of the surveillance authorities were brought to light, I fought for reforms that resulted in the passage of the USA FREEDOM Act.

Today I rise in support of this reauthorization bill. The expiring provisions are still necessary to the national security of the United States. However, much like in 2015, we have been made aware of surveillance abuses that re-

quire our attention. I believe this bill offers substantial reforms to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, reforms that are imperative for accountability and the restoration of Americans’ confidence in our intelligence system.

The FISA abuses in the Carter Page case were staggering. We learned about these when Inspector General Michael Horowitz released his report on December 9, 2019. I said at the time that Congress had the responsibility to fully examine his findings and to take corrective actions.

Unfortunately, we have not fully examined this report. Despite being released 3 months ago, we have not held one hearing on the House side. There is documented evidence of errors, missteps, and omissions that resulted in the degradation of Carter Page’s constitutional rights, and, to date, the House majority has largely ignored it.

So I am glad that the majority is finally acknowledging the abuses in the Horowitz report by introducing corrective actions in this bill.

There are several good provisions for accountability in the bill. For instance, the Attorney General must now approve, in writing, the FISA investigation of an elected official or candidate for Federal office. Also, the legislation expands the use of an amicus in cases involving the political activities of U.S. citizens. The legislation creates checks to ensure that information being presented to the FISC is accurate.

It is impossible to legislate away bad behavior by malicious actors, but this legislation places much-needed safeguards to prevent another Carter Page-type scandal from happening again.

My colleagues who wish we should do more are right; we should do more. But with a deadline on Sunday, we must either act now or let these important national security authorities expire.

Since the inception of the PATRIOT Act, I have fought for oversight of powerful surveillance apparatus. I believe that the reforms presented in this bill are a good step to restoring the oversight.

The reauthorization reinforces essential and effective tools that have been in place since 9/11, while also strengthening the protection of citizen civil liberties in the United States.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY).

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this USA FREEDOM Reauthorization Act of 2020.

This bill strikes just the right balance between protecting our national security and strengthening civil liberties. It preserves critical tools used by authorities to investigate international terrorism and foreign intelligence matters, but also makes significant reforms to enhance privacy and transparency.

I would like to quickly highlight some of the important privacy protections included in the bill.

For example, the FBI may no longer be able to keep business records collected under FISA indefinitely. Those records would have to be destroyed after 5 years, except in very narrow circumstances.

The government will also have to provide notice to individuals whose business records are used in a criminal case or other proceeding unless the proceeding's adjudicator finds that disclosure would harm national security. Individuals who receive notice would then be able to challenge the legality of the government's collection, a right that should be maintained when intrusive national security authorities are used to gather evidence.

In addition to these privacy enhancements, the bill also requires greater transparency about how the government uses FISA. The bill imposes a 180-day clock on declassification of significant opinions issued by the FISA court and requires the government to look further in its historical records than it has done before.

Moreover, the bill enhances transparency in the intelligence community's annual public reports so we get a better sense of when the government conducts U.S. person queries into FISA data.

These are but some examples of the important transparency and private reforms contained in this bill. These reforms are all accomplished without negatively impacting our national security.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for it.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS).

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The recurring theme that I have heard today is that we should be doing more to fix FISA. That is not unlike what James Madison described in the Federalist Papers when he described parchment barriers between the various departments of government, meaning the three branches of government, afraid that all of it could be sucked into the vortex of power—those are his words—of the legislative branch.

And here we are discussing parchment barriers for those who have basically abused the FISA process so far. We are putting more parchment barriers in place, but they don't mean anything. They don't mean anything if you never see someone prosecuted.

So let's talk about one of the things that has been touted, a lengthening of the time of sentencing from 5 years to 8 years if you are found to commit abuse. How about contempt proceedings that are being put in here?

But do you know what? We know FISA was abused. We know that people lied to the court, and we know something else. The Inspector General recommended criminal charges be filed on people.

These parchment barriers make no sense, have no strength and no efficacy

when we don't see someone indicted, charged, or convicted. To say something is criminal in nature doesn't matter when you don't prosecute them.

If you want to deter somebody, you must see prosecution so, that way, you get specific deterrence for that individual or general deterrence to the rest of the people who are inclined to commit bad acts.

The flaws in this bill are that we don't see application of any of these reforms. So we can tout them all we wish—a whole litany of them—but until you actually hold people accountable, this bill has no efficacy. For that reason, I will be opposing.

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

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON).

Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise to caution my colleagues about this false dilemma of security versus freedom and about supporting and defending our Constitution against all enemies foreign or domestic by abridging the rights and freedoms protected by our Constitution.

I want to applaud, frankly, the behind-the-scenes folks on the committees who worked hard to make this bill better than the status quo. Many of my colleagues will look at this, and, frankly, that has been the argument by the ranking member and the chairman that this bill really isn't that good of a bill, that it is really not what we should do, but it is better than the status quo.

Too often that is what happens here. I think that might leave people with the false perception that we couldn't do better. But the reality is there is bipartisan agreement and bicameral agreement on the Safeguarding Americans' Private Records Act.

The bill that the committee was going to move forward with was pulled. The committee process didn't take place because there was a bipartisan coalition of conservatives and progressives who had a plan to amend the bill. It may, in fact, have been a completely different bill.

We also didn't take it through committee. We also didn't allow any amendments, so numerous good amendments weren't even able to be considered, amendments like the confess your transgressions amendment that would say that, of all these agencies that report, the Director of National Intelligence would say: What has been done to discipline people who access these records in violation of statute?

My colleague, Mr. BIGGS, highlighted the real problem. There is one standard for everyday Americans and a different one for the powerful and connected. Our Justice Department needs to hold someone accountable. Whether it is in my district, in a Republican district, or one of my colleagues' districts, in a Democratic district, we get the same

question: When is someone going to jail?

We need to know that the law is being followed, that Lady Justice does have a blindfold on, and that there is one standard. This falls far short of that, and it is not the standard that should be used against American citizens; therefore, it is not the standard that should be used to secure our country.

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

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, may I inquire of the Chair how much time the minority has remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. ARMSTRONG).

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Madam Speaker, to my colleagues on both sides who think that this bill doesn't go far enough, I can tell you that, probably 3 days ago, I was 100 percent in your camp. If you would have told me today I was going to stand up and speak in favor of this bill, I would have told you that is not true, yet here I am.

The reason is because I think we are dealing with some issues that are important to discuss:

One, there is no legislation that we can write that will make bad actors not be bad actors. There is no amicus provision or any provision that is going to allow for somebody who is going to lie to their own superiors to not lie to somebody else.

Two, the provisions of lone wolf and roving wiretaps are incredibly important to national security. There is not a lot of debate amongst those things.

Three, FISA and title 1 were originally designed because of abuses to civil rights. We know that title 1 has been abused, and that is why we are here.

But are we better off without title 1? I don't think so. We weren't before. We are better off with it.

So what does this bill actually do that is important, that is why a guy like me who believes in the Fourth Amendment, believes in the First Amendment, and believes in the privacy of our citizens, why would I stand here? Because it increases transparency; it moves it through the process faster; it puts real compliance checks in place; and it holds people accountable both through a contempt proceeding and enhanced criminal penalties.

When we are dealing with something as important as civil liberties, I think we have to ask the question: Are we better off tomorrow than we are today? This bill puts us in a better position tomorrow than it did yesterday.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Madam Speaker, as the gentleman from North Dakota just articulated, the bill is better than where we are currently—no call detail records, amicus kicks in if there is a First Amendment concern of any American citizen who is in front of the court. The penalties are real: You lie to the court, you omit information from the court, or you go leak information about the application you submitted to the court, there are enhanced penalties.

There is the transcript provision. There is now a transcript that will be given to the intelligence community. That is a good step, knowing that somebody is going to be looking at what you are doing and is going to see it in a real timeframe is important.

The annual assessment from the IG, the same IG who just told us 3 months ago that the FBI went to the court in the Carter Page application and lied 17 times, that individual, Mr. Horowitz, will be doing an annual assessment; compliance office within the Department of Justice so that there are more people looking at the application on the front end, hopefully, we don't have as many problems; and finally, as the chairman indicated, no cell site GPS location indication without a warrant—those are victories for the American citizen. It is not as much as we would like, but it is a darn good first step.

Madam Speaker, I urge people to support the legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I just want to say that I am in complete agreement with the ranking minority member that this is a very good bill, that we do a lot of things that we ought to do, that we don't do a lot of things, unfortunately, that we should do, but we did what we could.

Undoubtedly, the ranking member and I have different ideas. Some of the things which he thinks we did not enough I think we did too much and vice versa, but we did have some of the things he thinks that we shouldn't have done I wish we had done. But we did manage to reach agreement.

As I said, I believe it is a very good bill. It is not as protective of civil liberties as I would like to see it, but we got as far as we possibly could, and so I urge everyone to vote for this bill.

I know there will be some dissent on our side of the aisle based on civil liberties concerns. I can only say that, with most of those concerns that I have heard voiced, I agree with them, but we just couldn't get them.

Before I close, I want to recognize the staff on both sides of the aisle who have worked around the clock for the past few weeks to reach a compromise and bring this bill to the floor.

Although there are too many to name here, I should single out the following individuals: Aaron Hiller, Sophia Brill, and Sarah Istel from my staff; Wells Bennett, Nicolas Mitchell, Raffaella Wakeman, and William Wu

from the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence majority; Ryan Breitenbach and Bobby Parmiter from the Judiciary Republican side; Stephen Castor and Tyler Grimm from Mr. JORDAN's staff; and Laura Casulli, Meghan Green, and Allen Souza for the HPSCI Republicans.

□ 1545

The country should be proud of what we have all accomplished here, what they have accomplished here, and I thank each and every one of them.

Madam Speaker, in closing, I will simply say that it is our responsibility to work across the aisle and across the branches of the government to bring our national security in line with our values.

We have done so here, but that work is an ongoing project. It must not end today, because we have a long way to go yet.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the USA FREEDOM Reauthorization Act, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) and the gentleman from California (Mr. NUNES) each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the USA FREEDOM Reauthorization Act of 2020.

This bill makes a number of critical and important reforms to strengthen civil liberties and privacy protections under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act while simultaneously protecting the national security of the United States. In addition, the bill provides for greater transparency and increased oversight and accountability to ensure the integrity of the FISA process.

Over the past several weeks, Chairman NADLER and I, along with Speaker PELOSI and Majority Leader HOYER, have worked with Members from across the caucus and the aisle to develop a set of reforms that our Democratic Caucus could be proud to support. This bill is a result of that effort. It builds on the achievements of the USA FREEDOM Act of 2015, which passed with 338 votes in the House and the overwhelming support of the Democratic Caucus to put in place long-sought reforms to FISA.

The three expiring provisions that this bill would reauthorize are vitally important to protecting national security. One of those measures, the roving wiretap provision, authorizes continued court-approved surveillance of targets, even if they change their phones or other devices. Its expiration, or that of the other two provisions, would be to no one's benefit. Our counterterrorism and national security activities would be severely hamstrung, and we would have lost the opportunity to press for reforms that we are seeking.

At the outside of this process, administration officials, like the Attorney General, along with Senate Republican leadership, made it clear that they preferred a clean and permanent reauthorization of these authorities. On a bipartisan basis, this bill rejects that demand, producing a bill that holds firm to our commitment to civil liberties, oversight, and transparency, and, importantly, has an important sunset.

Let me describe just a few of the reforms included in this legislation:

The bill would end, once and for all, NSA's authority to collect call detail records on an ongoing basis, and destroy all records previously obtained under these authorities.

This bill would require that the government get a warrant under FISA, if one would be needed in the law enforcement context.

This bill would prohibit the government from retaining business records for more than 5 years, with exceptions, such as an imminent threat to human life.

This bill would expand the appointment of amici in FISA court proceedings, permit amici to seek access to more information, and creating a framework for amici to seek higher court review of questions of law to the FISA courts.

The bill would also strengthen the requirement for the declassification and release of FISA court opinions and apply the requirements retroactively to prior to the enactment of the 2015 USA FREEDOM Act.

Madam Speaker, I recognize there are additional reforms that Members would like to see in the bill. I sought additional reforms as well. As with any negotiation, no one side is getting everything they want, but I believe it is important to enhance transparency and privacy safeguards whenever possible.

But this is a strong result that makes substantial reforms that so many members of our caucus, myself included, have worked hard to secure for many years. And I will continue to work to secure further protections for privacy and civil liberties and to provide vigorous oversight of FISA.

Madam Speaker, I support the bill, which makes important reforms to the FISA process and urge Members to vote "yes," and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, or FISA, is a critical tool for thwarting terrorist plots and collecting vital intelligence on actors who are hostile to U.S. interests.

During the FBI's 2016 Russia collusion investigation, however, FBI officials grossly abused FISA to spy on an associate of a Presidential campaign they opposed.

The purpose of the bill before us today is to reauthorize expiring FISA authorities while ensuring that other

FISA tools can never again be turned against the American people for political purposes.

In 2017, in the course of our own investigation on Russia, House Intelligence Committee Republicans received strong indications that FISA had been severely abused in order to spy on Carter Page, a former associate of the Trump campaign.

As we investigated the matter, we were stonewalled at nearly every juncture by top officials of the FBI and the Department of Justice. Their denials of any wrongdoing were uniformly repeated by the media and by political figures, who were spreading the false accusation that Trump campaign officials colluded with the Russian Government to interfere in the 2016 Presidential election.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank my Republican colleagues and staff on the committee who persisted amid the most determined obstruction of any investigation this House has seen in a long time.

I also want to thank our Republican colleagues on the House Oversight and Judiciary Committees who worked hard to uncover the full extent of this malfeasance.

The full scope of the abuse was eventually detailed by Inspector General Michael Horowitz, whose December 2019 report revealed 17 major mistakes and omissions, along with many lesser abuses.

Among many other abuses the Inspector General found, is that the FBI had used unverified allegations from the Steele dossier to get a FISA warrant on Carter Page; had misrepresented the reliability of those allegations to the court; had omitted exculpatory information from their submission; and had doctored an email to hide Page's prior cooperation with a U.S. intelligence agency.

H.R. 6172 is the first step in imposing reforms to address these gross abuses and restore accountability in the FISA process. These reforms include but are not limited to:

Requiring the Attorney General's approval in order to obtain a FISA warrant for any candidate for Federal office;

Imposing stronger penalties for those who conceal information from the FISA court or leak FISA-derived information; and

Providing clear authorization for Congress to access FISA materials so that elected officials can better oversee FISA cases without obstruction.

This legislation makes strong reforms that will protect the American people from government overreach while continuing to protect the homeland from terrorist threats.

Close Congressional oversight of the FISA process, which will be enhanced significantly by this bill, must continue in order to prevent future abuses. What happened to the Trump campaign in 2016 can never be allowed to happen again, not to a political campaign and not to an American citizen.

I believe I speak for all Republicans when I say that our work is not finished. We will continue to look for further ways to improve both privacy protections as well as FISA's effectiveness in defusing national security threats to our country.

Madam Speaker, I urge support of H.R. 6172, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. HIMES).

Mr. HIMES. Madam Speaker, I thank and compliment the chairman and the ranking member—and the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary—for doing such good and bipartisan work at this rather tense and polarized time around reauthorizing a number of authorities that have been, not just important, but essential to keeping the American public safe.

And they did that, of course, mindful of the need to balance those authorities and those activities with the very legitimate civil liberties interests that we all have, and with our obligation to the Constitution, which we all swear an oath to support and defend.

Madam Speaker, as the chairman said, this bill will reauthorize, even as it imposes additional oversight, a couple of very important authorities, while ending the authority that I think in the last several years was most problematic to me, to many people in this Chamber, and to the American people, which was the bulk collection of telephone metadata.

That was a debate that led to the original USA FREEDOM Act of 2015, to those reforms, and gets us to where we are today where Americans can know that the NSA, a foreign intelligence agency, will not be collecting their records, their metadata. And I believe that that is a very substantial achievement in today's bill.

I would like to take a moment, though, to wrestle with a charge that was leveled by my friends and colleagues on the progressive side, and their recommendation with respect to this bill. Their statement called these authorities "sweeping unconstitutional surveillance." And, with respect, I would say that none of that is true.

Sweeping. Let's talk about sweeping for a second. I guess we could argue about exactly what that means, but of the authorities that are being discussed, we are ending the metadata program. The lone-wolf authority, which allows us to surveil a potential terrorist who is not affiliated with a designated terrorist group, has never been used. That leaves, of course, the roving wiretap authority, which is used in a pointed and careful way and has been used to save lives and prosecute terrorists. That is not, I would suggest with respect, sweeping.

So constitutional, the charge that this is unconstitutional is something that we should examine and take seriously. In this time of overheated rhet-

oric, I think it is important that we be very clear and very specific in the words that we use. So let me just say about the charge that there is anything unconstitutional in these authorities:

No provision has ever been held to be unconstitutional by the Supreme Court, by the FISA court itself, or by any other court.

And it is not just the courts, these authorities have been subject to review by the President's Civil Liberties Oversight Board, and they have not deemed any of these authorities unconstitutional.

They have been subject to Congressional scrutiny and, of course, most famously and most recently, subject to review by the Inspector General, who—yes—discovered very significant deficiencies in the way a FISA application dealing with an American citizen was dealt with.

My friends who are concerned about the possibility of the unconstitutional activity should remember, not a single authority has ever been deemed to be unconstitutional. And over and over again, the FISA court, and most recently Inspector General Horowitz, has pushed back hard on misbehavior, on negligence in this area.

So what we are left with here is balance. And as the chairman and as the ranking member have said, the reforms that are made in this bill with respect to empowering an amicus, with respect to giving the President's Civil Liberties Oversight Board additional authorities strike that balance.

Madam Speaker, I close by urging my colleagues to accept that we have made a lot of progress, that this was all about preserving civil liberties, and to vote in favor of H.R. 6172, the USA FREEDOM Reauthorization Act of 2020.

□ 1600

Mr. NUNES. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the Republican leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Madam Speaker, before I begin, I want to thank the gentleman, the ranking member of the Intelligence Committee. He warned the American public when he was chair. He warned them and told them that FISA was not used correctly, that the power of the government overstretched their arms.

But even when the other elements of government said no, they did not, even when others got on to that exact same position and told us everything was fine with FISA, it was not until the inspector general got his report that the truth was known.

I thank Congressman DEVIN NUNES for being the truth, telling it to the American public, and staying with it when others wanted to lie.

That is why we are here today. That is why this will not continue or ever happen again.

Madam Speaker, at the heart of our Constitution is a simple idea, the idea

of checks and balances. These principles protect Americans' freedoms by creating safeguards against the potential of government overreach of power.

Unfortunately, in 2016, those checks and balances were not in place to stop individuals at the highest level of the FBI and Justice Department from spying on Carter Page, an American citizen who could have been one of us.

They used the secretive FISA courts, which are meant to keep Americans safe from foreign enemies, to attempt to undermine their domestic political opponent at that time, then-candidate Donald Trump.

After years of thorough and independent investigation, we now know the truth: what happened in 2016 was politically motivated; it was completely unjustified; and it must never happen again.

This bipartisan legislation addresses the need for greater accuracy and accountability in the FISA process. It does not damage the legitimate authorities our intelligence community relies on to keep us safe, but it does strengthen protections for civil liberties.

Among its many reforms, this legislation increases the punishment for unauthorized disclosure of FISA applications, authorizes an amicus to be appointed to cases involving political activity, and enhances oversight by Congress and creates a new Office of Compliance.

These reforms are an astonishing accomplishment in a period of divided government. That just tells you how important FISA reforms and checks and balances truly are.

Outside this Chamber, there are quotes from famous Americans who dedicated their lives to preserving American freedom.

One of those individuals, Patrick Henry, was so passionate about his defense of freedom that he famously said: "Give me liberty or give me death." We can learn a lot from Henry's total devotion to the American cause.

We can learn a lot from those who are willing to stand up to oppressive Big Government, who would use an arm illegally against the check and balance just to try to have an outcome in a political race.

We could thank those like DEVIN, who stood for the American public and the truth, or those in other committees who helped work on this, the JIM JORDANS, the DOUG COLLINSes, that we would not be here today and getting a new compliance office, a check and balance to make sure what happened in 2016 cannot happen again.

I do urge all my colleagues to vote "yes." I do urge that this is a turning point, that even though in these committees they could have told us, and they did, that there was nothing wrong, that we had to continue to fight to get an inspector general to have the truth.

Now, we have a check and balance that we will not have to wait for that.

Even if somebody tries to use it in the wrong manner, it cannot happen again.

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I am especially thankful to Chairman SCHIFF for yielding me this time since I have reached a different conclusion on the bill than he has.

I would like to quote from the American Civil Liberties Union letter received today. The American Civil Liberties Union strongly urges us to vote "no" on this bill.

They say: "Over the last several years, it has been abundantly clear that many of our surveillance laws are broken." But that, "disappointingly, the reforms contained in H.R. 6172 are minimal—in many cases merely representing a codification of the status quo. In addition," the ACLU says, "the bill contains provisions that would be a step back from even our flawed current law."

The ACLU goes on to say that "the bill fails to require that individuals receive appropriate notice and access to information when FISA information is used against them," that "the bill fails to fully address deficiencies with the FISA court that have led to illegal surveillance," that "the bill fails to appropriately limit the types of information that can be collected under section 215," that "the bill fails to appropriately raise the standard for collecting information under section 215," and that "the bill fails to appropriately limit the retention of information collected under section 215."

I agree with the chairman that the roving wiretap provision in the act is important and should be renewed. But I cannot support the bill that is before us today, and I say that with tremendous respect for Chairman SCHIFF. We have had very candid and useful discussions. I appreciate the effort that he has put into this.

I have put in a lot of effort, too. But in the end, we have a bill that I think should not be supported. I intend to vote "no," with tremendous respect for the chairman and the effort that he has put into this.

Mr. NUNES. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, I appreciate my friend yielding to me, and I appreciate my colleague, Ms. LOFGREN's comments.

Any law that is based on a lie has a good chance of being a problem. The lie starts with the initial FISA, the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act. Yet, it is not foreign.

Now, since I have been here, whether it is the PATRIOT Act or reauthorizing the FISA court, we are told: Look, American citizens have nothing to worry about because the only American citizen that gets caught up through the FISA court is somebody that is dealing with a known foreign terrorist or a known foreign organiza-

tion engaged in terrorism. You know, just avoid dealing with terrorists, and you are going to be okay.

The problem is, I keep hearing, this is a good first step. No, this isn't the first step. This is the last step, and as my friend Ms. LOFGREN said, it doesn't go far enough.

As my friend MICHAEL CLOUD said, under the current bill, they ignored the penalty for lying to the judge, which was a 5-year sentence. Now, under the new law, they can ignore an 8-year sentence. That doesn't really help preserve anybody's rights.

This was not done in the committee. It did not have proper debate. The secret court had the bill pulled away from the full committee, so we couldn't debate it. We couldn't discuss it, and it was pulled into a secret negotiation that many of us were not part of.

Look, having the Attorney General sign it doesn't work either, and it shouldn't be a special category for Federal elected officials. In fact, what it should be is all Americans.

Acting Attorney General Rosenstein, he signed off on one of the applications himself. Obviously, that is not a deterrent.

We need to fix the FISA court. This doesn't do it, and I will vote "no" until we have adequate reforms that do.

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I have no further speakers. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NUNES. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. STEWART).

Mr. STEWART. Madam Speaker, let me state a fact. FISA has been abused by those who are trusted with authority, and we can't let it happen again.

This is what we know are also facts: An opposing campaign paid a foreign citizen to dig up dirt on President Trump and his campaign associates. These allegations—produced, by the way, by a foreign citizen—came to be known as the Steele dossier. The campaign then fed these bogus allegations through the administration, to include leadership at the FBI, the CIA, the Department of Justice, and even the State Department. Then, the FBI shamefully used these bogus allegations as the basis for a secret wiretap, of course, on the famous Mr. Carter Page.

The FBI deliberately hid the fact that these allegations were both known to be bogus and the fact that the campaign had paid for them. The application on Mr. Page cited a news article corroborating these allegations, but the FBI hid from the court the fact that they knew the source of these articles was the author of the dossier.

We discovered that the FBI and DOJ investigators in this case demonstrated enormous bias against the Trump campaign with such words as: we will stop him; he won't become President; viva la resistance.

Finally, the inspector general revealed that an FBI attorney altered a

document to deceive the court regarding Mr. Page's relationship with another agency.

These are shocking abuses of power, and the reforms in this bill will stop them from ever happening again.

I am proud to have been the author of the bill that is the basis for some of these reforms.

It requires an amicus review for applications against U.S. citizens when their First Amendment rights are in question.

It requires the court to maintain a transcript. I have read this FISA application. It begs for questions to be asked. We don't know if the judges were curious or asked obvious questions because we don't have a transcript.

It requires the government to keep a log.

It enhances penalties for up to 8 years for those who improperly surveil or deceive the court. It allows agencies to take immediate action, including termination, of those who do.

Madam Speaker, it is incumbent on us, as an institution, to ensure these abuses simply don't happen again. The USA FREEDOM Reauthorization Act will accomplish this.

Let me end by saying this: To those who oppose this bill, if you vote against this bill, you keep the status quo. FISA remains in place. The ability to abuse FISA doesn't change.

Vote "yes" on this bill or accept future abuse. That is the choice we have before us. I hope that we don't do that.

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

Mr. NUNES. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD).

Mr. CRAWFORD. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the USA FREEDOM Reauthorization Act of 2020.

I would also like to associate myself with the comments of my friend and colleague from Utah (Mr. STEWART).

I also acknowledge and applaud the efforts of the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. NUNES), whose tenacity brought this to bear. I appreciate his leadership on this issue.

This is a bipartisan piece of legislation that makes urgent and necessary reforms to the FISA process, which, as Inspector General Horowitz found 3 months ago, was misused to conduct illegal surveillance on Carter Page, a U.S. person.

This bill enhances requirements on the FBI and DOJ to ensure all applications are accurate and complete. This bill creates a compliance officer at the FBI who is directly responsible for making sure FBI agents are following the law.

This bill heightens criminal penalties to deter bad actors and other layers of review to root them out.

Finally, the bill reauthorizes three counterterrorism tools that are significantly important to our national security.

Madam Speaker, I rise to support this bill, and I urge a "yes" vote from my colleagues.

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

Just a couple of comments for some of my colleagues who I know are concerned that this doesn't go far enough.

One of the concerns they have is that there is an ongoing investigation led by the U.S. attorney out of Connecticut, and there is a lot of consternation on our side of the aisle that nothing has been done yet.

I want to assure my colleagues that even if that gets to a point where people are held accountable for what we believe to be criminal activity, these reforms in this new piece of legislation where we opened up title I, we believe that we have all the reforms that are necessary to prevent this malfeasance from happening again in the future.

□ 1615

If this doesn't work and if this does happen again, I think then you will have what some people want, which is a complete elimination of the court and this entire system.

I hope that we don't get to that point in this country, because these tools have worked well as long as the people who are conducting and using these surveillance capabilities don't decide to turn them on political opponents.

So I want to, you know, assure my colleagues on this side of the aisle that we feel like these reforms are as far as we need to go at this time, no matter what the ultimate conclusion is of the U.S. attorney out of Connecticut on whether or not to bring charges against those who perpetrated these crimes and criminal activity.

Madam Speaker, I am prepared to close at this time.

In closing, the weaponization of FISA, as exhibited in 2016, should never have happened, and this bill aims to prevent future gross abuses from occurring again.

I would like to thank my staff, particularly Allen Souza, Laura Casulli, Meghan Green, Andrew House, and Betsy Hulme, for all their efforts to reach this bipartisan compromise. They worked many, many hours with Members of both parties and colleagues of both parties, staff of both parties, from the Judiciary Committee and the Republican and Democratic leadership, to reach this bipartisan compromise.

I am also fairly confident, with the remarks that have been made on the Senate side, that this will be a rare opportunity where we actually pass a bill, and it appears like the Senate is prepared to accept a complete House-produced product, which I think means a lot to everyone involved in this process, that that rarely happens, especially in this day and age.

Madam Speaker, I urge adoption of H.R. 6172, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I want to, for my Democratic colleagues, provide a reality check on some of what they have heard during this debate.

It is important to remember that the inspector general report—which, by the way, doesn't go to the expiring provisions that we are here to authorize today. But the inspector general report found no evidence of spying on the Trump campaign.

The inspector general found no evidence of political bias influencing decisionmaking in the investigation of the Trump campaign and its connections to Russia during the 2016 election.

The inspector general found that the investigation, in fact, was properly predicated, that investigation into many of the more than 100 unexplained and often falsely denied contacts between the Trump campaign and the Russians during the 2016 campaign, including a notorious secret meeting in Trump Tower between the President's son, son-in-law, and campaign chairman with a Russian delegation that was set up by a series of emails in which a Russian delegation offered dirt on Hillary Clinton to the Trump campaign, and the President's son, on behalf of that campaign, said that he would love it and set up that secret meeting. Now, my colleagues don't think that is collusion; the American people do.

Bob Mueller, for his part, much as his report has been misrepresented, makes it clear in the very first pages of the report that he does not address the issues of collusion, only whether he can prove criminal conspiracy.

So it is important, with that reality check, to once again return to the bill before us. With respect to the bill before us, we do make important changes to strengthen the privacy protections, the civil liberties protections. We also retain the important tools necessary to help protect the country, the business records provision, the lone-wolf provision, as well as the roving wiretaps.

The roving wiretap provision, for example, allows the government, when someone, for example, in the midst of planning a crime of terrorism uses phones disposably and goes from one phone to another, it is not necessary to go and get a new warrant every time they change phones. The warrant can follow the individual rather than the phone.

The business records provision has also been very important in terms of our efforts at foreign intelligence gathering as well as counterterrorism. Those authorities would be retained, but new protections would be put in place such that business records couldn't be retained more than 5 years unless certain exceptions applied, protections where, if business records gathered in the FISA context are used in a criminal proceeding, there is notice given to people that they are being used in a criminal proceeding.

There is expansion of the amicus authorities so that we have the amicus

involved in a broader scope of cases so the court has the advantage of independent judgment.

Some of those reforms come out of the inspector general's recommendations and looking into the FISA application involving Carter Page. Many of those recommendations have nothing to do with Carter Page and are long-standing interests of the privacy community in trying to strengthen some of the privacy protections.

I also want to take this opportunity to thank Representative LOFGREN and Representative JAYAPAL. We worked extensively, have spent hours ourselves, our staff, consulting and trying to make this a better and stronger bill. While I regret that we couldn't get it to the point where those two esteemed Members felt they could support the bill, nonetheless, their input made this bill better, and I am grateful for their hard work and advocacy on behalf of a stronger privacy and civil liberties protection.

This vote today is the culmination of many months of negotiations. Therefore, with our diverse Caucus, with our friends in the other party who, as you have heard today, we have strong disagreements over the Russia investigation, the Trump campaign's conduct, as well as the FISA process, but, nonetheless, in the interest of our Nation's security, we were able to get to common ground on this measure, giving the government the critical tools it needs to protect the country while advancing civil liberties and privacy rights.

This bill creates a much-needed change to the way government uses FISA, ensures the government is more transparent and accountable, and I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, in 2016, our nation's premier law enforcement agency, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, weaponized its authority to illegally surveil a U.S. citizen for political purposes.

What happened to Carter Page, then-candidate Trump, and the Trump campaign was wrong, and it is our responsibility to ensure it never happens again. The USA Freedom Reauthorization Act achieves that, but our work is far from done.

While this bill doesn't include every reform sought by Republicans, it does accomplish our central goal: To institute necessary safeguards to protect the civil liberties of every American and reauthorize critical counterterrorism provisions.

This bipartisan legislation also protects U.S. citizens from being spied on for political purposes by requiring that the Attorney General approve any investigation of an elected official or federal candidate. This provision directly addresses the abuses against Carter Page and the Trump campaign.

Some have claimed that provision prioritizes politicians over Americans. It does not. That provision addresses the real abuse documented by House Republicans and the DOJ Inspector General—abuse that strikes at the core of our democratic republic.

In addition to multiple other reforms, this legislation makes it a crime to willfully make a false statement to the court, and increases penalties for those who abuse the system. These provisions are aimed like a laser at the abuses that occurred in 2016 and 2017.

Madam Speaker, Congress must continue to conduct vigorous oversight and work with our law enforcement and intelligence communities to restore the American people's trust in these critical institutions.

Our government's primary duty is to protect its citizens and their constitutional rights, and every American should have confidence we're fulfilling that role.

I urge my colleagues to support this vitally important legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 891, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 278, nays 136, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 98]

YEAS—278

Adams	Cole	Graves (MO)
Aderholt	Comer	Green (TN)
Aguilar	Conaway	Grothman
Allen	Cook	Guest
Allred	Cooper	Guthrie
Amodei	Costa	Harder (CA)
Armstrong	Courtney	Hartzler
Arrington	Cox (CA)	Hastings
Axne	Craig	Hayes
Babin	Crawford	Heck
Bacon	Crenshaw	Hern, Kevin
Baird	Crist	Higgins (NY)
Balderson	Crow	Hill (AR)
Banks	Cuellar	Himes
Barr	Cunningham	Holding
Bera	Curtis	Horn, Kendra S.
Bergman	Davids (KS)	Horsford
Bilirakis	Davis (CA)	Houlahan
Bishop (GA)	Davis, Rodney	Hoyer
Bishop (UT)	Dean	Hudson
Blunt Rochester	DeLauro	Hurd (TX)
Bost	Delgado	Jackson Lee
Brady	Demings	Johnson (GA)
Brindisi	Deutch	Johnson (LA)
Brooks (IN)	Diaz-Balart	Johnson (OH)
Brown (MD)	Dunn	Johnson (SD)
Buchanan	Engel	Johnson (TX)
Bucshon	Escobar	Jordan
Burgess	Estes	Joyce (OH)
Bustos	Evans	Joyce (PA)
Butterfield	Ferguson	Kaptur
Byrne	Finkenauer	Katko
Calvert	Fitzpatrick	Keating
Carbajal	Fleischmann	Keller
Cardenas	Fletcher	Kelly (MS)
Carson (IN)	Poster	Kilmer
Carter (TX)	Poxx (NC)	Kind
Cartwright	Frankel	King (NY)
Case	Gallagher	Kinzinger
Casten (IL)	Gallego	Kirkpatrick
Castor (FL)	Garamendi	Krishnamoorthi
Chabot	Garcia (TX)	Kuster (NH)
Cheney	Gibbs	Kustoff (TN)
Cicilline	Gonzalez (OH)	LaHood
Cisneros	Gonzalez (TX)	LaMalfa
Clyburn	Gottheimer	Lamb
Cohen	Granger	Langevin

Larsen (WA)	Payne	Smith (NJ)
Larson (CT)	Pence	Smucker
Latta	Perlmutter	Soto
Lawrence	Peters	Spanberger
Lawson (FL)	Peterson	Spano
Lee (NV)	Phillips	Stanton
Lesko	Porter	Stauber
Levin (CA)	Price (NC)	Stefanik
Lipinski	Quigley	Steil
Loeb sack	Reed	Steube
Lowey	Reschenthaler	Stevens
Lucas	Rice (NY)	Stewart
Luetkemeyer	Rice (SC)	Stivers
Luria	Richmond	Suo zzi
Lynch	Riggleman	Swa lwell (CA)
Malinowski	Roby	Taylor
Maloney, Sean	Rogers (AL)	Thompson (CA)
Marshall	Rogers (KY)	Thompson (MS)
Matsui	Rose (NY)	Thompson (PA)
McAdams	Rouda	Thornberry
McBath	Rouzer	Timmons
McCarthy	Roybal-Allard	Torres Small
McCaul	Ruiz	(NM)
McEachin	Ruppersberger	Trone
McHenry	Rutherford	Turner
McKinley	Ryan	Underwood
Meeks	Sánchez	Upton
Meuser	Sarbanes	Vargas
Mitchell	Scalise	Veasey
Moolenaar	Scanlon	Vela
Morelle	Schiff	Visclosky
Moulton	Schneider	Wagner
Mucarsels-Powell	Schrader	Walorski
Murphy (FL)	Schrier	Waltz
Murphy (NC)	Scott (VA)	Wasserman
Nadler	Scott, Austin	Schultz
Napolitano	Scott, David	Watkins
Neal	Sensenbrenner	Wenstrup
Newhouse	Sewell (AL)	Westerman
Norcross	Shalala	Wexton
Nunes	Sherman	Wild
O'Halleran	Sherrill	Wilson (FL)
Olson	Shimkus	Womack
Palmer	Simpson	Woodall
Panetta	Sires	Young
Pappas	Slotkin	
Pascrell	Smith (NE)	

NAYS—136

Abraham	Gohmert	Neguse
Amash	Golden	Norman
Barragán	Gomez	Ocasio-Cortez
Bass	Gooden	Omar
Beatty	Graves (LA)	Pallone
Biggs	Green, Al (TX)	Perry
Bishop (NC)	Griffith	Pingree
Blumenauer	Grijalva	Pocan
Bonamici	Haaland	Posey
Boyle, Brendan F.	Hagedorn	Pressley
Brooks (AL)	Harris	Raskin
Buck	Herrera Beutler	Rodgers (WA)
Budd	Hice (GA)	Roe, David P.
Burchett	Higgins (LA)	Rose, John W.
Carter (GA)	Hollingsworth	Roy
Castro (TX)	Huffman	Rush
Chu, Judy	Huizenga	Schakowsky
Clark (MA)	Jayapal	Schweikert
Clarke (NY)	Jeffries	Serrano
Clay	Kelly (IL)	Smith (MO)
Cleaver	Kelly (PA)	Smith (WA)
Cline	Kennedy	Takano
Cloud	Khanna	Tipton
Connolly	Kildee	Titus
Correa	Kim	Tlaib
Davidson (OH)	King (IA)	Tonko
Davis, Danny K.	Lamborn	Torres (CA)
DeFazio	Lee (CA)	Trahan
DeGette	Levin (MI)	Van Drew
DelBene	Lieu, Ted	Velázquez
DeSaulnier	Lofgren	Walberg
DesJarlais	Long	Walden
Dingell	Loudermilk	Walker
Doggett	Lowenthal	Waters
Doyle, Michael F.	Lujan	Watson Coleman
Duncan	Maloney, Carolyn B.	Weber (TX)
Emmer	Marchant	Webster (FL)
Eshoo	Massie	Welch
Espallat	Mast	Williams
Flores	McClintock	Wilson (SC)
Fudge	McCollum	Wittman
Fulcher	McGovern	Wright
Gabbard	McNerney	Yarmuth
Garcia (IL)	Meng	Yoho
Gianforte	Mooney (WV)	Zeldin
	Moore	

NOT VOTING—15

Beyer
Brownley (CA)
Collins (GA)
Fortenberry
Gaetz
Gosar
Graves (GA)
Lewis
Meadows
Miller
Mullin
Palazzo
Ratcliffe
Rooney (FL)
Speier

□ 1703

Messrs. WEBER of Texas, BLUMENAUER, LONG, Mses. VELÁZQUEZ, ESHOO, BARRAGÁN, SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. WATERS, Messrs. GREEN of Texas, RUSH, and Ms. PRESSLEY changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. KELLER, TIMMONS, and NORCROSS changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BUCK OF COLORADO

Mr. BUCK. Madam Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk to correct the name of the bill to the “Federal Initiative to Spy on Americans (FISA) Act.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: “A bill to be known as the Federal Initiative to Spy on Americans (FISA) Act”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under clause 6 of rule XVI, the amendment is not debatable.

The question is on the amendment.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BUCK of Colorado. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 35, noes 376, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 99]

AYES—35

Abraham	Duncan	Roe, David P.
Amash	Estes	Rose, John W.
Babin	Gohmert	Roy
Biggs	Griffith	Rush
Bishop (NC)	Harris	Schweikert
Bishop (UT)	Hice (GA)	Van Drew
Brooks (AL)	Kelly (PA)	Weber (TX)
Buck	Massie	Webster (FL)
Budd	McClintock	Wright
Burchett	Mooney (WV)	Yoho
Davidson (OH)	Perry	Young
DesJarlais	Posey	

NOES—376

Adams	Barr	Boyle, Brendan
Aderholt	Barragán	F.
Aguilar	Bass	Brady
Allen	Beatty	Brindisi
Allred	Bera	Brooks (IN)
Amodei	Bergman	Brown (MD)
Armstrong	Bilirakis	Buchanan
Arrington	Bishop (GA)	Buschon
Axne	Blumenauer	Burgess
Bacon	Bustos	Green (TN)
Baird	Blunt Rochester	Green, Al (TX)
Balderson	Bonamici	Grijalva
Banks	Bost	Grothman
		Guest

Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cline
Cloud
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Comer
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cunningham
Curtis
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Dunn
Emmer
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Españillat
Evans
Ferguson
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Flores
Foster
Foxx (NC)
Frankel
Fudge
Fulcher
Gabbard
Gallagher
Gallego
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Garamendi
García (IL)
García (TX)
Gianforte
Gibbs
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez (TX)
Gooden
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Grothman
Guest

Guthrie
Haaland
Hagedorn
Harder (CA)
Hartzler
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill (AR)
Himes
Holding
Hollingsworth
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlihan
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Hurd (TX)
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Keller
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamb
Lamborn
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Lesko
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu, Ted
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marshall
Mast
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCarthy
McCaul
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McNerney

Meeks
Meng
Meuser
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (NC)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newhouse
Norcross
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Olson
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascarella
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (KY)
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rutherford
Ryan
Sanchez
Sarbanes
Scalise
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Shimkus
Simpson
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Spanberger
Spano
Stanton
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stevens
Stewart
Stivers
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Taylor

Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Timmons
Tipton
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small
(NM)
Trahan
Trone
Turner
Underwood
Upton
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Waltz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watkins
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wexton
Wild
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—18

Beyer	Graves (GA)	Palazzo
Brownley (CA)	Lewis	Palmer
Collins (GA)	Lipinski	Ratcliffe
Fortenberry	Meadows	Rogers (AL)
Gaetz	Miller	Rooney (FL)
Gosar	Mullin	Speier

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1713

Mr. RUSH changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DIRECTING THE REMOVAL OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES FROM HOSTILITIES AGAINST THE ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN THAT HAVE NOT BEEN AUTHORIZED BY CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. JAYAPAL). Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 68) to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran that have not been authorized by Congress, will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

MOTION TO COMMIT

Mr. McCAUL. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to commit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the joint resolution?

Mr. McCAUL. I am in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to commit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. McCaul moves to commit the joint resolution S.J. Res. 68 to the Committee on Foreign Affairs with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

After paragraph (5) of section 1, insert the following:

(6) For more than two decades, Qassem Soleimani posed a deadly threat to American personnel and interests as commander of the Quds Force of the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps, which is responsible for Iran's extraterritorial military and clandestine operations. His activities to fund and train Iran's terrorist proxies in Iraq, Syria, Lebanon, Bahrain, Yemen, and Afghanistan led

to the deaths of more than 600 United States troops.

(7) In late 2019, Soleimani began escalating Iranian-supported attacks on Americans, including the assault on the United States Embassy in Baghdad and a rocket attack that killed an American citizen and wounded four United States servicemembers in Iraq. Prior to his death, Soleimani was traveling around the Middle East coordinating further attacks on Americans.

(8) Removing Qassem Soleimani from the battlefield has increased the safety and security of American troops, diplomats, and citizens, of our partners and allies, including the State of Israel, and of the world.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, here we are, once again, debating war powers when the simple fact is we are not engaged in hostilities against Iran.

Why are we wasting precious floor time when all the American people really care about today is coronavirus? Today the WHO declared it a pandemic. That is the biggest threat to our Nation today.

So, why are my colleagues launching more partisan political attacks against this President for taking justified military action to protect Americans against one of the world's most dangerous terrorists?

That is why my motion states that Soleimani was a terrorist and that the world is safer without him, just like the world was safer when President Obama ordered the strike on bin Laden when Republicans and Democrats came together to praise his decision. President Obama conducted thousands of unauthorized strikes in Libya unrelated to protecting Americans, and at that time Leader PELOSI said that she was satisfied he had the authority for those strikes.

Soleimani was a mastermind of terror in the Middle East for two decades, and that is why President Obama designated him as a terrorist.

Soleimani funded, trained, and equipped Iran's terrorist proxies in Lebanon, Syria, Iraq, Yemen, and Afghanistan.

Soleimani is the one who convinced Russia to fight for Assad.

Tens of thousands of innocent people in Syria are dead today, victims of war crimes, because of Soleimani.

Soleimani played a key role in the crackdown of protesters in Iraq that killed hundreds of Iraqis.

Most importantly, Madam Speaker, he has the blood of over 600 American soldiers on his hands.

Under Soleimani's command, Iran tried to assassinate the Saudi Ambassador to the United States in a Washington, D.C., restaurant less than 4 miles from where we are standing today.

The danger he posed to the United States was not just a thing of the past. He was directing a campaign of terror and violence against us in Iraq, which killed one American and injured four other servicemen.

He orchestrated the attack on our Embassy in Baghdad.

Look at this picture. This was not simply a brush fire, Madam Speaker. They stormed and attacked our Embassy under Soleimani's orders.

What more evidence do we need than this?

Soleimani was not done after his attack on our Embassy. He wasn't on a vacation when he went to meet with his top lieutenants in Damascus, Lebanon, and Baghdad. Secretary Pompeo testified to our committee that Soleimani was in the region actively plotting to kill Americans. He was going to report back to Tehran, to the Ayatollah, to plan future attacks.

What if our President had done nothing and our Embassy was attacked again like in 1979 with diplomats taken hostage? What if the President did nothing? What if more United States troops were killed? What then would the other side of the aisle be saying?

Madam Speaker, the enemies of our country are watching this debate right now, and they need to know darn well that, if you kill or injure Americans, you will pay the price.

Like President Reagan, I am a firm believer in peace through strength. When we show strength like we did with this necessary strike, our enemies back down.

So, Madam Speaker, I call upon my colleagues to drop their partisanship, to stand as Americans as we did when President Obama struck bin Laden, and to support this simple fact that the world is a better place without Soleimani.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the motion to commit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I doubt that there is a person on this floor who disagrees with the premises that Mr. MCCAUL just stated. Soleimani was a bad person. I said during the course of debate on the Slotkin amendment, which referenced exactly that premise, that no one lamented the loss of Mr. Soleimani—no one. That is not what this bill is about, nor is that what this amendment is about.

This bill, which is called a partisan bill by Mr. MCCAUL, had 15 percent of the Republicans in the United States Senate vote for it.

This bill, called a partisan bill, says the bill we are voting on, the bill we are going to pass, says that Members of the United States Armed Forces and intelligence community and all those involved in the planning of the January 2, 2020, strike on Qasem Soleimani, including President Donald J. Trump, should be commended for their efforts in a successful mission. That is what the bill that we are asking this body to vote for says.

Madam Speaker, does that sound to you like a partisan document?

Now, Madam Speaker, the purpose of this motion is to kill this bill. This is a Senate bill. It will send it back to committee. It will not allow it to pass with an amendment, and it will preclude it from going to the President of the United States.

Now, what this issue is about is our Constitution, about the power of this body, about the responsibility of this body, and about the authority of this body to declare or not declare war. That is what this bill is about.

There may be some in this body who want to shrink from that responsibility and send it to the President of the United States, but our Founders believed that was not what our democracy ought to be. It ought to be the Representatives of the people who take them to war, not a President—any President, Democratic or Republican—to take us to war.

This is about our responsibility. It commends President Trump, and it commends our Armed Forces, and it allows them to defend themselves if attacked. But it stands for the proposition that I hope all Members are for, that we, the Representatives of the American people, ought to decide on their behalf whether they or their sons and daughters go to the point of the spear at war—not just one person.

There are a lot of countries in this world where one person makes the decision. They are called dictators. Our Founding Fathers did not want dictators running America.

And I say to my colleagues, of course, our Republican friends who are offered this amendment never vote for an MTR, because—and I will not read the litany of quotes from so many of you—an MTR is simply to delay and defeat. Your quotes, not mine.

So I ask all of us, without exception, vote against this MTR, vote to send this bill to the President of the United States, supported by 15 percent of the Republicans in the United States Senate. It is not a partisan bill. It doesn't attack President Trump. In fact, it says, "our troops," and "President Trump ought to be commended." It is in the bill.

Don't tell me this is a partisan act. It is not. It is an act of responsibility, and to our oath of office, and to the Constitution of the United States. Vote "no."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to commit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to commit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to commit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of S.J. Res. 68, if ordered, and agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 198, noes 212, answered "present" 1, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 100]

AYES—198

Abraham Granger Peterson
Aderholt Graves (LA) Phillips
Allen Graves (MO) Posey
Amodei Green (TN) Reed
Armstrong Griffith Reschenthaler
Arrington Grothman Rice (SC)
Axne Guest Riggleman
Babin Guthrie Roby
Bacon Hagedorn Rodgers (WA)
Baird Harris Roe, David P.
Balderson Hartzler Rogers (AL)
Banks Hern, Kevin Rogers (KY)
Barr Herrera Beutler Rose (NY)
Bergman Hice (GA) Rose, John W.
Biggs Higgins (LA) Rouzer
Bilirakis Hill (AR) Roy
Bishop (NC) Holding Rutherford
Bishop (UT) Hollingsworth Scalise
Bost Horn, Kendra S. Schweikert
Brady Hudson Scott, Austin
Brindisi Huizenga Sensenbrenner
Brooks (AL) Hurd (TX) Shimkus
Brooks (IN) Johnson (LA) Simpson
Buchanan Johnson (OH) Smith (MO)
Buck Johnson (SD) Smith (NE)
Bucshon Jordan Smith (NJ)
Budd Joyce (OH) Smucker
Burchett Joyce (PA) Spano
Burgess Katko Stauber
Byrne Keller Stefanik
Calvert Kelly (MS) Steil
Carter (GA) Kelly (PA) Steube
Carter (TX) King (IA) Stewart
Chabot King (NY) Stivers
Cheney Kinzinger Taylor
Cline Kustoff (TN) Thompson (PA)
Cloud LaHood Thornberry
Cole LaMalfa Timmons
Comer Lamborn Tipton
Conaway Latta Torres Small
Cook Lesko (NM)
Crawford Long Turner
Crenshaw Loudermilk Upton
Cunningham Lucas Van Drew
Curtis Luetkemeyer Wagner
Davidson (OH) Luria Walberg
Davis, Rodney Marchant Walden
DesJarlais Marshall Walker
Diaz-Balart Mast Walorski
Duncan McAdams Waltz
Dunn McCarthy Watkins
Emmer McCaul Weber (TX)
Estes McClintock Webster (FL)
Ferguson McKinley Wenstrup
Finkenauer Meuser Westerman
Fitzpatrick Mitchell Wild
Fleischmann Moolenaar Williams
Flores Mooney (WV) Wilson (SC)
Foxx (NC) Murphy (FL) Wittman
Fulcher Murphy (NC) Womack
Gallagher Newhouse Woodall
Gianforte Norman Wright
Gibbs Nunes Yoho
Gohmert Olson Young
Gonzalez (OH) Palmer Zeldin
Gooden Pence
Gottheimer Perry

NOES—212

Adams Bonamici Castro (TX)
Aguilar Brown (MD) Chu, Judy
Allred Bustos Cicilline
Amash Butterfield Cisneros
Barragan Carbajal Clark (MA)
Bass Cardenas Clarke (NY)
Beatty Carson (IN) Clay
Bera Cartwright Cleaver
Bishop (GA) Case Clyburn
Blumenauer Casten (IL) Cohen
Blunt Rochester Castor (FL) Connolly

Cooper Correa
Correa Costa
Courtney Cox (CA)
Craig Crist
Crow Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hastings
Hayes
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kaptur
Kasper
Kirkpatrick
Kildeer
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu, Ted
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe y
Lujan
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McBath
McCollum
McEeachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Massie

NOT VOTING—18

Beyer Gosar Mullin
Boyle, Brendan Graves (GA) Palazzo
F. Lewis Ratcliffe
Brownley (CA) Lipinski Rooney (FL)
Collins (GA) McHenry
Fortenberry Meadows Speier
Gaetz Miller

□ 1735

Ms. JACKSON LEE changed her vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the motion to commit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. McCAUL. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 227, noes 186, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 101]

AYES—227

Adams Golden Panetta
Aguilar Gomez Pappas
Allred Gonzalez (TX) Pascrell
Amash Gottheimer Payne
Axne Green, Al (TX) Perlmutter
Barragan Griffith Peters
Bass Grijalva Peterson
Beatty Haaland Phillips
Bera Harder (CA) Pingree
Bishop (GA) Hastings Pocan
Blumenauer Hayes Porter
Blunt Rochester Heck Pressley
Bonamici Higgins (NY) Price (NC)
Boyle, Brendan Himes Quigley
F. Horsford Raskin
Brown (MD) Houlahan Reed
Buck Hoyer Richmond
Bustos Huffman Rice (NY)
Butterfield Jackson Lee Richmond
Carbajal Jayapal Rouda
Cardenas Jeffries Roybal-Allard
Carson (IN) Johnson (GA) Ruiz
Cartwright Johnson (TX) Ruppertsberger
Case Kaptur Rush
Casten (IL) Keating Ryan
Castor (FL) Kelly (IL) Sanchez
Castro (TX) Kennedy Sarbanes
Chu, Judy Khanna Scanlon
Cicilline Kildeer Schakowsky
Cisneros Kilmer Schiff
Clark (MA) Kim Schneider
Clarke (NY) Kind Schrader
Clay Kirkpatrick Schriker
Cleaver Krishnamoorthi Schweikert
Clyburn Kuster (NH) Scott (VA)
Cohen Lamb Scott, David
Connolly Langevin Serrano
Cooper Larsen (WA) Sewell (AL)
Correa Larson (CT) Shalala
Costa Lawrence Sherman
Courtney Lawson (FL) Sherrill
Cox (CA) Lee (CA) Sires
Craig Lee (NV) Slotkin
Crist Levin (CA) Smith (WA)
Crow Levin (MI) Soto
Cuellar Lieu, Ted Loeb sack Stanton
Cunningham Davis (KS) Lofgren Stevens
Davids (KS) Davis (CA) Lowenthal
Davis (CA) Lowey
Davis, Danny K. Lujan Swalwell (CA)
Dean Lynch Takano
DeFazio Lynch Thompson (CA)
DeGette Malinowski Thompson (MS)
DeLauro Maloney, Titus
DelBene Carolyn B. Traib
Demings Maloney, Sean Tonko
DeSaulnier Massie Torres (CA)
Deutch Matsui Torres Small
Dingell McBath (NM)
Doggett McCollum Trahan
Doyle, Michael McEachin Waters
F. McGovern Underwood
Engel Meeks Upton
Escobar Meng Vargas
Eshoo Moore Veasey
Espaillat Morelle Velazquez
Evans Moulton Visclosky
Finkenauer Mucarsel-Powell Visclosky
Fletcher Nadler Wasserman
Foster Nadler Schultz
Frankel Napolitano Waters
Fudge Neal Waters
Gabbard Neguse Watson Coleman
Gallego Norcross Welch
Garamendi O'Halleran Wexton
Garcia (IL) Ocasio-Cortez Wild
Garcia (TX) Pallone Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—186

Abraham Balderson Brady
Aderholt Banks Brindisi
Allen Barr Brooks (AL)
Amodei Bergman Brooks (IN)
Armstrong Biggs Buchanan
Arrington Bilirakis Bucshon
Babin Bishop (NC) Budd
Bacon Bishop (UT) Burchett
Baird Bost Burgess

Byrne	Hudson	Roby
Calvert	Huizenga	Rodgers (WA)
Carter (GA)	Hurd (TX)	Roe, David P.
Carter (TX)	Johnson (LA)	Rogers (AL)
Chabot	Johnson (OH)	Rogers (KY)
Cheney	Johnson (SD)	Rose (NY)
Cline	Jordan	Rose, John W.
Cloud	Joyce (OH)	Rouzer
Cole	Joyce (PA)	Roy
Comer	Katko	Rutherford
Conaway	Keller	Scalise
Cook	Kelly (MS)	Scott, Austin
Crawford	Kelly (PA)	Sensenbrenner
Crenshaw	King (IA)	Shimkus
Curtis	King (NY)	Simpson
Davidson (OH)	Kinzinger	Smith (MO)
Davis, Rodney	Kustoff (TN)	Smith (NE)
DesJarlais	LaHood	Smith (NJ)
Diaz-Balart	LaMalfa	Smucker
Duncan	Lamborn	Spano
Dunn	Latta	Stauber
Emmer	Lesko	Stefanik
Estes	Long	Steil
Ferguson	Loudermilk	Steube
Fitzpatrick	Lucas	Stewart
Fleischmann	Luetkemeyer	Stivers
Flores	Luria	Taylor
Foxx (NC)	Marchant	Thompson (PA)
Fulcher	Marshall	Thornberry
Gallagher	Mast	Timmons
Gianforte	McAdams	Tipton
Gibbs	McCarthy	Turner
Gohmert	McCaull	Van Drew
Gonzalez (OH)	McClintock	Wagner
Gooden	McHenry	Walberg
Granger	McKinley	Walden
Graves (LA)	Meuser	Walker
Graves (MO)	Mitchell	Walorski
Green (TN)	Moolenaar	Waltz
Grothman	Mooney (WV)	Watkins
Guest	Murphy (FL)	Weber (TX)
Guthrie	Murphy (NC)	Webster (FL)
Hagedorn	Newhouse	Wenstrup
Harris	Norman	Westerman
Hartzler	Nunes	Williams
Hern, Kevin	Olson	Wilson (SC)
Herrera Beutler	Palmer	Wittman
Hice (GA)	Pence	Womack
Higgins (LA)	Perry	Woodall
Hill (AR)	Posey	Wright
Holding	Resenthaler	Yoho
Hollingsworth	Rice (SC)	Young
Horn, Kendra S.	Riggleman	Zeldin

NOT VOTING—16

Beyer	Graves (GA)	Palazzo
Brownley (CA)	Lewis	Ratcliffe
Collins (GA)	Lipinski	Rooney (FL)
Fortenberry	Meadows	Speier
Gaetz	Miller	
Gosar	Mullin	

□ 1742

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Byrd, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 76. Joint Resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of

title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to "Borrower Defense Institutional Accountability".

□ 1745

DIGNITY IN AGING ACT OF 2019

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 4334) to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2020 through 2024, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. SCANLON). The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows: Senate amendment: Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Supporting Older Americans Act of 2020".

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title.
Sec. 2. Table of contents.
Sec. 3. References.
Sec. 4. Definitions.

TITLE I—MODERNIZING DEFINITIONS AND PROGRAMS UNDER THE ADMINISTRATION ON AGING

Sec. 101. Reauthorization.
Sec. 102. Person-centered, trauma-informed services.
Sec. 103. Aging and Disability Resource Centers.
Sec. 104. Assistive technology.
Sec. 105. Vaccination.
Sec. 106. Malnutrition.
Sec. 107. Sexually transmitted diseases.
Sec. 108. Addressing chronic pain management.
Sec. 109. Screening for suicide risk.
Sec. 110. Screening for fall-related traumatic brain injury; addressing public health emergencies and emerging health threats; negative health effects associated with social isolation.

Sec. 111. Clarification regarding board and care facilities.
Sec. 112. Person-centered, trauma-informed services definition.
Sec. 113. Traumatic brain injury.
Sec. 114. Modernizing the review of applications and providing technical assistance for disasters.
Sec. 115. Increased focus of Assistant Secretary on negative health effects associated with social isolation.

Sec. 116. Notification of availability of or updates to policies, practices, and procedures through a uniform e-format.

Sec. 117. Evidence-based program adaptation.

Sec. 118. Business acumen provisions and clarification regarding outside funding for area agencies on aging.

Sec. 119. Demonstration on direct care workers.

Sec. 120. National resource center for older individuals experiencing the long-term and adverse consequences of trauma.

Sec. 121. National Resource Center for Women and Retirement.

Sec. 122. Family caregivers.

Sec. 123. Interagency coordination.

Sec. 124. Modernizing the Interagency Coordinating Committee on Healthy Aging and Age-Friendly Communities.

Sec. 125. Professional standards for a nutrition official under the Assistant Secretary.

Sec. 126. Report on social isolation.

Sec. 127. Research and evaluation.

TITLE II—IMPROVING GRANTS FOR STATE AND COMMUNITY PROGRAMS ON AGING

Sec. 201. Social determinants of health.

Sec. 202. Younger onset Alzheimer's disease.

Sec. 203. Reauthorization.

Sec. 204. Hold harmless formula.

Sec. 205. Outreach efforts.

Sec. 206. State Long-Term Care Ombudsman program minimum funding and maintenance of effort.

Sec. 207. Coordination with resource centers.

Sec. 208. Senior legal hotlines.

Sec. 209. Increase in limit on use of allotted funds for State administrative costs.

Sec. 210. Improvements to nutrition programs.

Sec. 211. Review of reports.

Sec. 212. Other practices.

Sec. 213. Screening for negative health effects associated with social isolation and traumatic brain injury.

Sec. 214. Supportive services and senior centers.

Sec. 215. Culturally appropriate, medically tailored meals.

Sec. 216. Nutrition services study.

Sec. 217. National Family Caregiver Support program.

Sec. 218. National Family Caregiver Support program cap.

Sec. 219. Reauthorization.

Sec. 301. Reauthorization.

Sec. 302. Public awareness of traumatic brain injury.

Sec. 303. Falls prevention and chronic disease self-management education.

Sec. 304. Demonstration to address negative health impacts associated with social isolation.

Sec. 305. Technical assistance and innovation to improve transportation for older individuals.

Sec. 306. Grant program for multigenerational collaboration.

TITLE III—MODERNIZING ACTIVITIES FOR HEALTH, INDEPENDENCE, AND LONGEVITY

Sec. 401. Priority for the senior community service employment program.

Sec. 402. Authorization of appropriations.

TITLE IV—SENIOR COMMUNITY SERVICE EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

Sec. 501. Reauthorization.

Sec. 502. Volunteer State long-term care ombudsman representatives.

Sec. 503. Prevention of elder abuse, neglect, and exploitation.

Sec. 504. Principles for person-directed services and supports during serious illness.

Sec. 505. Extension of the Supporting Grandparents Raising Grandchildren Act.

Sec. 506. Best practices for home and community-based ombudsmen.

Sec. 507. Senior home modification assistance initiative.

TITLE V—ENHANCING GRANTS FOR NATIVE AMERICANS

Sec. 701. Technical corrections.

SEC. 3. REFERENCES.

Except as otherwise expressly provided in this Act, wherever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to,

or a repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to that section or other provision of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3001 et seq.).

SEC. 4. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act, the terms “area agency on aging”, “Assistant Secretary”, “greatest social need”, “older individual”, and “Secretary” have the meanings given such terms in section 102 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3002).

TITLE I—MODERNIZING DEFINITIONS AND PROGRAMS UNDER THE ADMINISTRATION ON AGING

SEC. 101. REAUTHORIZATION.

Section 216 (42 U.S.C. 3020f) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 216. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

“(a) *IN GENERAL.*—For purposes of carrying out this Act, there are authorized to be appropriated for administration, salaries, and expenses of the Administration \$43,937,410 for fiscal year 2020, \$46,573,655 for fiscal year 2021, \$49,368,074 for fiscal year 2022, \$52,330,158 for fiscal year 2023, and \$55,469,968 for fiscal year 2024.

“(b) *ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATIONS.*—There are authorized to be appropriated—

“(1) to carry out section 202(a)(21) (relating to the National Eldercare Locator Service), \$2,180,660 for fiscal year 2020, \$2,311,500 for fiscal year 2021, \$2,450,190 for fiscal year 2022, \$2,597,201 for fiscal year 2023, and \$2,753,033 for fiscal year 2024;

“(2) to carry out section 215, \$1,988,060 for fiscal year 2020, \$2,107,344 for fiscal year 2021, \$2,233,784 for fiscal year 2022, \$2,367,811 for fiscal year 2023, and \$2,509,880 for fiscal year 2024;

“(3) to carry out section 202 (relating to Elder Rights Support Activities under this title), \$1,371,740 for fiscal year 2020, \$1,454,044 for fiscal year 2021, \$1,541,287 for fiscal year 2022, \$1,633,764 for fiscal year 2023, and \$1,731,790 for fiscal year 2024; and

“(4) to carry out section 202(b) (relating to the Aging and Disability Resource Centers), \$8,687,330 for fiscal year 2020, \$9,208,570 for fiscal year 2021, \$9,761,084 for fiscal year 2022, \$10,346,749 for fiscal year 2023, and \$10,967,554 for fiscal year 2024.”

SEC. 102. PERSON-CENTERED, TRAUMA-INFORMED SERVICES.

Section 101(2) (42 U.S.C. 3001(2)) is amended by inserting “(including access to person-centered, trauma-informed services as appropriate)” after “health”.

SEC. 103. AGING AND DISABILITY RESOURCE CENTERS.

Section 102(4) (42 U.S.C. 3002(4)) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting “, in collaboration with (as appropriate) area agencies on aging, centers for independent living (as described in part C of chapter 1 of title VII of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 796f et seq.)), and other aging or disability entities” after “provides”;

(2) in subparagraph (B)—

(A) by inserting “services, supports, and” after “plan for long-term”; and

(B) by inserting “and choices” after “desires”; and

(3) in subparagraph (D), by striking “part C of title VII of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 796f et seq.), and other community-based entities,” and inserting “part C of chapter 1 of title VII of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, and other community-based entities, including other aging or disability entities.”

SEC. 104. ASSISTIVE TECHNOLOGY.

The Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3001 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 102(8) (42 U.S.C. 3002(8)), by adding at the end the following:

“(C) The term ‘State assistive technology entity’ means the agency, office, or other entity designated under subsection (c)(1) of section 4 of

the Assistive Technology Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 3003) to carry out State activities under such section.”;

(2) in section 306 (42 U.S.C. 3026)—

(A) in subsection (a)(6)—

(i) in subparagraph (G), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(ii) in subparagraph (H), by striking “appropriate;” and inserting “appropriate; and”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(I) to the extent feasible, coordinate with the State agency to disseminate information about the State assistive technology entity and access to assistive technology options for serving older individuals;”; and

(B) in subsection (b)(3)—

(i) in subparagraph (K)—

(I) by aligning the margins of the subparagraph with the margins of subparagraph (J); and

(II) by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(ii) by redesignating subparagraph (L) as subparagraph (M); and

(iii) by inserting after subparagraph (K) the following:

“(L) assistive technology devices and services; and”; and

(3) in section 411(a) (42 U.S.C. 3032(a))—

(A) in paragraph (2), by inserting “, aligned with evidence-based practice,” after “applied social research”; and

(B) in paragraph (10), by inserting “consistent with section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 794d)” after “other technologies”.

SEC. 105. VACCINATION.

Section 102(14) (42 U.S.C. 3002(14)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B), by inserting “immunization status,” after “oral health;”; and

(2) in subparagraph (D), by inserting “infectious disease, and vaccine-preventable disease, as well as” after “cardiovascular disease.”

SEC. 106. MALNUTRITION.

The Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3001 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 102(14)(B), as amended by section 105(1), by inserting “(including screening for malnutrition)” after “nutrition screening”; and

(2) in section 330(1), by striking “and food insecurity” and inserting “, food insecurity, and malnutrition”.

SEC. 107. SEXUALLY TRANSMITTED DISEASES.

Section 102(14)(D) (42 U.S.C. 3002(14)(D)), as amended by section 105(2), is further amended by inserting “prevention of sexually transmitted diseases,” after “vaccine-preventable disease.”

SEC. 108. ADDRESSING CHRONIC PAIN MANAGEMENT.

Section 102(14)(D) (42 U.S.C. 3002(14)(D)), as amended by section 107, is further amended by inserting “chronic pain management,” after “substance abuse reduction.”

SEC. 109. SCREENING FOR SUICIDE RISK.

Section 102(14)(G) (42 U.S.C. 3002(14)(G)) is amended by inserting “and screening for suicide risk” after “depression”.

SEC. 110. SCREENING FOR FALL-RELATED TRAUMATIC BRAIN INJURY; ADDRESSING PUBLIC HEALTH EMERGENCIES AND EMERGING HEALTH THREATS; NEGATIVE HEALTH EFFECTS ASSOCIATED WITH SOCIAL ISOLATION.

Section 102(14) (42 U.S.C. 3002(14)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (H) through (J), and subparagraphs (K) and (L), as subparagraphs (I) through (K), and subparagraphs (M) and (O), respectively;

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (G) the following:

“(H) screening for fall-related traumatic brain injury and other fall-related injuries, coordination of treatment, rehabilitation and related services, and referral services related to such injury or injuries;”;

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (K), as redesignated by paragraph (1), the following:

“(L) services that are a part of responses to a public health emergency or emerging health threat;”; and

(4) in subparagraph (M), as redesignated by paragraph (1), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(5) by inserting after subparagraph (M), as redesignated by paragraph (1), the following:

“(N) screening for the prevention of negative health effects associated with social isolation and coordination of supportive services and health care to address negative health effects associated with social isolation; and”; and

(6) in subparagraph (O), as redesignated, by striking “(A) through (K)” and inserting “(A) through (N)”.

SEC. 111. CLARIFICATION REGARDING BOARD AND CARE FACILITIES.

Section 102(35)(C) (42 U.S.C. 3002(35)(C)) is amended by striking “for purposes of sections 307(a)(12) and 712.”

SEC. 112. PERSON-CENTERED, TRAUMA-INFORMED SERVICES DEFINITION.

Section 102 (42 U.S.C. 3002) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (41) through (54) as paragraphs (42) through (55), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (40) the following:

“(41) The term ‘person-centered, trauma-informed’, with respect to services, means services provided through an aging program that—

“(A) use a holistic approach to providing services or care;

“(B) promote the dignity, strength, and empowerment of victims of trauma; and

“(C) incorporate evidence-based practices based on knowledge about the role of trauma in trauma victims’ lives.”

SEC. 113. TRAUMATIC BRAIN INJURY.

Section 102 (42 U.S.C. 3002), as amended by section 112, is further amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (55) as paragraph (56); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (54) the following:

“(55) The term ‘traumatic brain injury’ has the meaning given such term in section 393B(d) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280b-1c(d)).”

SEC. 114. MODERNIZING THE REVIEW OF APPLICATIONS AND PROVIDING TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR DISASTERS.

(a) *REVIEW OF APPLICATIONS.*—Section 202 (42 U.S.C. 3012) is amended—

(1) by amending subsection (a)(4) to read as follows:

“(4) administer the grants provided by this Act, but not approve an application submitted by an applicant for a grant for an activity under a provision of this Act for which such applicant previously received a grant under such provision unless the Assistant Secretary determines—

“(A) the activity for which such application was submitted is being operated, or was operated, effectively to achieve its stated purpose; and

“(B) such applicant has complied with the assurances provided to the Assistant Secretary with the application for such previous grant.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(h) The Assistant Secretary shall publish, on an annual basis, a list of centers and demonstration projects funded under each title of this Act. The Assistant Secretary shall ensure that this information is also directly provided to State agencies and area agencies on aging.”

(b) *ADDRESSING THE NEEDS OF OLDER INDIVIDUALS IN DISASTERS.*—Section 202(a) (42 U.S.C. 3012(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (30), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (31), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(32) provide technical assistance to, and share best practices with, State agencies and area agencies on aging on how to collaborate and coordinate activities and develop long-range emergency preparedness plans with local and State emergency response agencies, relief organizations, local and State governments, Federal agencies as appropriate, and any other institutions that have responsibility for disaster relief service delivery;”.

SEC. 115. INCREASED FOCUS OF ASSISTANT SECRETARY ON NEGATIVE HEALTH EFFECTS ASSOCIATED WITH SOCIAL ISOLATION.

Section 202(a) (42 U.S.C. 3012(a)), as amended by section 114(b), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(33) with input from aging network stakeholders, including caregivers, develop objectives, priorities, and a long-term plan for supporting State and local efforts involving education about prevention of, detection of, and response to negative health effects associated with social isolation among older individuals, and submit a report to Congress on this effort by January 2021; and”.

SEC. 116. NOTIFICATION OF AVAILABILITY OF OR UPDATES TO POLICIES, PRACTICES, AND PROCEDURES THROUGH A UNIFORM E-FORMAT.

Section 202(a) (42 U.S.C. 3012(a)), as amended by sections 114(b) and 115, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(34) provide (to the extent practicable) a standardized notification to State agencies, area agencies on aging, providers of services under this Act, and grantees or contract awardees under this Act, through an electronic format (e-mail or other electronic notification), of the availability of, or updates to, policies, practices, and procedures under this Act.”.

SEC. 117. EVIDENCE-BASED PROGRAM ADAPTATION.

(a) FUNCTIONS OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY.—Section 202 (42 U.S.C. 3012) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(28), by inserting before the semicolon “, including information and technical assistance on delivery of such services in different settings”; and

(2) in subsection (b)(9)(B), by inserting before the semicolon “, including delivery of such services in different settings”.

(b) EVIDENCE-BASED DISEASE PREVENTION AND HEALTH PROMOTION SERVICES.—Section 361(a) (42 U.S.C. 3030m(a)) is amended in the second sentence by inserting “provide technical assistance on the delivery of evidence-based disease prevention and health promotion services in different settings and for different populations, and” before “consult”.

SEC. 118. BUSINESS ACUMEN PROVISIONS AND CLARIFICATION REGARDING OUTSIDE FUNDING FOR AREA AGENCIES ON AGING.

(a) ASSISTANCE RELATING TO GROWING AND SUSTAINING CAPACITY.—Section 202(b)(9) (42 U.S.C. 3012(b)(9)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “and” after the semicolon at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (B), as amended by section 117(a)(2), by inserting “and” after the semicolon at the end; and

(3) by adding at the end the following: “(C) activities for increasing business acumen, capacity building, organizational development, innovation, and other methods of growing and sustaining the capacity of the aging network to serve older individuals and caregivers most effectively;”.

(b) CLARIFYING PARTNERSHIPS FOR AREA AGENCIES ON AGING.—Section 306 (42 U.S.C. 3026) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(g) Nothing in this Act shall restrict an area agency on aging from providing services not provided or authorized by this Act, including through—

“(1) contracts with health care payers;

“(2) consumer private pay programs; or

“(3) other arrangements with entities or individuals that increase the availability of home- and community-based services and supports.”.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 307(a) (42 U.S.C. 3027(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (26); and

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (27) through (30) as paragraphs (26) through (29).

SEC. 119. DEMONSTRATION ON DIRECT CARE WORKERS.

Section 411(a) (42 U.S.C. 3032(a)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (13) and (14) as paragraphs (14) and (15), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (12) the following:

“(13) in coordination with the Secretary of Labor, the demonstration of new strategies for the recruitment, retention, or advancement of direct care workers, and the soliciting, development, and implementation of strategies—

“(A) to reduce barriers to entry for a diverse and high-quality direct care workforce, including providing wages, benefits, and advancement opportunities needed to attract or retain direct care workers; and

“(B) to provide education and workforce development programs for direct care workers that include supportive services and career planning;”.

SEC. 120. NATIONAL RESOURCE CENTER FOR OLDER INDIVIDUALS EXPERIENCING THE LONG-TERM AND ADVERSE CONSEQUENCES OF TRAUMA.

Section 411(a) (42 U.S.C. 3032(a)), as amended by section 119, is further amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (14) and (15) as paragraphs (15) and (16), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (13) the following:

“(14) the establishment and operation of a national resource center that shall—

“(A) provide training and technical assistance to agencies in the aging network delivering services to older individuals experiencing the long-term and adverse consequences of trauma;

“(B) share best practices with the aging network; and

“(C) make subgrants to the agencies best positioned to advance and improve the delivery of person-centered, trauma-informed services for older individuals experiencing the long-term and adverse consequences of trauma;”.

SEC. 121. NATIONAL RESOURCE CENTER FOR WOMEN AND RETIREMENT.

Section 215 (42 U.S.C. 3020e-1) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(k)(1) The Assistant Secretary shall, directly or by grant or contract, operate the National Resource Center for Women and Retirement (in this subsection referred to as the ‘Center’).

“(2) The Center shall—

“(A) provide tools, such as basic financial management, retirement planning, and other tools that promote financial literacy and help to identify and prevent exploitation (including fraud), and integrate these with information on health and long-term care;

“(B) annually disseminate a summary of outreach activities provided, including work to provide user-friendly consumer information and public education materials;

“(C) develop targeted outreach strategies;

“(D) provide technical assistance to State agencies and to other public and nonprofit private agencies and organizations; and

“(E) develop partnerships and collaborations to address program objectives.”.

SEC. 122. FAMILY CAREGIVERS.

(a) ADMINISTRATION.—Section 202 (42 U.S.C. 3012), as amended by section 114, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(i) The Assistant Secretary shall carry out the RAISE Family Caregivers Act (42 U.S.C. 3030s note).”.

(b) SUNSET.—Section 6 of the RAISE Family Caregivers Act (42 U.S.C. 3030s note) is amended by striking “3 years” and inserting “4 years”.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 2(3) of the RAISE Family Caregivers Act (42 U.S.C. 3030s note) is amended by inserting “, acting through the Assistant Secretary for Aging” before the period at the end.

SEC. 123. INTERAGENCY COORDINATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Assistant Secretary shall, in performing the functions of the Administration on Aging under section 202(a)(5) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3012(a)(5)) related to health (including mental and behavioral health) services, coordinate with the Assistant Secretary for Mental Health and Substance Use and the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention—

(1) in the planning, development, implementation, and evaluation of evidence-based policies, programs, practices, and other activities pertaining to the prevention of suicide among older individuals, including the implementation of evidence-based suicide prevention programs and strategies identified by the National Center for Injury Prevention and Control at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and other entities, as applicable; and

(2) in providing and incorporating technical assistance for the prevention of suicide among older individuals, including technical assistance related to the Suicide Prevention Technical Assistance Center established under section 520C of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290bb-34).

(b) PROGRAM DESIGN.—Section 202(a)(5) (42 U.S.C. 3012(a)(5)) is amended by inserting “cultural experiences, activities, and services, including in the arts,” after “education,”.

SEC. 124. MODERNIZING THE INTERAGENCY COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON HEALTHY AGING AND AGE-FRIENDLY COMMUNITIES.

(a) FEDERAL AGENCY CONSULTATION.—Section 203(b) (42 U.S.C. 3013(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (18), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (19), by striking the period at the end and inserting “, and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(20) section 393D of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280b-1f), relating to safety of seniors.”.

(b) MODERNIZATION.—Section 203(c) (42 U.S.C. 3013(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking “the Federal officials” and inserting “other Federal officials”; and

(B) by striking “Committee on Aging” and inserting “Committee on Healthy Aging and Age-Friendly Communities”; and

(C) by inserting “and the development of a national set of recommendations, in accordance with paragraph (6), to support the ability of older individuals to age in place and access homelessness prevention services, preventive health care, promote age-friendly communities, and address the ability of older individuals to access long-term care supports, including access to caregivers and home- and community-based health services” before the period;

(2) in paragraph (4), by adding at the end the following: “The first term, after the date of enactment of the Supporting Older Americans Act of 2020, shall start not later than 1 year after such date of enactment.”;

(3) in paragraph (6)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “The Committee shall” and inserting “The recommendations described in paragraph (1) may include recommendations for”; and

(B) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking “share information with and establish an ongoing system to” and inserting “ways to”; and

(ii) by striking “for older individuals and recommend improvements” and all that follows through “accessibility of such programs and services” and inserting “that impact older individuals”;

(C) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) by striking “identify, promote, and implement (as appropriate).”;

(ii) in clause (i), by striking “and” after the semicolon;

(iii) in clause (ii), by inserting “and” after the semicolon; and

(iv) by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) best practices identified in coordination with the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the National Institute on Aging, the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, the Office of Lead Hazard Control and Healthy Homes of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and other Federal agencies, as appropriate, to reduce and prevent falls among older individuals, that incorporate evidence-based falls prevention programs and home modifications, which recommendations shall supplement and not unnecessarily duplicate activities authorized under section 393D of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280b-1f), relating to safety of seniors.”;

(D) in subparagraph (C)—

(i) by inserting “ways to” before “collect”;

(ii) by striking “older individuals and”;

(iii) by striking “the individuals to ensure” and all that follows through “information” and inserting “older individuals to ensure that such information is accessible”;

(E) in subparagraph (D), by striking “work with” and all that follows through “member agencies to ensure” and inserting “ways to ensure”;

(F) in subparagraph (E), by striking “seek input” and all that follows through “foundations” and inserting “seeking input from and consulting with nonprofit organizations, academic or research institutions, community-based organizations, philanthropic organizations, or other entities supporting age-friendly communities”;

(G) in subparagraph (F), by striking “identify” and inserting “identifying”;

(H) by amending subparagraph (G) to read as follows:

“(G) ways to improve coordination to provide housing, health care, and other supportive services to older individuals.”;

(4) in paragraph (7)(A)(i), by striking “services for older individuals” and inserting “services that impact older individuals”;

(5) by adding at the end the following:

“(9) In this subsection, the term ‘age-friendly community’ means a community that—

“(A) is taking measurable steps to—

“(i) include adequate and accessible housing, public spaces and buildings, safe and secure paths, variable route transportation services, and programs and services designed to support health and well-being;

“(ii) respect and include older individuals in social opportunities, civic participation, volunteerism, and employment; and

“(iii) facilitate access to supportive services for older individuals;

“(B) is not an assisted living facility or long-term care facility; and

“(C) has a plan in place to meet local needs for housing, transportation, civic participation, social connectedness, and accessible public spaces.”.

(C) ADMINISTRATION OF THE ACT.—Section 205(a)(2) (42 U.S.C. 3016(a)(2)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (D); and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following:

“(C) The Assistant Secretary may provide technical assistance, including through the regional offices of the Administration, to State agencies, area agencies on aging, local government agencies, or leaders in age-friendly communities (as defined, for purposes of this subparagraph, in section 203(c)(9)) regarding—

“(i) dissemination of, or consideration of ways to implement, best practices and recommendations from the Interagency Coordinating Committee on Healthy Aging and Age-Friendly Communities established under section 203(c); and

“(ii) methods for managing and coordinating existing programs to meet the needs of growing age-friendly communities.”.

SEC. 125. PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS FOR A NUTRITION OFFICIAL UNDER THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY.

Section 205(a)(2)(D)(ii) (42 U.S.C. 3016(a)(2)(D)(ii)), as redesignated by section 124(c)(1), is amended to read as follows:

“(ii) be a registered dietitian or registered dietitian nutritionist.”.

SEC. 126. REPORT ON SOCIAL ISOLATION.

(a) PREPARATION OF REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall, in carrying out activities under section 206(a) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3017(a)), prepare a report on programs authorized by such Act (42 U.S.C. 3001 et seq.), and supported or funded by the Administration on Aging, that include a focus on addressing the negative health effects associated with social isolation through targeting older individuals identified as being in greatest social need, as appropriate.

(2) IMPACT.—Such report shall identify—

(A) whether social isolation is being adequately addressed under such programs, including, to the extent practicable—

(i) the prevalence of social isolation in rural areas and in urban areas;

(ii) the negative public health effects associated with social isolation; and

(iii) the role of preventive measures or of services, including nutrition services, in addressing the negative health effects associated with social isolation among older individuals; and

(B) public awareness of and efforts to address the negative health effects associated with social isolation.

(3) TYPES OF PROGRAMS.—Such report shall identify whether programs described in paragraph (1)—

(A) support projects in local communities and involve diverse sectors associated with such communities to decrease the negative health effects associated with social isolation among older individuals and caregivers;

(B) support outreach activities to screen older individuals for negative health effects associated with social isolation; and

(C) include a focus on decreasing the negative health effects associated with social isolation.

(4) RECOMMENDATIONS.—Such report shall, as appropriate, include recommendations for reducing the negative health effects associated with social isolation and to address any negative health effects identified under clauses (ii) and (iii) of subparagraph (A), and subparagraph (B), of paragraph (2).

(b) SUBMISSION OF REPORT.—

(1) INTERIM STATUS REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit an interim report, to the committees of the Senate and of the House of Representatives with jurisdiction over the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3001 et seq.), and the Special Committee on Aging of the Senate, on the status of the evaluation underway to develop the final report required under this section.

(2) FINAL REPORT.—Not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a final report that meets the requirements of this section to the committees of the Senate and of the House of Representatives with jurisdiction over the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3001 et seq.), and the Special Committee on Aging of the Senate.

SEC. 127. RESEARCH AND EVALUATION.

(a) CENTER.—Section 201 (42 U.S.C. 3011) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(g)(1) The Assistant Secretary shall, as appropriate, coordinate the research and evaluation functions of this Act under a Research, Demonstration, and Evaluation Center for the Aging Network (in this subsection referred to as the ‘Center’), which shall be headed by a director designated by the Assistant Secretary from individuals described in paragraph (4).

“(2) The purpose of the Center shall be—

“(A) to coordinate, as appropriate, research, research dissemination, evaluation, demonstration projects, and related activities carried out under this Act;

“(B) to provide assessment of the programs and interventions authorized under this Act; and

“(C) to increase the repository of information on evidence-based programs and interventions available to the aging network, which information shall be applicable to existing programs and interventions and help in the development of new evidence-based programs and interventions.

“(3) Activities of the Center shall include, as appropriate, conducting, promoting, coordinating, and providing support for—

“(A) research and evaluation activities that support the objectives of this Act, including—

“(i) evaluation of new and existing programs and interventions authorized by this Act; and

“(ii) research on and assessment of the relationship between programs and interventions under this Act and the health outcomes, social determinants of health, quality of life, and dependence of individuals served under this Act;

“(B) demonstration projects that support the objectives of this Act, including activities to bring effective demonstration projects to scale with a prioritization of projects that address the needs of underserved populations, and promote partnerships among aging services, community-based organizations, and Medicare and Medicaid providers, plans, and health (including public health) systems;

“(C) outreach and dissemination of research findings; and

“(D) technical assistance related to the activities described in this paragraph.

“(4) The director shall be an individual with substantial knowledge of and experience in aging and health policy, and research administration.

“(5) Not later than October 1, 2020, and at 5-year intervals thereafter, the director shall prepare and publish in the Federal Register for public comment a draft of a 5-year plan that—

“(A) outlines priorities for research, research dissemination, evaluation, demonstration projects, and related activities;

“(B) explains the basis for such priorities; and

“(C) describes how the plan will meet the needs of underserved populations.

“(6) The director shall coordinate, as appropriate, research, research dissemination, evaluation, and demonstration projects, and related activities with appropriate agency program staff, and, as appropriate, with other Federal departments and agencies involved in research in the field of aging.

“(7) Not later than December 31, 2020, and annually thereafter, the director shall prepare, and submit to the Secretary, the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate, the Special Committee on Aging of the Senate, and the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives, a report on the activities funded under this section and title IV.

“(8) The director shall, as appropriate, consult with experts on aging research and evaluation and aging network stakeholders on the implementation of the activities described under paragraph (3) of this subsection.

“(9) The director shall coordinate, as appropriate, all research and evaluation authorities under this Act.”.

(b) EVALUATION.—Section 206 (42 U.S.C. 3017) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (b) through (g) as subsections (c) through (h), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

“(b) Not later than July 1, 2020, the Secretary shall provide, directly or through grant or contract, for an evaluation of programs under this Act, which shall include, to the extent practicable, an analysis of the relationship of such

programs, including demonstration projects under title IV of this Act, to health care expenditures under the Medicare program established under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.) and the Medicaid program established under title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.). The Secretary shall oversee analyses of data obtained in connection with program evaluation to evaluate, where feasible, the relationship of programs under this Act to health care expenditures, including under the Medicare and Medicaid programs.”.

(c) **REPORT ON HEALTH CARE EXPENDITURES.**—Section 207 (42 U.S.C. 3018) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d) The Assistant Secretary shall provide the evaluation required under section 206(b) to—

“(1) the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate;

“(2) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate;

“(3) the Special Committee on Aging of the Senate;

“(4) the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives; and

“(5) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.”.

TITLE II—IMPROVING GRANTS FOR STATE AND COMMUNITY PROGRAMS ON AGING

SEC. 201. SOCIAL DETERMINANTS OF HEALTH.

Section 301(a)(1) (42 U.S.C. 3021(a)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (C), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (D), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(E) measure impacts related to social determinants of health of older individuals.”.

SEC. 202. YOUNGER ONSET ALZHEIMER'S DISEASE.

The Act (42 U.S.C. 3001 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 302(3) (42 U.S.C. 3022(3)), by inserting “of any age” after “an individual”; and

(2) in section 711(6) (42 U.S.C. 3058(6)), by inserting “of any age” after “individual”.

SEC. 203. REAUTHORIZATION.

(a) **GRANTS FOR STATE AND COMMUNITY PROGRAMS ON AGING.**—Subsections (a) through (e) of section 303 (42 U.S.C. 3023) are amended to read as follows:

“(a)(1) There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out part B (relating to supportive services) \$412,029,180 for fiscal year 2020, \$436,750,931 for fiscal year 2021, \$462,955,987 for fiscal year 2022, \$490,733,346 for fiscal year 2023, and \$520,177,347 for fiscal year 2024.

“(2) Funds appropriated under paragraph (1) shall be available to carry out section 712.

“(b)(1) There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out subpart 1 of part C (relating to congregate nutrition services) \$530,015,940 for fiscal year 2020, \$561,816,896 for fiscal year 2021, \$595,525,910 for fiscal year 2022, \$631,257,465 for fiscal year 2023, and \$669,132,913 for fiscal year 2024.

“(2) There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out subpart 2 of part C (relating to home delivered nutrition services) \$268,935,940 for fiscal year 2020, \$285,072,096 for fiscal year 2021, \$302,176,422 for fiscal year 2022, \$320,307,008 for fiscal year 2023, and \$339,525,428 for fiscal year 2024.

“(c) Grants made under part B, and subparts 1 and 2 of part C, of this title may be used for paying part of the cost of—

“(1) the administration of area plans by area agencies on aging designated under section 305(a)(2)(A), including the preparation of area plans on aging consistent with section 306 and the evaluation of activities carried out under such plans; and

“(2) the development of comprehensive and coordinated systems for supportive services, and congregate and home delivered nutrition services under subparts 1 and 2 of part C, the devel-

opment and operation of multipurpose senior centers, and the delivery of legal assistance.

“(d) There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out part D (relating to disease prevention and health promotion services) \$26,587,360 for fiscal year 2020, \$28,182,602 for fiscal year 2021, \$29,873,558 for fiscal year 2022, \$31,665,971 for fiscal year 2023, and \$33,565,929 for fiscal year 2024.

“(e) There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out part E (relating to family caregiver support) \$193,869,020 for fiscal year 2020, \$205,501,161 for fiscal year 2021, \$217,831,231 for fiscal year 2022, \$230,901,105 for fiscal year 2023, and \$244,755,171 for fiscal year 2024.”.

(b) **NUTRITION SERVICES INCENTIVE PROGRAM.**—Section 311(e) (42 U.S.C. 3030a(e)) is amended to read as follows:

“(e) There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section (other than subsection (c)(1)) \$171,273,830 for fiscal year 2020, \$181,550,260 for fiscal year 2021, \$192,443,275 for fiscal year 2022, \$203,989,872 for fiscal year 2023, and \$216,229,264 for fiscal year 2024.”.

SEC. 204. HOLD HARMLESS FORMULA.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 304(a)(3)(D) (42 U.S.C. 3024(a)(3)(D)) is amended to read as follows:

“(D)(i) In this subparagraph and paragraph (5)—

“(I) the term ‘allot’ means allot under this subsection from a sum appropriated under section 303(a) or 303(b)(1), as the case may be; and

“(II) the term ‘covered fiscal year’ means any of fiscal years 2020 through 2029.

“(ii) If the sum appropriated under section 303(a) or 303(b)(1) for a particular covered fiscal year is less than or equal to the sum appropriated under section 303(a) or 303(b)(1), respectively, for fiscal year 2019, amounts shall be allotted to States from the sum appropriated for the particular year in accordance with paragraphs (1) and (2), and subparagraphs (A) through (C) as applicable, but no State shall be allotted an amount that is less than—

“(I) for fiscal year 2020, 99.75 percent of the State’s allotment from the corresponding sum appropriated for fiscal year 2019;

“(II) for fiscal year 2021, 99.50 percent of that allotment;

“(III) for fiscal year 2022, 99.25 percent of that allotment;

“(IV) for fiscal year 2023, 99.00 percent of that allotment;

“(V) for fiscal year 2024, 98.75 percent of that allotment;

“(VI) for fiscal year 2025, 98.50 percent of that allotment;

“(VII) for fiscal year 2026, 98.25 percent of that allotment;

“(VIII) for fiscal year 2027, 98.00 percent of that allotment;

“(IX) for fiscal year 2028, 97.75 percent of that allotment; and

“(X) for fiscal year 2029, 97.50 percent of that allotment.

“(iii) If the sum appropriated under section 303(a) or 303(b)(1) for a particular covered fiscal year is greater than the sum appropriated under section 303(a) or 303(b)(1), respectively, for fiscal year 2019, the allotments to States from the sum appropriated for the particular year shall be calculated as follows:

“(I) From the portion equal to the corresponding sum appropriated for fiscal year 2019, amounts shall be allotted in accordance with paragraphs (1) and (2), and subparagraphs (A) through (C) as applicable, but no State shall be allotted an amount that is less than the percentage specified in clause (ii), for that particular year, of the State’s allotment from the corresponding sum appropriated for fiscal year 2019.

“(II) From the remainder, amounts shall be allotted in accordance with paragraph (1), subparagraphs (A) through (C) as applicable, and paragraph (2) to the extent needed to meet the requirements of those subparagraphs.”.

(b) **REPEAL.**—Section 304(a)(3)(D) (42 U.S.C. 3024(a)(3)(D)) is repealed, effective October 1, 2029.

(c) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 304(a)(5) (42 U.S.C. 3024(a)(5)) is amended by striking “of the prior year” and inserting “as required by paragraph (3)”.

SEC. 205. OUTREACH EFFORTS.

Section 306(a)(4)(B) (42 U.S.C. 3026(a)(4)(B)) is amended—

(1) in clause (i)(VII), by inserting “, specifically including survivors of the Holocaust” after “placement”; and

(2) in clause (ii), by striking “(VI)” and inserting “(VII)”.

SEC. 206. STATE LONG-TERM CARE OMBUDSMAN PROGRAM MINIMUM FUNDING AND MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT.

The Act (42 U.S.C. 3001 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by amending section 306(a)(9) (42 U.S.C. 3026(a)(9)) to read as follows:

“(9) provide assurances that—

“(A) the area agency on aging, in carrying out the State Long-Term Care Ombudsman program under section 307(a)(9), will expend not less than the total amount of funds appropriated under this Act and expended by the agency in fiscal year 2019 in carrying out such a program under this title; and

“(B) funds made available to the area agency on aging pursuant to section 712 shall be used to supplement and not supplant other Federal, State, and local funds expended to support activities described in section 712.”; and

(2) by amending section 307(a)(9) (42 U.S.C. 3027(a)(9)) to read as follows:

“(9) The plan shall provide assurances that—

“(A) the State agency will carry out, through the Office of the State Long-Term Care Ombudsman, a State Long-Term Care Ombudsman program in accordance with section 712 and this title, and will expend for such purpose an amount that is not less than the amount expended by the State agency with funds received under this title for fiscal year 2019, and an amount that is not less than the amount expended by the State agency with funds received under title VII for fiscal year 2019; and

“(B) funds made available to the State agency pursuant to section 712 shall be used to supplement and not supplant other Federal, State, and local funds expended to support activities described in section 712.”.

SEC. 207. COORDINATION WITH RESOURCE CENTERS.

(a) **AREA PLANS.**—Section 306(a) (42 U.S.C. 3026(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (16), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (17), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(18) provide assurances that the area agency on aging will collect data to determine—

“(A) the services that are needed by older individuals whose needs were the focus of all centers funded under title IV in fiscal year 2019; and

“(B) the effectiveness of the programs, policies, and services provided by such area agency on aging in assisting such individuals; and

“(19) provide assurances that the area agency on aging will use outreach efforts that will identify individuals eligible for assistance under this Act, with special emphasis on those individuals whose needs were the focus of all centers funded under title IV in fiscal year 2019.”.

(b) **STATE PLANS.**—Section 307(a) (42 U.S.C. 3027(a)), as amended by section 118(c), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(30) The plan shall contain an assurance that the State shall prepare and submit to the Assistant Secretary annual reports that describe—

“(A) data collected to determine the services that are needed by older individuals whose needs were the focus of all centers funded under title IV in fiscal year 2019;

“(B) data collected to determine the effectiveness of the programs, policies, and services provided by area agencies on aging in assisting such individuals; and

“(C) outreach efforts and other activities carried out to satisfy the assurances described in paragraphs (18) and (19) of section 306(a).”.

SEC. 208. SENIOR LEGAL HOTLINES.

Not later than 4 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Assistant Secretary shall prepare and submit to Congress a report containing—

(1) information on which States or localities operate senior legal hotlines;

(2) information on how such hotlines operated by States or localities are funded;

(3) information on the usefulness of senior legal hotlines in the coordination and provision of legal assistance; and

(4) recommendations on additional actions that should be taken related to senior legal hotlines.

SEC. 209. INCREASE IN LIMIT ON USE OF ALLOTMENT FUNDS FOR STATE ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.

Section 308 (42 U.S.C. 3028) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), in paragraphs (1) and (2), by striking “subsection (b)(1)” and inserting “subsection (b)”; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in each of paragraphs (1) and (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by striking “clause (ii)” and inserting “subparagraph (B)”; and

(II) by striking “greater of” and all that follows through “or” and inserting the following: “greater of—

“(i) 5 percent of the total amount of the allotments made to a State under sections 304(a)(1) and 373(f); or

“(ii)”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking “such allotment” and inserting “such total amount”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking “\$500,000” and inserting “\$750,000”.

SEC. 210. IMPROVEMENTS TO NUTRITION PROGRAMS.

Section 308(b)(4) (42 U.S.C. 3028(b)(4)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(D) The State, in consultation with area agencies on aging, shall ensure the process used by the State in transferring funds under this paragraph (including requirements relating to the authority and timing of such transfers) is simplified and clarified to reduce administrative barriers and direct limited resources to the greatest nutrition service needs at the community level. Such process shall be modified to attempt to lessen the administrative barriers of such transfers, and help direct limited resources to where they are needed the most as the unmet need for nutrition services grows.”.

SEC. 211. REVIEW OF REPORTS.

Section 308(b) (42 U.S.C. 3028(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(8) The Assistant Secretary shall review the reports submitted under section 307(a)(30) and include aggregate data in the report required by section 207(a), including data on—

“(A) the effectiveness of the programs, policies, and services provided by area agencies on aging in assisting older individuals whose needs were the focus of all centers funded under title IV in fiscal year 2019; and

“(B) outreach efforts and other activities carried out to satisfy the assurances described in paragraphs (18) and (19) of section 306(a), to identify such older individuals and their service needs.”.

SEC. 212. OTHER PRACTICES.

Section 315 (42 U.S.C. 3030c–2) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) RESPONSE TO AREA AGENCIES ON AGING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Upon request from an area agency on aging, the State shall make available any policies or guidance pertaining to policies established under this section.

“(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in paragraph (1) shall require a State to develop policies or guidance pertaining to policies established under this section.”.

SEC. 213. SCREENING FOR NEGATIVE HEALTH EFFECTS ASSOCIATED WITH SOCIAL ISOLATION AND TRAUMATIC BRAIN INJURY.

Section 321(a)(8) (42 U.S.C. 3030d(a)(8)) is amended—

(1) by striking “screening and” and inserting “screening, screening for negative health effects associated with social isolation.”; and

(2) by inserting “, and traumatic brain injury screening” after “falls prevention services screening”.

SEC. 214. SUPPORTIVE SERVICES AND SENIOR CENTERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 321(a) (42 U.S.C. 3030d(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (24), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) by redesignating paragraph (25) as paragraph (26); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (24) the following:

“(25) services that promote or support social connectedness and reduce negative health effects associated with social isolation; and”.

(b) SUPPORTIVE SERVICES.—Section 321(a)(7) (42 U.S.C. 3030d(a)(7)) is amended by inserting “cultural experiences (including the arts),” after “art therapy.”.

SEC. 215. CULTURALLY APPROPRIATE, MEDICALLY TAILORED MEALS.

Section 339(2)(A)(iii) (42 U.S.C. 3030g–21(2)(A)(iii)) is amended by inserting “, including meals adjusted for cultural considerations and preferences and medically tailored meals” before the comma at the end.

SEC. 216. NUTRITION SERVICES STUDY.

Subpart 3 of part C of title III (42 U.S.C. 3030g–21 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 339B. NUTRITION SERVICES IMPACT STUDY.

“(a) STUDY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Assistant Secretary shall perform a study to assess how to measure and evaluate the discrepancy between available services and the demand for such services in the home delivered nutrition services program and the congregate nutrition services program under this part, which shall include assessing various methods (such as those that States use) to measure and evaluate the discrepancy (such as measurement through the length of waitlists).

“(2) CONTENTS.—In performing the study, the Assistant Secretary shall—

“(A) consider means of obtaining information in rural and underserved communities; and

“(B) consider using existing tools (existing as of the date the Assistant Secretary begins the study) such as the tools developed through the Performance Outcome Measurement Project.

“(3) ANALYSIS.—The Assistant Secretary shall analyze and determine which methods are the least burdensome and most effective for measuring and evaluating the discrepancy described in paragraph (1).

“(b) RECOMMENDATIONS.—

“(1) PREPARATION.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of the Supporting Older Americans Act of 2020, the Assistant Secretary shall prepare recommendations—

“(A) on how to measure and evaluate, with the least burden and the most effectiveness, the discrepancy described in subsection (a)(1) (such as measurement through the length of waitlists); and

“(B) about whether studies similar to the study described in subsection (a) should be carried out for programs carried out under this Act, other than this part.

“(2) ISSUANCE.—The Assistant Secretary shall issue the recommendations, and make the recommendations available as a notification pursuant to section 202(a)(34) and to the committees

of the Senate and of the House of Representatives with jurisdiction over this Act, and the Special Committee on Aging of the Senate.”.

SEC. 217. NATIONAL FAMILY CAREGIVER SUPPORT PROGRAM.

(a) DEFINITIONS FOR NATIONAL FAMILY CAREGIVER SUPPORT PROGRAM.—Section 372(a) (42 U.S.C. 3030s(a)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (3) as paragraphs (2) through (4), respectively; and

(2) by inserting before paragraph (2), as so redesignated, the following:

“(1) CAREGIVER ASSESSMENT.—The term ‘caregiver assessment’ means a defined process of gathering information to identify the specific needs, barriers to carrying out caregiving responsibilities, and existing supports of a family caregiver or older relative caregiver, as identified by the caregiver involved, to appropriately target recommendations for support services described in section 373(b). Such assessment shall be administered through direct contact with the caregiver, which may include contact through a home visit, the Internet, telephone or teleconference, or in-person interaction.”.

(b) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—Section 373 (42 U.S.C. 3030s–1) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting “which may be informed through the use of caregiver assessments,” after “provided.”;

(2) in subsection (e)(3), in the first sentence, by inserting “, including caregiver assessments used in the State,” after “mechanisms”;

(3) by redesignating subsections (e) through (g) as subsections (f) through (h), respectively;

(4) by inserting after subsection (d) the following:

“(e) BEST PRACTICES.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Supporting Older Americans Act of 2020 and every 5 years thereafter, the Assistant Secretary shall—

“(1) identify best practices relating to the programs carried out under this section and section 631, regarding—

“(A) the use of procedures and tools to monitor and evaluate the performance of the programs carried out under such sections;

“(B) the use of evidence-based caregiver support services; and

“(C) any other issue determined relevant by the Assistant Secretary; and

“(2) make available, including on the website of the Administration and pursuant to section 202(a)(34), best practices described in paragraph (1), to carry out the programs under this section and section 631.”; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

“(i) ACTIVITIES OF NATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE.—The Assistant Secretary may award funds authorized under this section to States, public agencies, private nonprofit agencies, institutions of higher education, and organizations, including tribal organizations, for conducting activities of national significance that—

“(1) promote quality and continuous improvement in the support provided to family caregivers and older relative caregivers through programs carried out under this section and section 631; and

“(2) include, with respect to such programs, program evaluation, training, technical assistance, and research.

“(j) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR CAREGIVER ASSESSMENTS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Supporting Older Americans Act of 2020, the Assistant Secretary, in consultation with stakeholders with appropriate expertise and, as appropriate, informed by the strategy developed under the RAISE Family Caregivers Act (42 U.S.C. 3030s note), shall provide technical assistance to promote and implement the use of caregiver assessments. Such technical assistance may include sharing available tools or templates, comprehensive assessment protocols, and best practices concerning—

“(1) conducting caregiver assessments (including reassessments) as needed;

“(2) implementing such assessments that are consistent across a planning and service area, as appropriate; and

“(3) implementing caregiver support service plans, including conducting referrals to and coordination of activities with relevant State services.”

(c) REPORT ON CAREGIVER ASSESSMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Assistant Secretary shall issue a report on the use of caregiver assessments by area agencies on aging, entities contracting with such agencies, and tribal organizations. Such report shall include—

(A) an analysis of the current use of caregiver assessments, as of the date of the report;

(B) an analysis of the potential impact of caregiver assessments on—

(i) family caregivers and older relative caregivers; and

(ii) the older individuals to whom the caregivers described in clause (i) provide care;

(C) an analysis of the potential impact of using caregiver assessments on the aging network;

(D) an analysis of how caregiver assessments are being used to identify the specific needs, barriers to carrying out caregiving responsibilities, and existing supports of family caregivers and older relative caregivers, with particular consideration to supporting—

(i) a caregiver specified in this subparagraph who is caring for individuals with disabilities, or, if appropriate, with a serious illness; and

(ii) caregivers with disabilities;

(E) recommendations for furthering the use of caregiver assessments, as appropriate, including in rural or underserved areas; and

(F) recommendations for assisting State agencies and area agencies on aging, particularly in rural or underserved areas, in implementing the use of caregiver assessments.

(2) SUBMISSION.—Not later than 6 months after the issuance of the report specified in paragraph (1), the Assistant Secretary shall submit the report to the committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives with jurisdiction over this Act, and the Special Committee on Aging of the Senate.

(3) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection—

(A) the terms “caregiver assessment” and “older relative caregiver” have the meanings given such terms in section 372(a) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3030s(a));

(B) the term “family caregiver” has the meaning given the term in section 302 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 3022); and

(C) the terms “State agency” and “tribal organization” have the meanings given the terms in section 102 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 3002).

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 631(b) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 3057k-11(b)) is amended by striking “(c), (d), and (e)” and inserting “(c), (d), and (f)”.

SEC. 218. NATIONAL FAMILY CAREGIVER SUPPORT PROGRAM CAP.

(a) FEDERAL SHARE.—Subsection (h)(2), as redesignated by section 217(b)(3) of this Act, of section 373 (42 U.S.C. 3030s-1) is amended by striking subparagraph (C).

(b) MONITORING THE IMPACT OF THE ELIMINATION OF THE CAP ON FUNDS FOR OLDER RELATIVE CAREGIVERS.—

(1) REPORT.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Assistant Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives a report on the impact of the amendment made by subsection (a) to eliminate the limitation on funds that States may allocate to provide support services to older relative caregivers in the National Family Caregiver Support Program established under part E of title III of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3030s

et seq.). Each such report shall also be made available to the public.

(2) CONTENTS.—For purposes of reports required by paragraph (1), each State that receives an allotment under such National Family Caregiver Support Program for fiscal year 2020 or a subsequent fiscal year shall report to the Assistant Secretary for the fiscal year involved the amount of funds of the total Federal and non-Federal shares described in section 373(h)(2) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3030s-1(h)(2)) used by the State to provide support services for older relative caregivers and the amount of such funds so used for family caregivers.

TITLE III—MODERNIZING ACTIVITIES FOR HEALTH, INDEPENDENCE, AND LONGEVITY

SEC. 301. REAUTHORIZATION.

Section 411(b) (42 U.S.C. 3032(b)) is amended to read as follows:

“(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out—

“(1) aging network support activities under this section, \$14,514,550 for fiscal year 2020, \$15,385,423 for fiscal year 2021, \$16,308,548 for fiscal year 2022, \$17,287,061 for fiscal year 2023, and \$18,324,285 for fiscal year 2024; and

“(2) elder rights support activities under this section, \$15,613,440 for fiscal year 2020, \$16,550,246 for fiscal year 2021, \$17,543,261 for fiscal year 2022, \$18,595,857 for fiscal year 2023, and \$19,711,608 for fiscal year 2024.”

SEC. 302. PUBLIC AWARENESS OF TRAUMATIC BRAIN INJURY.

Section 411(a)(12) (42 U.S.C. 3032(a)(12)) is amended—

(1) by striking “impairments” and inserting “impairments,”; and

(2) by striking “, and mental disorders” and inserting “, mental disorders, and traumatic brain injury”.

SEC. 303. FALLS PREVENTION AND CHRONIC DISEASE SELF-MANAGEMENT EDUCATION.

Section 411(a) (42 U.S.C. 3032(a)), as amended by sections 119 and 120, is further amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (15) and (16) as paragraphs (17) and (18), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (14) the following:

“(15) bringing to scale and sustaining evidence-based falls prevention programs that will reduce the number of falls, fear of falling, and fall-related injuries in older individuals, including older individuals with disabilities;

“(16) bringing to scale and sustaining evidence-based chronic disease self-management programs that empower older individuals, including older individuals with disabilities, to better manage their chronic conditions.”

SEC. 304. DEMONSTRATION TO ADDRESS NEGATIVE HEALTH IMPACTS ASSOCIATED WITH SOCIAL ISOLATION.

Section 411(a)(42 U.S.C. 3032(a)), as amended by sections 119, 120, and 303, is further amended—

(1) in paragraph (17), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(2) by redesignating paragraph (18) as paragraph (19); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (17), the following:

“(18) projects that address negative health effects associated with social isolation among older individuals; and”.

SEC. 305. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND INNOVATION TO IMPROVE TRANSPORTATION FOR OLDER INDIVIDUALS.

Section 416(b)(2) (42 U.S.C. 3032e(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B), by inserting before the semicolon “, call center, website or Internet-based portal, mobile application, or other technological tools”; and

(2) in subparagraph (C), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(3) by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (G); and

(4) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following:

“(D)(i) improving the aggregation, availability, and accessibility of information on options for transportation services for older individuals, including information on public transit, on-demand transportation services, volunteer-based transportation services, and other private transportation providers; and

“(ii) providing older individuals with the ability to schedule trips both in advance and on demand, as appropriate;

“(E) identifying opportunities to share resources and reduce costs of transportation services for older individuals;

“(F) coordinating individualized trip planning responses to requests from older individuals for transportation services; and”.

SEC. 306. GRANT PROGRAM FOR MULTIGENERATIONAL COLLABORATION.

Section 417 (42 U.S.C. 3032f) is amended—

(1) by amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

“(a) GRANTS AND CONTRACTS.—The Assistant Secretary shall award grants to and enter into contracts with eligible organizations to carry out projects, serving individuals in younger generations and older individuals, to—

“(1) provide opportunities for older individuals to participate in multigenerational activities and civic engagement activities that contribute to the health and wellness of older individuals and individuals in younger generations by promoting—

“(A) meaningful roles for participants;

“(B) reciprocity in relationship building;

“(C) reduced social isolation and improved participant social connectedness;

“(D) improved economic well-being for older individuals;

“(E) increased lifelong learning; or

“(F) support for caregivers of families by—

“(i) providing support for older relative caregivers (as defined in section 372(a)) raising children (such as support for kinship navigator programs); or

“(ii) involving volunteers who are older individuals who provide support and information to families who have a child with a disability or chronic illness, or other families in need of such family support;

“(2) coordinate multigenerational activities and civic engagement activities, including multigenerational nutrition and meal service programs;

“(3) promote volunteerism, including by providing opportunities for older individuals to become a mentor to individuals in younger generations; and

“(4) facilitate development of, and participation in, multigenerational activities and civic engagement activities.”;

(2) by striking subsection (g);

(3) by redesignating subsections (b) through (f) as subsections (c) through (g), respectively;

(4) by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

“(b) GRANT AND CONTRACT PERIODS.—Each grant awarded and contract entered into under subsection (a) shall be for a period of not less than 36 months.”;

(5) by amending subsection (c), as so redesignated, to read as follows:

“(c) USE OF FUNDS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—An eligible organization shall use funds made available under a grant awarded, or a contract entered into, under this section to carry out a project described in subsection (a).

“(2) PROVISION OF PROJECTS THROUGH GRANTS.—In awarding grants and entering into contracts under this section, the Assistant Secretary shall ensure that such grants and contracts are for the projects that satisfy each requirement under paragraphs (1) through (4) of subsection (a).”;

(6) in subsection (d), as so redesignated—
 (A) in paragraph (1), by inserting “, intent to carry out, or intent to partner with local organizations or multiservice organizations to carry out,” after “record of carrying out”;

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(C) in paragraph (4), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(5) eligible organizations proposing multigenerational activity projects that utilize shared site programs, such as collocated child care and long-term care facilities.”;

(7) by amending subsections (f) and (g), as so redesignated, to read as follows:

“(f) ELIGIBLE ORGANIZATIONS.—Organizations eligible to receive a grant or enter into a contract under subsection (a) shall—

“(1) be a State, an area agency on aging, or an organizational that provides opportunities for older individuals to participate in activities described in such subsection; and

“(2) have the capacity to conduct the coordination, promotion, and facilitation described in such subsection through the use of multigenerational coordinators.

“(g) EVALUATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of the Supporting Older Americans Act of 2020, the Assistant Secretary shall, through data submitted by organizations carrying out projects through grants or contracts under this section, evaluate the activities supported through such grants and contracts to determine—

“(A) the effectiveness of such activities;

“(B) the impact of such activities on the community being served and the organization providing the activities; and

“(C) the impact of such activities on older individuals participating in such projects.

“(2) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 6 months after the Assistant Secretary completes the evaluation under paragraph (1), the Assistant Secretary shall prepare and submit to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate a report that assesses such evaluation and contains, at a minimum—

“(A) the names or descriptive titles of the projects funded under subsection (a);

“(B) a description of the nature and operation of such projects;

“(C) the names and addresses of organizations that conducted such projects;

“(D) a description of the methods and success of such projects in recruiting older individuals as employees and as volunteers to participate in the projects;

“(E) a description of the success of the projects in retaining older individuals participating in such projects as employees and as volunteers;

“(F) the rate of turnover of older individuals who are employees or volunteers in such projects;

“(G) a strategy for disseminating the findings resulting from such projects; and

“(H) any policy change recommendations relating to such projects.”; and

(8) in subsection (h)(2)(B)(i), by striking “individuals from the generations with older individuals” and inserting “older individuals”.

TITLE IV—SENIOR COMMUNITY SERVICE EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

SEC. 401. PRIORITY FOR THE SENIOR COMMUNITY SERVICE EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM.

(a) PRIORITY.—The Act (42 U.S.C. 3001 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 503(a)(4)(C) (42 U.S.C. 3056a(a)(4)(C))—

(A) in clause (iii), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in clause (iv), by adding “and” at the end; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(v) eligible individuals who have been incarcerated within the last 5 years or are under supervision following release from prison or jail within the last 5 years.”;

(2) in section 514(e)(1) (42 U.S.C. 30561(e)(1)), by inserting “eligible individuals who have been incarcerated or are under supervision following release from prison or jail,” after “need.”; and

(3) in section 518 (42 U.S.C. 3056p)—

(A) in subsection (a)(3)(B)(ii)—

(i) in subclause (IV), by striking “or” at the end;

(ii) in subclause (V), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(VI) have been incarcerated within the last 5 years or are under supervision following release from prison or jail within the last 5 years.”; and

(B) in subsection (b)(2)—

(i) in subparagraph (F), by striking “or” at the end;

(ii) in subparagraph (G), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(H) has been incarcerated within the last 5 years or is under supervision following release from prison or jail within the last 5 years.”.

(b) TRANSITION PERIOD.—This section shall take effect 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 402. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 517(a) (42 U.S.C. 3056o(a)) is amended to read as follows:

“(a) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this title \$428,000,000 for fiscal year 2020, \$453,680,000 for fiscal year 2021, \$480,900,800 for fiscal year 2022, \$509,754,848 for fiscal year 2023, and \$540,340,139 for fiscal year 2024.”.

TITLE V—ENHANCING GRANTS FOR NATIVE AMERICANS

SEC. 501. REAUTHORIZATION.

Title VI (42 U.S.C. 3057 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in part D (42 U.S.C. 3057l et seq.)—

(A) by amending section 643 (42 U.S.C. 3057n) to read as follows:

“(a) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this title—

“(1) for parts A and B, \$37,102,560 for fiscal year 2020, \$39,298,714 for fiscal year 2021, \$41,626,636 for fiscal year 2022, \$44,094,235 for fiscal year 2023, and \$46,709,889 for fiscal year 2024; and

“(2) for part C, \$10,759,920 for fiscal year 2020, \$11,405,515 for fiscal year 2021, \$12,089,846 for fiscal year 2022, \$12,815,237 for fiscal year 2023, and \$13,584,151 for fiscal year 2024.”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 644. FUNDING SET ASIDE.

“(Of the funds appropriated under section 643(1) for a fiscal year, not more than 5 percent shall be made available to carry out part D for such fiscal year, provided that for such fiscal year—

“(1) the funds appropriated for parts A and B are greater than the funds appropriated for fiscal year 2019; and

“(2) the Assistant Secretary makes available for parts A and B no less than the amount of resources made available for fiscal year 2019.”;

(2) by redesignating part D, as so amended, as part E; and

(3) by inserting after part C the following:

“PART D—SUPPORTIVE SERVICES FOR HEALTHY AGING AND INDEPENDENCE

“SEC. 636. PROGRAM.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Assistant Secretary may carry out a competitive demonstration program for making grants to tribal organizations or organizations serving Native Hawaiians with applications approved under parts A and B, to pay for the Federal share of carrying out programs, to enable the organizations described in this subsection to build their capacity to provide a wider range of in-home and community sup-

portive services to enable older individuals to maintain their health and independence and to avoid long-term care facility placement.

“(b) SUPPORTIVE SERVICES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), supportive services described in subsection (a) may include any of the activities described in section 321(a).

“(2) PRIORITY.—The Assistant Secretary, in making grants under this section, shall give priority to organizations that will use the grant funds for supportive services described in subsection (a) that are for in-home assistance, transportation, information and referral, case management, health and wellness programs, legal services, family caregiver support services, and other services that directly support the independence of the older individuals served.

“(3) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed or interpreted to prohibit the provision of supportive services under part A or B.”.

TITLE VI—MODERNIZING ALLOTMENTS FOR VULNERABLE ELDER RIGHTS PROTECTION ACTIVITIES AND OTHER PROGRAMS

SEC. 601. REAUTHORIZATION; VULNERABLE ELDER RIGHTS PROTECTION ACTIVITIES.

Section 702 (42 U.S.C. 3058a) is amended by striking subsections (a) and (b) and inserting the following:

“(a) OMBUDSMAN PROGRAM.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out chapter 2, \$18,066,950 for fiscal year 2020, \$19,150,967 for fiscal year 2021, \$20,300,025 for fiscal year 2022, \$21,518,027 for fiscal year 2023, and \$22,809,108 for fiscal year 2024.

“(b) OTHER PROGRAMS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out chapters 3 and 4, \$5,107,110 for fiscal year 2020, \$5,413,537 for fiscal year 2021, \$5,738,349 for fiscal year 2022, \$6,082,650 for fiscal year 2023, and \$6,447,609 for fiscal year 2024.”.

SEC. 602. VOLUNTEER STATE LONG-TERM CARE OMBUDSMAN REPRESENTATIVES.

Section 712(a)(5) (42 U.S.C. 3058g(a)(5)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(E) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION FOR VOLUNTEER OMBUDSMAN REPRESENTATIVES.—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed as prohibiting the program from providing and financially supporting recognition for an individual designated under subparagraph (A) as a volunteer to represent the Ombudsman program, or from reimbursing or otherwise providing financial support to such an individual for any costs, such as transportation costs, incurred by the individual in serving as such volunteer.”.

SEC. 603. PREVENTION OF ELDER ABUSE, NEGLECT, AND EXPLOITATION.

Section 721(b)(12) (42 U.S.C. 3058i(b)(12)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (C), by inserting “community outreach and education,” after “technical assistance.”; and

(2) in subparagraph (F)—

(A) by striking “studying” and inserting “implementing”; and

(B) by inserting “, programs, and materials” after “practices”.

SEC. 604. PRINCIPLES FOR PERSON-DIRECTED SERVICES AND SUPPORTS DURING SERIOUS ILLNESS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term “Administrator” means the Administrator of the Administration for Community Living.

(2) COVERED AGENCY.—The term “covered agency” means—

(A) a State agency or area agency on aging; and

(B) a Federal agency other than the Department of Health and Human Services, and a unit of that Department other than the Administration on Aging, that the Assistant Secretary determines performs functions for which the principles are relevant, and the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services.

(3) **PRINCIPLES.**—The term “principles” means the Principles for Person-directed Services and Supports during Serious Illness, issued by the Administration for Community Living on September 1, 2017, or an updated set of such Principles.

(4) **STATE AGENCY.**—The term “State agency” has the meaning given the term in section 102 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3002).

(b) **DISSEMINATION.**—The Administrator shall disseminate the principles to appropriate stakeholders within the aging network, as determined by the Assistant Secretary, and to covered agencies. The covered agencies may use the principles in setting priorities for service delivery and care plans in programs carried out by the agencies.

(c) **FEEDBACK.**—The Administrator shall solicit, on an ongoing basis, feedback on the principles from covered agencies, experts in the fields of aging and dementia, and stakeholders who provide or receive disability services.

(d) **REPORT.**—Not less often than once, but not more often than annually, during the 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall prepare and submit to Congress a report describing the feedback received under subsection (c) and indicating if any changes or updates are needed to the principles.

SEC. 605. EXTENSION OF THE SUPPORTING GRANDPARENTS RAISING GRANDCHILDREN ACT.

Section 3(f) of the Supporting Grandparents Raising Grandchildren Act (Public Law 115-196) is amended by striking “3” and inserting “4”.

SEC. 606. BEST PRACTICES FOR HOME AND COMMUNITY-BASED OMBUDSMEN.

Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Assistant Secretary shall issue a report updating the best practices for home and community-based ombudsmen that were included in the report entitled “Best Practices for Home and Community-Based Ombudsmen”, issued by the National Direct Service Workforce Resource Center of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services and prepared by the Research and Training Center at the University of Minnesota and The Lewin Group (January 2013).

SEC. 607. SENIOR HOME MODIFICATION ASSISTANCE INITIATIVE.

Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study and issue a report that includes—

(1) an inventory of Federal programs, administered by the Department of Health and Human Services, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, or any other Federal agency or department determined appropriate by the Comptroller General, that support evidence-based falls prevention, home assessments, and home modifications for older individuals and individuals with disabilities;

(2) statistical data, for recent fiscal years, on the number of older individuals and individuals with disabilities served by each Federal program described in paragraph (1) and the approximate amount of Federal funding invested in each such program;

(3) a demographic analysis of individuals served by each such program for recent fiscal years;

(4) an analysis of duplication and gaps in populations supported by the Federal programs described in paragraph (1);

(5) what is known about the impact of the Federal programs described in paragraph (1) on health status and health outcomes in populations supported by such programs;

(6) a review of Federal efforts to coordinate Federal programs existing prior to the date of enactment of this Act that support evidence-based falls prevention, home assessments, and home modifications for older individuals and individuals with disabilities and any consider-

ations for improving coordination, which may include an indication of the Federal agency or department that is best suited to coordinate such Federal programs; and

(7) information on the extent to which consumer-friendly resources, such as a brochure, are available through the National Eldercare Locator Service established under section 202(a)(21) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3012(a)(21)), are accessible to all area agencies on aging, and contain information on evidence-based falls prevention, home assessments, and home modifications for older individuals attempting to live independently and safely in their homes and for the caregivers of such individuals.

TITLE VII—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 701. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.

The Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3001 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 102(37)(A) (42 U.S.C. 3002(37)(A)), by striking “paragraph (5)” and inserting “paragraph (26)”;

(2) in section 202(a)(23) (42 U.S.C. 3012(a)(23)), by striking “sections 307(a)(18) and 731(b)(2)” and inserting “sections 307(a)(13) and 731”;

(3) in section 202(e)(1)(A) (42 U.S.C. 3012(e)(1)(A)), by moving the left margin of clause (i) 2 ems to the left;

(4) in sections 203(c)(7) (42 U.S.C. 3013(c)(7)), 207(b)(2)(B) (42 U.S.C. 3018(b)(2)(B)), and 215(i) (42 U.S.C. 3020e-1(i)), by striking “Committee on Education and the Workforce” each place it appears and inserting “Committee on Education and Labor”;

(5) in section 207(b)(3)(A) (42 U.S.C. 3018(b)(3)(A)), by striking “Administrator of the Health Care Finance Administration” and inserting “Administrator of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services”;

(6) in section 304(a)(3)(C) (42 U.S.C. 3024(a)(3)(C)), by striking “term” and all that follows through “does” and inserting “term ‘State’ does”;

(7) in section 304(d)(1)(B), by striking “(excluding)” and all that follows through “303(a)(3)”;

(8) in section 306(a) (42 U.S.C. 3026(a))—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting “the number of older individuals at risk for institutional placement residing in such area,” before “and the number of older individuals who are Indians”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)(B), by striking “who are victims of” and inserting “with”;

(9) in section 339(2)(A)(ii)(I) (42 U.S.C. 3030g-21(2)(A)(ii)(I)), by striking “Institute of Medicine of the National Academy of Sciences” and inserting “National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine”;

(10) in section 611 (42 U.S.C. 3057b), by striking “(a)”;

(11) in section 614(c)(4) (42 U.S.C. 3057e(c)(4)), by striking “(a)(12)” and inserting “(a)(11)”;

and

(12) in section 721(i) (42 U.S.C. 3058i(i)), by striking “section 206(g)” and inserting “section 206(h)”.

Ms. BONAMICI (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

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

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOOR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the

House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

CELEBRATING SCORING SENSATION RAKIYAH SELLERS

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

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate a scoring sensation in my district, Rakiyah Sellers. The senior guard at College of Saint Elizabeth scored her 1,000th career point in February.

She began her basketball career at the Ivy Hill Elementary School in Newark, New Jersey. From there, she continued to shine as a standout player for the Lady Jaguars of Newark's Arts High School.

Her scoring milestone came in a Colonial States Athletic Conference semifinal. Her team, College of Saint Elizabeth, beat Notre Dame of Maryland University 76-51.

In the conference final, Rakiyah had 4 points, 2 assists, 2 blocks, and 3 steals. Unfortunately, her Eagles of Saint Elizabeth lost to the Keystone Giants 72-61, but that does not dim her accomplishment. She is a shining star of Newark, and I am proud to highlight her today.

HONORING LIFE OF DR. DAVID L. RICE

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

Mr. BAIRD. Madam Speaker, today, I rise to celebrate and honor the life of Dr. David L. Rice.

Dr. Rice was the founding and first president of the University of Southern Indiana, where he worked from 1967 until his retirement in 1994.

Before his time at the University of Southern Indiana, Dr. Rice earned a bachelor of science in agriculture and a master of science and a doctor of philosophy in education, all from Purdue University.

While studying at Purdue, he met his wife, Betty J. Fordice, and the two were shortly wedded to one another. The following year of their marriage, Dr. Rice answered the call for his country and served in the United States Army infantry in Korea. After serving in the military, Dr. Rice returned to Indiana, where he taught public school while pursuing his advanced degrees at Purdue.

In 1967, Dr. Rice was appointed to lead the Evansville campus of Indiana State University. By 1985, under his leadership, the campus became its own separate university, the University of Southern Indiana.

During his tenure, the University of Southern Indiana grew in enrollment

from 992 students to 7,443, expanded the curriculum from 2-year degree programs to a comprehensive range of baccalaureate and master's degree programs. He did such an exemplary job, they honored him by naming the library after him.

Dr. Rice was also very dedicated to bettering his community. He was a member of countless groups and organizations, such as being on the board of the Evansville Museum of Arts, History and Science, and starting an organization called Leadership Everyone. The group looks to develop leaders in the community who are committed to utilizing inclusion and creativity in order to bring positive change.

Dr. Rice's legacy of service and achieving excellence will live on through all the lives he impacted and through the David L. Rice and Betty Fordice Rice Presidential Scholarship.

Most importantly, his memory will live on through his family. Dr. Rice is survived by his wife of 69 years, Betty "Janey" Fordice Rice, and their two children, along with six grandchildren.

**NOW IS TIME TO ACT ON
CORONAVIRUS**

(Mr. KILMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILMER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to share my sympathies for lives lost due to the coronavirus and to offer my gratitude to the first responders, healthcare professionals, and others working to respond to this public health emergency.

Now is the time for action.

Last week, Congress approved \$8.3 billion in funding to ensure the Federal Government steps up to the scale and seriousness of this growing crisis: public health funding, support to State and local health agencies, investments in R&D for vaccines, and a measure I led to help our small businesses that are already feeling the impact.

This week, the Federal Government should go further to help workers and families across the country. I am proud the House will be moving to ensure paid sick days and economic assistance for impacted workers, to increase capacity of the medical system, to protect first responders, to make testing more widespread and free, and to ensure access to food for the most vulnerable Americans.

There is no time to waste. The House should act now to ensure the safety and security of the American people.

**RECOGNIZING ACHIEVEMENTS OF
HAROLD AGNEW**

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

Mr. BURCHETT. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize the achievements of Harold Agnew, from Knoxville, Tennessee.

At 91 years young, Harold continues to be active in our community through his job as a barber and a gospel musician.

Harold was raised on a farm in South Carolina but came to call Knoxville home in his adult years. For 61 years, Harold has been a barber and still works 6 days a week at Gam's Barber-shop in Mechanicsville.

Anyone who has had their hair cut by Harold will notice something unique about him. He is a gifted singer who sings gospel tunes as he works. He is a member of the group known as Brother Agnew and the Angel Voices, which released their latest album called "Serving the Lord" in November 2019.

At 91 years old, Harold has a cheerful personality and optimistic attitude. He continues to live his life to the fullest, with no intention of taking a step back from his day job.

One of the lyrics from his recent songs is, "but sometimes a nobody is your somebody." Harold believes everyone matters, regardless of who you are. That is a message we can all believe in.

Congratulations, Harold, on all your success. Keep being an outstanding member of our great community.

HONORING PETE TAYLOR, CENTRAL VIRGINIAN OF THE WEEK

(Ms. SPANBERGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SPANBERGER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the commitment, selflessness, and advocacy of Peyton "Pete" Taylor, the owner of a community pharmacy in our district and our Central Virginian of the Week.

Mr. TAYLOR graduated from pharmacy school in 1979. After graduating, he began operating Goochland Pharmacy to serve our community and provide patients with healthcare services tailored to their needs.

Despite the evolving pharmaceutical landscape over the past decades, Mr. TAYLOR remains committed to providing personalized service to those in his community. His deep concern for the rising costs of prescription drugs has made him a vocal advocate for the needs of his customers in the Goochland community.

Mr. TAYLOR's knowledge of the challenges facing small business pharmacies has been a vital resource to my team and me, and I am grateful for his thoughtful engagement.

Mr. TAYLOR truly has the best interests of his community at heart, and I thank him for his 40 years of dedicated service to Goochland and the greater Seventh District.

**RECOGNIZING ENTREPRENEUR
ANGIE RUFF**

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

Mr. SPANO. Madam Speaker, today, I rise to recognize Women's History Month, a time to highlight the many often-overlooked female contributions to our national history.

Great women have undoubtedly helped make America great. From the classroom to the boardroom, from Capitol Hill to outer space, their impact is undeniable.

Now, across our land, women-owned businesses are thriving in our booming economy above all others. Over the past 5 years, these businesses have grown by 21 percent, compared to 9 percent across all other sectors.

An example of this entrepreneurial spirit is seen in Lakeland, Florida's own Angie Ruff. Mrs. Ruff opened a dry food manufacturing business in 2018. Through her dedication and passion for creating good local jobs, her warehouse has since tripled in size, and her head count quadrupled. The future for her and other entrepreneurs like her looks bright.

It is because of individuals like Angie Ruff, who are making history, that I am proud to represent Florida's 15th District on the House Small Business Committee, and it is because of dedicated women like her that we can proudly say: America is back and open for business.

HONORING SEEING EYE DOGS

(Ms. SHERRILL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SHERRILL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor The Seeing Eye and Seeing Eye dogs for being named the State dog of New Jersey.

Seeing Eye dogs are New Jersey's cutest export. But that alone does not capture the inspiring and important work behind an organization that has partnered more than 17,000 service dogs in North America.

The Seeing Eye is the world's oldest guide dog school, dedicated to enhancing the independence, dignity, and self-confidence of people who are blind.

Headquartered in Morristown, they breed, raise, and train service dogs, and work with blind individuals to handle and care for their dogs.

They conduct research on canine health and development, and they helped to lead the passage of the Americans with Disabilities Act.

I have seen the care the organization puts into pairing each individual with the right dog, fundamentally transforming their owners' lives.

I would like to thank The Seeing Eye for 91 years of leadership and State Senator Tony Bucco and the late Senator Anthony M. Bucco for their work to make the Seeing Eye dog New Jersey's State dog.

**HONORING EAGLE SCOUT THOMAS
SCOTT JEFFERSON**

(Mr. VAN DREW asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VAN DREW. Madam Speaker, this past Saturday, I was proud to attend the Eagle Scout Court of Honor for Thomas Scott Jefferson in Whitesboro, south Jersey. TJ is a member of Whitesboro Troop 104.

TJ not only was an exemplary student, maintaining a 4.0 GPA throughout high school, but he was also a committed volunteer at CCWI, a homework club, among other after-school activities.

He is currently studying classical performance voice at William Paterson University. He has an avid love for the arts, performing and starring in numerous plays, operas, and choirs.

TJ has become recognized for his singing voice, and he has continued to perform not only across the region but even training on Broadway in New York City.

We are so proud of you, TJ. I look forward to big things from you. I am confident you will live up to the name "Thomas Jefferson."

Congratulations to you and to your family. Some people look to sports or movie stars or, heaven forbid, politicians as role models. But it is individuals like you that inspire me.

You are one of my heroes. I know your future is bright, and may God bless you.

□ 1800

THE NEED FOR PAID SICK LEAVE

(Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. Madam Speaker, last night, I was so pleased to hold a telephone townhall with my colleague, Representative CHRIS PAPPAS, New Hampshire public health officials, and over 10,000 Granite Staters to provide an update on the impact of the coronavirus.

I continue to hear from constituents who are concerned, and a recurring theme for many is a lack of access to paid sick leave, which complicates our ability to address this public health crisis.

When faced with an illness or medical issue, many Americans face a challenging decision to put their job and their income at risk or risk their own health and the health of their colleagues and their community.

I am proud to support ROSA DELAURO's legislation to expand access to paid sick leave so that workers are able to follow the directives of public health officials and stay home from work when they are feeling ill.

As Congress continues to address policies to protect the American people against the spread of the coronavirus, I urge consideration of this important bill.

MATERNAL HEALTH CRISIS

(Ms. SCANLON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the historic bipartisan legislative package introduced this week to address the United States' urgent maternal health crisis. I am referring to the Black Maternal Health Momnibus.

Each year, 700 women in our country die from pregnancy complications, but 3 in 5 of those deaths could be prevented.

The United States' maternal mortality rate is exponentially higher than that of any other developed country, and Black women are three times more likely to die from pregnancy-related complications than White women, a glaring disparity that we cannot ignore.

In my community, organizations like The Foundation for Delaware County and the Maternity Care Coalition have stepped up to address this crisis, but we must do more.

I am proud to join Congresswomen LAUREN UNDERWOOD and ALMA ADAMS, Senator KAMALA HARRIS, and other congressional leaders in introducing the Black Maternal Health Momnibus.

The momnibus provides a comprehensive approach to maternal health, and particularly Black maternal health, by funding community-based organizations, investing in social determinants that influence maternal health outcomes, and growing and diversifying the prenatal workforce.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation for all our families.

CHINA AWARENESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. SCANLON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. YOHO. Madam Speaker, what I would like to do for the next few minutes is talk about an awareness campaign, and that is to make people aware of China and what China is doing.

We all know about China, a big country, wealthy country, a country that has come out of poverty and has become an industrial powerhouse. They have become a world power. Yet a lot of people don't understand what China really is doing.

When one really studies the history of China and sees where they are going, it is pretty remarkable that many of our countries around the world and our companies around the world do business with China.

The Communist Party took over in 1949, and that is when Mao Zedong came to power. He laid out a vision that I think any world leader would be

proud of. He laid out a 100-year plan. In fact, they call it the 100-year marathon.

We have seen a remarkable advancement of China, but, unfortunately, it was at the expense of many along the roadways.

We look at what they have done; and their goal, if you listen to what Xi Jinping has said when he came to power, was he wanted to remove any Western influence from China.

This was not too long after Tiananmen Square, where people in China were promoting liberties and democracies, and then the Tiananmen Square massacre happened where thousands of people were run over by tanks in the streets as the world watched. Yet China has taken that history and swept it under the rug and pretends it didn't happen. But we know. We have seen the videos.

Since that time, Xi Jinping has come out with a very strong statement. In fact, in 2017, in the Sixteenth Chinese Communist Party Congress, he made a statement, and it is a warning, and it should be a wake-up call for all people who are buying products from China.

In that statement, he said: The era of China has arrived. No longer will China be made to swallow their interests around the world. It is time for China to take the world center stage.

As we looked into that—and we have talked to people from Hong Kong and from China—their intent is very real, it is very true, and it is very out front. They are not trying to hide anything. Their goal is to be a world dominant power, or the world dominant power.

What we are seeing today in the world is a tectonic shift in world powers that we haven't seen since World War II. China has made very clear what their intent is.

Then they have marched on a campaign since 1949. Deng Xiaoping, in the eighties, said that it could not compete with American or Japanese technology and manufacturing, but what they could do is they could corner the market on rare earth metals.

As China came into the modern world, America and other countries helped China in technology, science, research, in advancement of weaponry, thinking that China would come along and become more Western democracy in their thinking. That is the furthest from the truth.

As China moved on, Deng Xiaoping's vision came to realization. They talked about cornering the market on rare earth metals. Well, today, they control virtually 100 percent of the rare earth metals that are needed in our electronics, in our cell phones, in our missile guidance systems and our satellites.

China has gone on to corner the market in the APIs in our pharmaceuticals. The APIs are the active pharmaceutical ingredients. They control approximately 85 to 90 percent of that. They control the majority of the minerals and vitamins that go into our livestock feed.

So their intent is very clear, yet they hide behind policies that favor China.

In the WTO, when they became a member of that in the nineties, they entered with a developing nation status. Today, they are the second largest economy in the world. They are building five aircraft carriers. They have got a space program. They have expanded around the world through their One Belt, One Road initiative. Yet, today, in the WTO, they claim developing nation status.

It is time that we let everybody know these things and wake up the American people and our manufacturers. China has risen, yet it has been at the expense of other nations. It is been through coercion, intimidation, not honoring contracts, and not honoring laws that are world norms.

A good example of that is what is going on in the South China Sea. They have reclaimed landmasses, and they went ahead and built facilities on these to the point where they have military installations, runway strips, military barracks, offensive and defensive weapons on there, military radar systems. Xi Jinping, when he was here visiting President Obama in 2015, said they have no intention of militarizing those structures; yet, today, they are militarized.

China has encroached on the ASEAN nations in the East China Sea, in the South China Sea, and they have gone into the exclusive economic zones in those areas, not honoring the world norms or the laws of the sea. In fact, the Philippines took them to court.

At the court arbitration, China lost the case. They said they had no claims to the nine-dash lines that China claims that the Philippines challenged them on. The Philippines won, yet China ignored that ruling and kept doing the dredging of the landmasses, destroying thousands of acres of coral reefs and laying claim to that area.

China has used their heavy hands with our corporations when somebody does something unfavorable to what China wants. An example is the Marriott Hotel employee who had mentioned something favorable about Taiwan. That person got fired.

We have seen that over and over again with different industries. Just recently, the manager of the Houston Rockets tweeted in favor of the protestors in Hong Kong to stay strong for liberties and freedoms, and we all know what China did. The NBA backed down to placate China. We have seen this with corporation after corporation. We have seen Nike do this. We have seen other corporations do this.

I think today, in the modern world today and what we are going through with the coronavirus—another gift from China—is the supply chain that they control of so many products that the world is dependent on, and I think this is a wake-up call that we need to remove manufacturing from China. We can't do it as a government, but our manufacturers can.

We have drafted a policy. It is called "Manufacture the ABC Method," and that is manufacturing anywhere but China.

When we make a product in China, China benefits from it. China introduces their Chinese Communist Party members within their corporation. Many times, our corporations have to give up their intellectual property. So China benefits from this by the theft of that property plus the production of that property. They counterfeit so many of our manufacturers' products, and our manufacturers go out of business.

We have met with many manufacturers that went over there initially for cheaper labor. Within 5 years, China has copied that product. That product is competing against the original manufacturer. It is being sold cheaper, and it is of an inferior quality, so it ruins the reputation of the manufacturer and they wind up going out of business. Then China just keeps producing. We see it over and over again, that they keep doing that.

We see constant abuses of human rights that we have seen over and over again, and these have been reported in the news. So many times we stand up for human rights around the world, and if we really, truly believe that as a nation, we believe in those values of liberty and freedom, that all people are created equal, that they have the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, they have the right of due process, they have the right to a court of law, if we believe in those things, we have to look at our trade policies.

Why are we trading with a country that blatantly ignores those?

I think I want to just pivot to Hong Kong.

I think everybody in the world agrees that Hong Kong is a province of China. In 1997, Great Britain and China came to an agreement that they would allow Hong Kong to go back to China over a 50-year process, and that was going to be from 1997 to 2047.

Hong Kong had the ability and the guarantee that they would be a semi-autonomous region, a portion of China, that they would have an independent judiciary system, they would have their own election process.

Yet 22 years into that process, we see the heavy hand of Xi Jinping and the heavy hand of the Chinese Communist Party. 22 years into that agreement, Xi Jinping came out publicly and said, as far as he was concerned, that agreement is null and void.

We saw the extradition bill that was brought up by their chief executive officer, Carrie Lam, and we know that she didn't bring that up by herself. That was at the direction of Beijing.

What that law did is it was robbing liberty and freedom from the people of Hong Kong. And it is sad, because the people of Hong Kong have always known liberty and freedom in today's modern world. But, unfortunately, the people of China—Xi Jinping and the

Chinese Communist Party—they, unfortunately, have never experienced liberty and freedom because they have lived under a communist, repressive regime that we have seen only grow stronger.

We did a floor speech down here on Tiananmen Square on the anniversary last summer, and shortly after that, within weeks, there were the protests in Hong Kong about the extradition bill.

□ 1815

And when you have 2 million people coming out in the streets in a province of China that has less than 8 million people, you have got a quarter of your population, and it was young people, it was old people, it was educated people, it was business people, mothers, fathers, children, and they are all protesting against the heavy-hand of China, because what they saw was freedom and liberty being taken away from them.

If that was an isolated case, that would be one thing, but what we have seen with China is the intimidation, the erasing of cultures, as they have done with the Tibetans, as they have tried to do with other ethnic minorities in their country, whether it is the Uighurs, the East Turkistan region, the Kyrgyz. And we see this over and over again, yet they make no apologies for it.

China is One Belt One Road. Or the Belt and Road Initiative is often referred to as One Belt One Road, and it goes one way, and that goes to the Chinese Communist Party.

They do predatory lending practices that put other countries in debt where they can't pay it back, and China winds up taking strategic ports. They have strategically done this around the world. They are in the Western Hemisphere and they are marching on.

The purpose of this Special Order tonight is to get people to pay attention to what China is doing. Who are we going to do business with in the future?

We have got a country that their goal is to take over the world. Xi Jinping says, and their philosophy is, you cannot have two suns in the sky at the same time, meaning one has to come down; and in their philosophy that would be us. Again, those are very confrontational points of view that they are pursuing, and they are pursuing them rapidly.

We have seen the intimidation of corporations with them. We have seen the intimidation of China and their heavy-hand with other countries.

The Czech Republic was going to have their Speaker of the House go to Taiwan to do some business there. China told them if they went there, the Czech Republic, their auto company, could no longer do business in China.

We have seen them do this with Mercedes Benz. If they don't buy Chinese batteries, they can no longer market in China, even though the majority of the Mercedes Benz Corporation is controlled by a Chinese individual.

We have seen the race for the 5G phone network with Huawei, with ZTE, in 2012, in this country. In this body here, in the House Intelligence Committee and the Senate Intelligence Committee, both ZTE and Huawei, in 2012, were deemed a national security risk. Yet, they keep going on and claim to be private enterprises. Yet, we know that the Chinese Communist Party and Government have invested heavily in those companies.

And what they are doing is, they are using their technology that will be able to be invaded through the backdoor by the Chinese Communist Party to be able to spy on people. Today, China has the most CCT cameras, closed-circuit television cameras, to where today in modern China they are using these television cameras to grade their citizens. They have good citizen scores. If you don't do what the Chinese Communist Party tells you, you can't travel, you can't bank, you can't go to the restaurants.

It is 1984, George Orwell's story is happening right now.

And what they are doing is they are doing that to suppress people. They have offered that technology around the world. They are using it in Hong Kong. They have offered that to Maduro in Venezuela to control his people. The Iranian ayatollahs want to use that technology. Vladimir Putin wants to use it.

And what we are finding is any authoritarian or despotic government wants that technology so that they can control their citizens. If you look in the Xinjiang region, which is East Turkistan. East Turkistan has been an Asian area of China for over 100 years. Yet, when the Communist Party came in they took it over, recently they renamed it Xinjiang, which means New Territory. And I bring that up because it is home to a Muslim population, the Uighurs, the Kyrgyzstans, the Kyrgyz, that are being suppressed by China.

I think we have all heard of the concentration camps that are going up all over China. We have done hearings—I sit on the Foreign Affairs Committee, I chaired the Asia Pacific Subcommittee last year, the ranking member this year, and we have had hearing after hearing on the human rights suppression, just the terrible things that they are doing over there.

When we looked into it, we have enough reports to feel this is true. What they are doing is, China has interned over a million Uighurs, and other ethnic groups, the Kyrgyz, the Turkistans, they have put them into these so-called re-education camps, but they are not re-education camps, they are concentration camps.

They have armed crematoriums around the country associated with these camps. And my question when we were in the Foreign Affairs Committee doing this hearing: Why do you need an armed crematorium? You know, the people that are supposed to be there are supposed to have passed away.

But we recently met with some people that—I found it very interesting. The people we met with were from East Turkistan. They had a Cossack person with them who had just won an award from Mike Pompeo and First Lady Melania Trump, for her courage, Women of Courage Award.

And what we found as we were listening to the story is, this family, an educated family, the husband was a schoolteacher, the wife was a practicing medical doctor. I mean, they were model citizens.

Well, the husband saw what was happening to his relatives, what was happening in the Xinjiang area, so he got passports, took himself and his kids out. The wife, the doctor, applied for a passport, China would not allow her to go. They felt she needed to go to the re-education camp. This is a lady that is a doctor that was practicing. China puts them in there, saying it was a threat to our country, she was a terrorist, they need to be re-educated.

What China is trying to do is erase other cultures. We have just seen this over and over again. And so when we spoke to these people that were in our office this week, I asked them, I said: Do you have reports of abuses? And they went on and on about the abuses. How they strap people in chairs, they electrocute them, they torture them, pull out their fingernails. The women were being raped, people were being—I can't say murdered, because they said they would disappear and never be seen again.

These are things—you know, it is not just hearsay. We have reports from all kinds of magazines, all kinds of researchers.

Here is one from Radio Free Asia, "China Secretly Transferring Uyghur Detainees from Xinjiang to Shaanxi, Gansu Province Prisons." And it goes on talking about ethnic Uighurs held in political "re-education camps." I am going to put quotes around that because they are not re-education camps, they are concentration camps, because the Chinese Communist Party is the highest of the hierarchy, there can be nothing higher than that. And if you have a religion, and you have a deity above that, that puts the Chinese Communist Party and people like Xi Jinping in fear because they don't know how to control free thought. These people are being sent to prisons in those provinces.

"China to address an overflow in overcrowded camps, where up to 1.1 million Uyghurs and other Muslim ethnic minorities accused of harboring strong religious views and politically incorrect ideas have been held since April of 2017." This is something that has been going on not just 3 years, but longer than that, but it is coming to light.

We have asked their ambassadors, have they had the Western Press in there, free and open presses? And they said: Oh, no, there is no need. These aren't going on. But we know they are going on. This is just one report.

I have another one here, Madam Speaker, information concerning China killing prisoners to harvest organs. This is something we have heard over and over again. We have had hearings on this. This is a multi-billion-dollar industry in China. It happens to anybody that doesn't agree with the Communist Party. They get picked up, they get imprisoned. Health checks are done. In fact, this person that was in our office is a medical doctor, she would do the health checks on these young Muslim men, and they would get a red check if they were healthy. And in the darkness of night, they would disappear, never to be seen again.

The China Tribunal, which was a tribunal put together to look into this, has published its final judgment. "The China Tribunal concluded that forced organ harvesting has been committed for years throughout China on a significant scale, and the tribunal has had no evidence that the significant infrastructure associated with China's transplantation industry has been dismantled and absent a satisfactory explanation as to the source of readily available organs concludes that forced organ harvesting continues till today."

I don't know how a civilized world can tolerate such atrocities. And when I see the armed crematoriums or the Uighurs being taken from their homes, forced from their homes, forced into a concentration camp, and then being rented out or sold as chattel to manufacturers, and this is well-documented, I don't know how we can tolerate that or how we can look at our trade policies to do those kind of deals with a country that works like that.

If they treat their own people that way, how do we expect they are going to treat any of us?

We have talked about Tibet. We have talked about Xinjiang, East Turkistan, the purging of individuals, the social credit scores, the coercion and intimidations.

I haven't touched on the theft of intellectual property. There is over \$600 billion of intellectual property theft that goes on and erodes economies all over the world.

I want to read an article here just briefly. "China Compels Uighurs to Work in Shoe Factory That Supplies Nike." And I don't bring Nike's name out to put a ding on Nike. It says: "The workers in standard-issue blue jackets stitch and glue and press together about 8 million pairs of Nikes each year at the Qingdao Taekwang Shoes Company, a Nike supplier for more than 30 years and one of the American brand's largest factories.

"They churn out pair after pair of Shox, with their springy shock absorbers in the heels, and the signature Air Max, plus seven other lines of sport shoes.

"But hundreds of these workers did not choose to be here: They are ethnic Uighurs from China's western Xinjiang region"—which again means New Territory, they renamed from East

Turkistan—“sent here by local authorities in groups of 50 to toil far from home.

“After intense international criticism of the Communist Party’s campaign to forcibly assimilate the mostly Muslim Uighur minority by detaining more than a million people in re-education camps, party officials said last year that most have ‘graduated’”—graduated from a work camp.

And, again, if you talk to these people—I have talked to pharmacists, I have talked to lawyers, I have talked to engineers, I have talked to doctors, they didn’t need to be re-educated. What China wanted to do was intimidate them, and basically brainwash them from their habits of a religion, of practicing their religion, and become good model Chinese citizens that bow down to the Communist Party.

“But there is new evidence to show that the Chinese authorities are moving Uighurs into government-directed labor around the country as part of the central government’s ‘Xinjiang Aid’ initiative.

“For the party, this would help meet its poverty-alleviation goals”—and, again, this is a doctor. They are saying, we need to alleviate their poverty goals—“but also allow it to further control the Uighur population and break familial”—

The Uighur workers, they are afraid or unable to interact—the Uighur workers at these facilities are afraid or unable to interact with anyone in this town where they went to north of Qingdao, beyond the most superficial of transactions at the stalls or in the local stores where they go. They won’t talk to anybody.

□ 1830

They won’t talk to anybody. The people at these towns say: “Everyone knows the Uighurs did not come here on their own free will. They were brought here,” said one of the fruit sellers at her stall. “The Uighurs had to come because they didn’t have an option. The government sent them here,” another vendor told the reporters. They were sent forcibly.

The report that we read did not ask their names out of concern for their safety, so they could not discuss the issues.

Like I said, we met with Mrs. Sayragul Sauytbay, an ethnic Kazakh from East Turkistan that, today, is now called, as I said, Xinjiang. She is the one who shared this. She is a true freedom fighter.

As we move on and we look at what China is doing, they have controlled so much of the supply chain.

Then we see what happened with the coronavirus. The coronavirus came out. It started off in Hubei province in Wuhan. The epicenter was supposedly a fish market or a fresh market.

With my science background, if you have an epicenter, you want to do your forensics and study it from an epidemiological standpoint. China didn’t do that.

We had a hearing where we had two epidemiologists there. They did not do the proper epidemiological studies, yet they destroyed any evidence that was there.

Then the doctors that tried to report this wound up being put in prison, in jail. They came down with the virus, and then they died.

China has done this over and over again.

Then that virus spread around the world. This will be reported, I am sure, in history as the Chinese plague that they tried to hide and conceal like they did SARS and MERS.

As we look at this as a nation and we make trade agreements and we work with these countries around the world, we should look at whom we are trading with.

We have a standard that is known around the world. We have a rule of law honoring our contracts, and when we look to do business with people, we should do business with people we know, like, and trust, and I don’t think those apply to China.

When you see the heavy hand of what China is doing, I just think, as a nation, with our trade agreements and with our businesses going over there, we all need to relook at what we are doing. If they will treat Hong Kong that way with those students over there and then the threat of taking over Taiwan and their goal of taking over the world, I think that is something we all need to look at and say: Do you know what? We need to diversify.

That is why we are kind of proud to talk about the manufacturing policy, the ABC method, anywhere but China. Go to Vietnam. Go to Indonesia. Go to anywhere but a country that wants to take us over.

I want to close on two things here. One is we had the students of Hong Kong who led the protests. They came to our office and they brought me this plaque. It says: “Democracy Now. Stand With Hong Kong.” They brought this plaque up, and as I have been able to travel around the world and I have seen how other countries look at America and they look at the ideals and the principles of this country, that is what they want.

It made me think that America is bigger than a Presidency. It is bigger than a Republican or a Democratic Party. It is those ideals, and it is those ideals that these students in Hong Kong who brought us this plaque are willing to take a chance and protest the Chinese Communist Party. They burned their flag and held up the American flag because that represents liberties and freedoms.

Taiwan is a different subject. Taiwan has never been part of the People’s Republic of China, the Communist Party, nor will they ever be. They have their own borders. They have their own military, their own economy, their Western democracy, yet China wants to claim them as their own.

I think this is a wake-up call for China. If you have got a quarter of a population in a province who knows they are part of China, you can’t do that to Taiwan because, when you look at the agreement we have with Taiwan, we have an agreement to make sure they have the equipment to protect themselves in a defensive manner.

I want to end with what we started with. When we looked at the students from Hong Kong, it made me think. I think we have all seen pictures of grass. It is green, tender, new shoots. They are very tender. If we were to compare that with pavement, this is hard road. This is asphalt.

If I were to ask you which one is tougher, which one is stronger, I think we would all say the asphalt is; right? But if we say this is freedom and liberty and this is repression from communism, which one is more powerful, liberties and freedoms will break through that force that is trying to suppress them.

That is what is going on in the world, and that is why China will never succeed long-term in what they are doing. That is why the people of Xinjiang, the Uighurs, will win, because they have the strength of a blade of grass that can grow through the asphalt.

I think I shared that the other day. These are the people who are standing up strong through that suppression. These are the people who have been there.

My heart goes out to those people because I can look back at our country when it was formed. We were under the suppression of another power, and we decided that we weren’t going to live there because we are not designed that way as people.

Madam Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to be here, and I want people to think when they go to buy something and it says “Made in China,” find a different source. Buy it somewhere else. Encourage your manufacturers, your Nikes, your basketball teams to go somewhere else. Don’t go to a country that is doing virtually genocide today.

If we look back to World War II when Eisenhower went to Auschwitz and the concentration camps and they saw the death and destruction and he said, “Never again,” we as a nation have a responsibility to move everything that we can so that the Chinese Communist Party has to change their way.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

AND STILL I RISE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, and still I rise, and still I rise. And I rise as a very proud American, proud of my country, proud to be a part of

this great Nation. I am also proud to be a liberated Democrat, unbought, unbosser, speak truth to power, speak truth about power, a liberated Democrat. And I rise tonight with a very special message at this time in the history of our country.

We find ourselves now in a state of fear. Unfortunately, too much of what we have based our response on to the novel coronavirus has been fear, not facts. We should act on facts, not fear. My hope is that after I say a few words tonight, I will at least cause some persons to rethink some of what they have already concluded.

I am a person who believes that there is a philosophy, an adage, if you will, of live and let live. This is not my philosophy, live and let live. It simply says: You go your way and live your life; I will go my way and live my life.

If this philosophy prevailed, I would not be in the Congress of the United States of America because a good many people did not embrace live and let live. Dr. King did not embrace it.

A good many people embrace a philosophy that I now embrace, and that is live and help live. It is because of other people who made great sacrifices that I am able to stand here in the well of the Congress of the United States of America. It was a live and help live philosophy that made it possible for me to be here. There were persons who lived and some who died so that I would have this opportunity.

I can bring Schwerner, Goodman, and Chaney to your attention. Schwerner and Goodman were not African Americans, by the way. They lost their lives in the cause of freedom along with Goodman, who was an African American. They were trying to help somebody. That was a live and help live philosophy.

There was John Shillady in Austin, Texas, an NAACP fieldworker, who was beaten by a mob. He was trying to help Black people.

In a sense, there is a debt that I owe, and whenever I have the opportunity, I try to repay it. So tonight, with our country in this state of fear, I would like to ask some things of people and share some thoughts.

The first thing that I want to address is what we expect from others.

We now expect others who are sick to stay home. If you are sick and you think that you have a virus and you are concerned, we want you to stay home. Of course, see your physician, get an opinion from your physician, but if you are ill and you may be contagious, we believe that you should stay home.

That is what we are saying to people across the length and breadth of the country. We believe that this is a patriotic thing to do, to stay home. Do what you can from home. Work from home.

Well, that can work for a lot of people. It can work for Members of Congress because we will be paid if we work from home. We will be paid, and we will be appreciated for staying

home because we don't want to spread an illness from one person to another by being in the workplace. That works quite well for Members of Congress.

But what about the person who works for minimum wage? \$7.25 an hour is still the minimum wage, the Federal minimum wage in this country. A good many places pay more than \$7.25 an hour, but it is the Federal standard for the minimum wage.

\$7.25 an hour, that is not a lot of money for most of the people who work here, but to a good many people it is the means by which they maintain their dignity and keep food, clothing, and shelter for themselves and others.

A good many of them are not in jobs that will pay them if they stay home. They are being patriotic Americans. They are doing what we are asking, but they won't get paid. They have to make a choice: Do they stay home and do that which we deem to be prudent and necessary, or do they come to work so that they will be able to put food on the table, so that they will have the shelter necessary to protect them from the environment? Will they have the necessary clothing so that they may continue to traverse through the elements?

But even at \$7.25 an hour, there is another case to be made, because some workers make less than the minimum wage of \$7.25 an hour. These are the persons who work and they receive tips. They make \$2.13 an hour. We expect them to stay home if they are sick.

Many of them work in the food service industry. They will serve our food. We want them to stay home if they are ill because we don't want them to contaminate the food. But these persons who serve our food, \$2.13 an hour, patriotic Americans, if they stay home and they are not paid, they have a choice: Do they stay home or do they come to work ill?

I say to the employers: Please give consideration to your minimum wage workers, \$7.25 an hour. Perhaps it is \$15 an hour. Give some consideration to them. And especially those who are working for \$2.13 an hour. Give them some consideration. Help them through this time of crisis, because they are helping us through this time of crisis.

They are there for us by staying home. They are doing the patriotic thing. We should do the patriotic thing and give them some consideration.

I plan to support legislation, hopefully, that will emanate from this House that would give persons some amount of money.

□ 1845

I think that we are at a point in our history when people who are going to have to stay at home are going to have to be accorded some sort of emolument because we don't want them to come to work and contaminate others. We don't expect them to do that which we would deem to be unpatriotic, so we have to help them.

I heard a person this morning talk about \$1,000 for persons who need help or \$1,000 to persons in general, some amount. I am not sure what the exact amount should be, but I do know we have to give some consideration to persons who are working for minimum wages and especially persons who are working for \$2.13 an hour, for tips.

There are those who contend that if you are working for \$2.13 an hour, you will get a lot of money in those tips, and you will be able to do what some will say, that "I did." That is not me saying the "I," but I am now speaking the words of others. They will say: "I was able to work my way through college on tips." Well, good for you. A good many others are not able to do such. A good many others are barely getting by on \$2.13 an hour.

I talk to people when I eat at these various cafeterias, and I have spoken to people who work in cafeterias in Houston, Texas, who tell me that they have gone home and made not more than \$2.13 for each of the hours. They didn't get any tips. There are days when they get no tips.

I would hope that they would get an abundance of tips, but the truth is, there are days when they do not. And they deserve some help because they are doing what we are asking when they stay at home. So, if they stay at home and don't come to work, I would hope that we would give them some consideration.

Live and help live. That is the philosophy I embrace. That is the philosophy that will cause an employer to conclude that he or she, or the company, should help people who we are asking to stay at home.

Live and help live, not live and let live: "I am going to live my life. You stay at home. Sorry. Can't help you."

No, let's help those persons who have to stay at home because they are ill and are wage earners. Live and help live.

Live and help live is a philosophy that I think we should embrace when we speak of persons who are of different ethnicities. More specifically, now, I am going to talk about persons of Asian ancestry.

I am standing here tonight to speak up on behalf of persons of Asian ancestry, and I am going to speak on their behalf as it relates to the novel coronavirus because ugly things are happening to persons of Asian ancestry.

I am here because I want to live and help live. I want to help them through this time of crisis when they are having to experience xenophobia and nativism.

I have here some examples of what persons of Asian ancestry are experiencing, and I am here to live and help them live. I believe that somebody helped me to get where I am, and I have a debt that I owe, that I pray that I will be able to repay.

Tonight, I would call to everybody's attention a person in New York, a

woman on a subway who was attacked by persons who said that she was diseased. They used a word that I would not use—the b-word is what it is called in this forum tonight—because she had on a face mask.

People have assumed that this is beneficial. It may not be. Many scientists—the persons who are supposed to know, the persons who deal with these things, who have studied these things—are saying to us that the mask doesn't help people, in general. It does help the persons who are aiding and assisting us, perhaps the physicians and nurses.

Be that as it may, if a person chooses to wear the mask and happens to be of Asian ancestry, that person ought not be attacked, that person ought not be spoken to in harsh language.

People have a right in this country to wear the type of face gear that they choose. If they choose to wear a mask, so be it.

We ought to respect people and not assume things and say things about them because of their ethnicity, because of their ancestry.

Another example, a person who is of the Hmong ancestry was checking in at a hotel and was told that Asians are not welcome. That is not a live-and-help-live philosophy. That is a form of nativism and xenophobia that is invidious, that is harmful to our society and harmful to this person trying to check into a hotel.

I remember a time in this country when there were certain places that I could not check into simply because of the hue of my skin. I was not allowed. There were signs that said: "No coloreds allowed." Those were the polite signs. There were some that had words that I will not repeat.

But I remember this. And when I remember this, I relate to persons of Asian ancestry told that they can't come into a given business place simply because of who they are.

I am here because I believe in live and help live, and I want to help them through this time of crisis.

In California, a 16-year-old high school student was sent to the emergency room after being attacked by bullies who accused him of having the coronavirus simply because of his ethnicity.

I have been attacked in my life, chased because of my ethnicity. I reflect on this, and it causes me to understand the plight of this person.

I stand here tonight to speak up, to speak on behalf of people of Asian ancestry who are being assaulted, who are being accused, who are being denied simply because of who they are.

I have an indication that even just looking Asian has been enough to incite attackers, to hurl insults and accuse individuals of being disease carriers.

Friends, this is a time for us to band together and come together as a Nation. This is not a time for us to engage in this sort of phobia, this xeno-

phobia, this nativism. This is not the time.

This disease is not something that is related to any ethnicity. It is not related to any party. It doesn't assault or attack Republicans or Democrats because they happen to be of a certain party. It doesn't matter what your gender is.

This disease attacks you because you are a human being and because you have been exposed to it in such a way as to allow it to enter your body.

We ought to see each other now as people of one race, the human race. We ought to see each other as people who we should help live.

We should embrace the philosophy of live and help live. Help the minimum wage worker. Help those who are not as fortunate as we are. Help those who may not be of the same hue as you. Help those who have been accused and attacked. This is a time for us to send a message that we won't tolerate it.

I am here because I believe that Asian Americans, those of Asian ancestry, should not have to defend themselves by themselves.

I think that it is important for persons who are not of Asian ancestry to send a message that we stand with them, and we stand against the Islamophobia that might ensue, the homophobia, all the various invidious phobias that can ensue from persons deciding that they are going to attack people because they are different.

I have moved on from the Asian ancestry now to persons who are different. In this country, we ought not attack people simply because they are different.

I believe that the differences that we have can make a difference in the culture, and it makes us richer for having these various differences. They are good for the country.

Please, let us send a message that we will not tolerate persons being assaulted because of who they are, that we will not tolerate persons being denied the opportunity to have access to various places within our society that we ordinarily would have access to simply because we happen to have the bill of fare. If we can pay our way in, pay for the hotel room, then I think we ought to allow people to have access.

More important than all of these, I think that it is important for us to treat each other with dignity and respect simply because we are people of the same creator. That creator, I believe, expects us to treat each other the same, regardless of our hues, regardless of our various differences.

This is an opportunity for us to pull together. I believe that this is a great adversity, but I also believe that it provides us a great opportunity to come together and stand up for each other.

Let us live and let live, simply leave people to find their way as best they can.

Let's help people through life. I am here because somebody helped me, and I want to be there to help others.

I promise that I will do what I can to be of service to man, to humans, more specifically, to men and women in this society.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

PUTTING ECONOMIC REPORTS IN CONTEXT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Speaker, we try to come here every week to do sort of a combination of economic reports and what we believe is a solution to long-term debt.

Often, we sort of get a little, shall we say, technical, if not a bit geeky. But, tonight, I am going to try to do a little bit of that but also try to put it in context to where I think we are.

We in the Joint Economic Committee, and also even some of the staff from the Ways and Means Committee—and bless their souls for tolerating my questions. They have been very helpful, but there is still a lot of things we don't know. But I want to start off with encouragement.

About 20 minutes ago, I got off the phone with my father. My father is in his mid-eighties, still doing pretty darn well but still has some health issues.

How do you turn to a family member like that—he is blessed to live in Scottsdale, Arizona, which is just a beautiful, beautiful place—and say, "Father, for the next few weeks, you may want to not go to the different activities," which I know he loves, the art shows, the art walks, and all of these other things that are activities in our community.

For the next few weeks, because of the things we are learning about the coronavirus, the populations that appear to be most at risk are those with a series of health issues. Do you have heart issues? Do you have diabetes? Do you have lung issues? Particularly, are you in your seventies or, in my father's case, mid-eighties?

Sort of the moral outreach I am going to ask everyone to think about is my call to him: "Hey, we have family in the neighborhood. If we can convince you to maybe spend a little bit more time around the house and avoid crowds and some of your activities, we will be happy to make sure food and things are dropped off at the house. If you need your pharmaceuticals picked up, we will be happy to go out and do that. We will try to be good family and be supportive."

Why don't we take that same concept, as both Democrats and Republicans, and say to the VFW, the Legion, my Knights of Columbus club, or some of the other things in our community: Are you reaching out to the seniors in your community?

□ 1900

Are you reaching out to those who may have certain health issues?

If they are making the decision to follow what our county and State health departments are suggesting, what the CDC, HHS, and the others are suggesting, that, if you are in those more statistically vulnerable populations, you are going to stay home, avoid the crowds, those things, at least for a few weeks, what do we as a community do? What do those organizations do to reach out to their friends and their members and let them know they are loved and let them know we care, but also provide a little bit of that human contact, even if it is through the phone, even if it is through FaceTime.

We were having the conversation of putting my little daughter a little more so he could FaceTime and have that contact with his granddaughter, but also picking up the food, the pharmaceuticals, and other things so that we don't create a situation where we take a vulnerable population and make them isolated from everyone else; so just a little moment of kindness, a little moment of thought.

If it is our grandparents or the friend from over at the VFW and they happen to be in those age brackets, they have what they call morbidity, comorbidities—and I always mispronounce that, so forgive me—what do we as a community do to try to actually reach out and be supportive and be helpful?

These are the sorts of things that those of us who are Members of Congress go to, all these briefings. We hear all the statistics. We are moving money around. We are trying to get the manufacturing and testing of all these things where they need to go. And a lot of good things are happening.

We know there are a lot of really smart people going as fast as they can, but now is the moment also for a lot of us in our communities to reach out and say: Look, the experts are saying, at least for the next few weeks, maybe the best thing is, if you are in that defined vulnerable population, stay home.

How do we, as their friends and neighbors, make sure that they are not feeling locked away and isolated, that they are still loved and they are still part of our community? It is also our moral obligation to reach out and help our neighbors, bringing things to their doorstep.

So, actually, what I am calling for—that is not Republican or Democrat; it is actually being human—is that idea of let's make that happen.

This evening I am going to do a telephone townhall in our district. That is actually going to be one of the themes. We have already been on the phone reaching out to a number of the veterans service organizations because we know, in a lot of their organizations, their mean ages are much, much older.

So how do we get the younger veterans now to actually be that contact with the world for those older veterans who may be choosing to isolate for a little bit?

Madam Speaker, math is math. We see the data that so many who are young seem to be doing just great. Someone like myself, I am a fairly severe asthmatic. I worry a little bit. But we are washing our hands, and we are taking the basic precautions you would take during any severe flu season.

We actually now have a little timer in our office, and every couple of hours, we are washing the doorknobs and doing things like that. It is a little compulsive, but it is the right thing to do.

So I just ask all of us, don't be macabre, don't be looking down. This is just part of life. But let's treat it like adults. Let's respect the professionals and their talents and the information they are providing us and let's work through this. Let's do the right things. But also, let's not isolate those populations we are being told are vulnerable.

On one hand, we are saying: You really should stay out of crowds, stay out of these things for a few weeks. We have the moral obligation to make them know they are still loved and cared for.

All right. A couple of things I do want to go through because we are trying to get our head around what is happening economically.

The fact of the matter is we just don't know yet. We don't have enough inbound data. I can give you some great data where we were a week ago. Has that changed? I promise you it has changed. But how much?

The good news is we went into this March actually surprisingly economically healthy. Do you remember last Friday, the jobs report number?

Now, remember, that jobs report number is looking back over the last month and working out particularly over the last week and the hires. But when you are gaining over 273,000 new jobs, Madam Speaker, that is pretty amazing, particularly where we were in the cycle.

Forgive me for reaching back here. I hope I am not breaking a protocol, but I actually subscribe to an app called GDP Now. It is the Atlanta Fed's calculator.

On March 6—that is the last update—they were at 3.1 percent GDP for this quarter. That is wonderful.

Do I think we are going to end up there? Probably not. But it at least lets you know there was something really, really positive happening in the economy.

When you start seeing numbers like this where we were hitting 3.5 percent unemployment—and I am going to touch on that just because I am fascinated with labor force participation and what that means to economic growth, but also what it means to the numbers of people in our community who are choosing to come back into the labor force, come back to work.

These are people who quit. There are fancy economic terms of the marginally detached, but from a societal

standpoint and from an economic standpoint, when those who are not looking all of a sudden start popping up in the data as coming back into the labor force, these are wonderful things. We were clicking along pretty darn well.

When you start looking at this February jobs report, we, as all Americans, should have been really happy with the economic robustness and stability.

I am also going to show another board and demonstrate how we are also the engine that is basically saving the rest of the world economically. We are pulling the rest of the world along where, just a few years ago, 3 years ago, the rest of the world was actually moving up and they were sort of pulling us along. Now that is somewhat reversed.

You always have to put that in context, Madam Speaker, because it gives you a sense of how strong the last couple years have been economically, particularly for labor markets.

I have been behind this mike a dozen times showing the wage charts and the miracle that has really happened the last couple years for the working poor.

It is a certain societal cruelty we have had for the last couple decades of our brothers and sisters who didn't have particular skills or may not have finished high school, the really smart economists were functionally writing them off. They were going to be part of the permanent underclass.

In many ways, if you sort of step back, there is a level of cruelty in just taking any American and saying: You don't have certain things we think the economy is going to look for. We are writing you off.

One of the great miracles we have had in the last couple years is that population, that bottom 10 percent of income earners—we refer to them as the working poor because they often have very moderate to low to none in the way of skills—their wages have actually been going up the fastest, double the mean of everyone else.

So part of our theme is also growth is moral. You can see it in society in how many people who have had a pretty rough decade seem to have come back the last couple of years.

But now we are going to have to face the issues of what do the next couple months look like with the coronavirus, what sort of disruption, what do we do as a body to maximize economic stability, also be rational, and then get back to the pattern that actually was helping so many Americans start to have these opportunities.

Madam Speaker, hopefully, that doesn't become partisan. Hopefully, that is just math and smart people coming up with ways, because those policies actually affect people's lives. That is the decision whether you can buy that new vehicle or buy a house or some of these other opportunities out there.

This slide is one we have been working on as a concept. It is a little noisy,

and these are really hard types of charts to read and look at, but it is really important.

We had lots of smart people a couple years ago basically saying that, as we are getting older as a society, we are never getting back to those days of the mid-1960s and labor force participation. It is just not going to happen.

Then we started to break apart some of the numbers, and we found this really interesting thing out there: We have, functionally, millions of Americans who were not looking—they basically had quit in previous years—who suddenly are coming back into the labor force.

So this is a slide of the share of newly employed from outside the labor force. So these are folks we don't consider traditionally as, well, they are part of our unemployment statistics or they are part of the rolling—they are getting unemployment benefits, or they have been looking, or even outside the marginally attached population. These are, functionally, folks who were not even looking.

What is stunning is you can see the wild ride we have had. Post the 2008 recession, this population had just sort of detached. They were in the mid-fifties of looking at working, coming into the labor force. Today, this population is starting to approach the mid-seventies, and it has substantially happened in just the last couple of years.

I want to argue that is a combination of lots of complex things, and it is something we don't talk about enough. Because there has been wage growth, the value of their labor has gone up.

You may actually get some things that are uncomfortable to talk about, Madam Speaker, and the numbers are difficult, so it is still theoretical. Some things have happened with immigration that have also made their labor, possibly, more valuable.

The other thing also is that work has changed, where, if you or I went back 10 or 15 years ago for parts of this population, they are not picking up bags of concrete. Now their work has changed. Is that part of it?

We have these fancy economists who come in and walk through all these different reasons, and we are trying to get our head around it, but the one thing we know is that there is something good happening in our society.

How do we as policymakers, those of us on the more conservative side, our brothers and sisters who might be on the more liberal side, and some of the people in the middle who call themselves moderate, how do we actually come up with ways to keep these good things happening? How do you do that in a society right now where our politics are often so polarizing?

I want to argue we actually have a moral obligation to figure out things that are working, figure out what is making them work, and do more of it.

This is a slide I am just putting up because it rounds out a discussion we were having a couple of weeks ago about what is happening in the world.

If you see the blue, Madam Speaker, that is the G-7. That actually has the United States in it. If you look at the orange, that is actually the G-7 without the United States. So call it the G-6, I guess. The green is the United States.

If we go back to the numbers that were coming out in 2017, you see the rest of the world through economic growth was very similar to the United States. They were helping us; we were helping them. But you can also see the last couple years the United States' economic growth has dramatically surpassed the rest of the industrialized world, the big economies.

There is this push-pull concept in economic growth. In the last couple years, we are basically—if you look at the last two sections of the graph, you start to understand that we are the engine that functionally has been keeping much of the rest of the world afloat. You can also see the incredible spike in growth and the continued growth post-tax reform.

The fact of the matter is what we did in the U.S. tax reform and the economic growth that it brought did things for the entire world. It is in the charts. It is in the data.

The other thing I want to put up, and I try to put this up about once a month just because it is that continuing conversation that we often get lost in our rhetoric and we get a piece of rhetoric in our head, we get behind microphones, we say it over and over and then, later on, find out that the math actually doesn't match the rhetoric.

This is actually what we call tax receipts. Many of you will think of it as revenues, but the proper term from the IRS and those of us on the Ways and Means Committee is "receipts." These are revenues as they are booked into Treasury. It is just really, really important to get your head around this.

In 2017, '18, and '19, even though we are post-tax reform and we had lots of really smart people—Members of Congress and economists—who were saying that this chart was going to crash this way, it didn't. As a matter of fact, if you look at this chart, those are the highest receipts in U.S. history.

□ 1915

So I beg of us—at some point those folks who will spend their time attacking the tax reform—I understand it is an election year—attempt to tell the truth about the math. And the ultimate test is: Are we getting the revenues in or not?

Now, the mix of the revenues has changed. Corporate taxes are down. Individual taxes are way up, particularly payroll, because more Americans are working. But that was the idea. And it wasn't just a Republican idea. If you actually go back during the Obama years, President Obama's economic team actually recommended much of the same thing in corporate taxes.

The difference is, it happened over here, so, therefore, it must be vilified,

even though that is truly unfair. This has been an economic concept for years. We finally got it delivered, and it is working.

This is the chart that I will often get the most phone calls about, and it is getting a little dated. We need to update it. The chart is not adjusted with constant dollars. That means over the next 30 years—this is a 30-year chart—you would probably reduce the numbers by a third, and that just means adjusting the purchasing power of today's dollar for an inflated dollar in the future.

The chart is very, very simple, though. And it is one where I am trying to communicate the future debt—and it is overwhelming—that is coming is demographics. It is those of us who are baby boomers; we are getting older. We have earned benefits. We have earned Social Security. We have earned Medicare. We just have a small problem. We didn't set aside the actual cash.

So here is a simple thought experiment with this chart:

This is Social Security. This is Medicare. If we would pull those out, 30 years from now—actually now, it is like 28 years—we would have \$23 trillion in the bank. But if we roll Social Security and Medicare back in, Social Security and Medicare's shortfall is \$103 trillion at the end of that 30 years, meaning when you add these two together, you are functionally at an \$80 trillion debt.

And what is really hard for this body to talk about is saying we have made promises, we are going to have to find a way to keep them. So every week we try to come here and say, "there is a way to do that." But you have to be willing to engage in something that sometimes is disharmonious around here, and sometimes just a little complicated. Because let's face it, as a body, we have difficulty doing one major concept, and our argument is you need to do dozens of things, and we almost need to do all of them immediately.

And what is so frustrating and heart-breaking is almost all of these turn partisan. And the ones that are technology we will find a way to make partisan and they are all absolutely necessary to create the economic growth, to create the price disruption in healthcare. As you just saw, most of that \$80 trillion debt at the end of that 30 years is Medicare.

I use this slide over and over, but we are trying to make an argument. A tax code, a regulatory code, an immigration code that maximizes economic expansion, incentives to be in the labor force.

And think about that. We right now still have a problem with millennial males coming into the labor force. We have had a miracle in the last 20 months of millennial females coming back in. They are coming in like crazy. We still have a problem with millennial men.

How about people who are older? Can you design incentives in the Social Security, Medicare, and other benefits to stay or come back into the labor force with their talents?

The other one is: Are we willing to actually unleash technology? And these are the presentations I have enjoyed the most. Just last week, I was here on the floor showing things, technology-wise, that could crash the price of healthcare. We actually brought in a slide a couple of weeks ago saying there was a major success in being able to put in T-cells that grew pancreatic cells, and those pancreatic cells in a mouse looked like they were growing insulin.

Now, when you go from a mouse experiment to humans, it is a decade. But the previous slide, you saw the math for Medicare—and Medicare is the key driver of U.S. debt in the future—30 percent of Medicare's debt is just diabetes. As a body, let's make sure the resources, the talents, the mechanisms, the encouragement, all the things we can do to create those disruptions is not a cure for something like diabetes because it is good policy. It is the moral, ethical thing to do, and it is also an amazing change in U.S. debt if you just cured diabetes.

Now diabetes, it turns out, is complicated. There are autoimmune issues. There are lifestyle issues. There is 1 and 2. It is complicated. But that is the way we need to be thinking around here if we are going to have an impact.

Well, it turns out in that same discussion of technology, a couple of years ago, I became fascinated with the concept of a universal flu vaccine. And the Gates Foundation, I believe, has moved \$60 million there. I believe Congress, a couple of years ago, we started to move some lines of research money into that concept. Now, we are told it is complicated, but we may be a couple of years away from actually having a universal flu vaccine.

So think about the societal economic disruption we believe we are stepping into right now. Now, it is not going to last forever, but it will last for a little while. Just that technology of something like a universal flu vaccine may become the solution that this type of viral—this economic disruption, societal health disruption, never happens again.

My argument is, I think, fairly elegant. We need to do all these growth and cost and technology disruptions. And if we do them, I believe we can make an argument that the ability to keep promises—our promises for Social Security, our promises for Medicare—there is a path. It is just uncomfortable to talk about these things, because when you use the word “disruption,” that often means someone's business model, someone's current technology.

We have used the example dozens of time here on the floor: “How many of you went to Blockbuster Video last weekend?” Of course not. The technology changed. Now, you hit a button

at home and you stream your entertainment.

We need to make sure that those types of disruptions are now happening in environment and healthcare technology, and who knows what else. We also see some of them even now coming in energy generation.

So there is a path. We don't have to be dour as we think about the future of the United States. It is actually incredibly optimistic. But to make the optimism a reality, this body needs to stop being dysfunctional. We cannot spend another year of our lives like we did last year, functionally accomplishing nothing of value. We are better than that. We know there is a path. We actually know the math. Now, let's just get our act together.

OUR IMMIGRATION ISSUES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, I think one more time we have to address what I feel 10 years from today will be viewed as the most significant issue that our Congress has to deal with, and that is immigration.

Madam Speaker, I want to mention the issue one more time, because a couple of weeks ago, I again went to the Arizona border to see what is going on, and I have since talked to a leader of the union of the Border Patrol agents.

I say this is the most important issue because our immigrants are going to determine where America is or what America is like 10 or 20 years from now. Donald Trump has made a lot of progress on the border, but we have to remember all of this progress—or almost all of this progress—is solely caused by our President.

First of all, let's recount the progress. He has begun to build the wall. When I was down in Arizona, I saw 12 miles of the wall along the Arizona border. While it is possible to get over the wall, it is very difficult.

The wall is 30-feet high. It is very difficult, and people, I think, only in the best of physical shape can get 30 feet up. There is sometimes concertina wire at the top, which causes some people, at least in Nogales, to get stuck at the top, and it is very difficult to get back down. So that is some progress.

We also have made progress, and we have reached agreement with Mexico, saying “if you are coming here for asylum, you have to be held on the Mexican side of the border pending a hearing.” Not only does this cause people not to be able to come across immediately but discourages people from Central America or Africa or South America from coming here in the first place. Because prior to President Trump becoming President or reaching an agreement with the Mexican Government, people would come here, say they were seeking asylum, and they

would be placed somewhere in the United States and never show up at the hearing anyway. Therefore, this is the way we have many people who are going to wind up living in America.

And the third thing President Trump has done, is he has put in a public charge rule covering people coming here legally, saying, “we do not want you in this country if you are going to wind up taking advantage of our public benefits.” It is not too strict of a law. He allows people to stay for 1 or 2 months, if they are on food stamps during that period of time—but, obviously, given that we can pick whoever we want around the world, we do not—our country right now, which is running a trillion-dollar deficit—want to take more people who are taking money out of this system rather than putting money in this system.

So the question is: What should Congress do now that we have kind of begun to take control of our borders?

The first thing we have to do is we have to permanently change our asylum laws so that in the future when people come here, we know we are dealing with people who genuinely have to seek asylum. We should not be taking—per President Trump—people who have to cross several countries to get here.

If you are in Venezuela, and you are genuinely at risk for your life, what would you do? You would move to Colombia. You would move to Panama. You would move to Costa Rica. You won't go through six or seven countries to get to the United States.

Secondly, we have to hire more people at the border. As we put up our wall, and as we hold people south of the border who are seeking asylum, more people will try to sneak in the country. As more people try to sneak in the country, it is more important that we have border patrol agents.

Over time, the drug cartels, which run the southern border, become more and more sophisticated. They have spotters along the border. And, quite frankly, they have equipment that is superior sometimes to the equipment our own Border Patrol has.

As long as we continue to allow this to happen, the cartels south of the border break up families. And they break up families by using minors, 16-, 15-, 14-year-olds to smuggle drugs across the border. They use these young people as spotters, knowing full well that if they are caught, they will not wind up in American jails but just turned around and sent back south of the border again.

Another thing that we have to look at is we should pass a bill, which I have introduced in the past, saying no public benefits for people who are not American citizens. Historically, in this country, when people come here, many return to their country of origin. The reason they return to their country of origin is they are not able to find work here.

We ought to across-the-board say, “no public benefits for people who are

not citizens.” As far as the few situations in which help is needed, that can always be handled by the many generous Americans who do feel these people should stay in the country, but it should not be a guaranteed right.

The next thing we have to do—as long as people are coming into our country—is get rid of the rule, which is the birthright citizenship rule. Among westernized countries, United States and Canada are the only two countries who allow someone to become a citizen if you are born in the country. There is a reason other nations don’t do this.

We want to properly vet the new families that are coming here. If we say that anybody who has a child in the United States becomes a citizen, the parents will follow, and our new generations will not be picked by appropriately vetting the future immigrants. They will be picked by whoever happens to come here.

Our intent has never been that if you get a green card, that if you are here on a student visa—much less sneak into the country illegally—that your children become citizens.

I think it is important that we deal with these issues promptly. And I say that because we will go back to the days of 140,000 people being apprehended at the border if we have a President who doesn’t go ahead with these three commonsense measures that President Trump has taken time to deal with.

I implore the press to report any progress on these issues, and to summarize again and again for the American public the progress that is made by President Trump and what would happen if President Trump would leave. It would result in a permanent change of America.

Again, we want immigrants. President Trump has increased the number of people being legally sworn in this country over the last few years, but we have to pick our immigrants. And if we do not pick our immigrants, we are going to wind up permanently changing an America in which we do not like.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 7 o’clock and 30 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2310

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. SEWELL of Alabama) at 11 o’clock and 10 minutes p.m.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. FORTENBERRY (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for March 9 and the balance of the week on account of illness.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced her signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1822.—An act to require the Federal Communications Commission to issue rules relating to the collection of data with respect to the availability of broadband services, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MORELLE. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o’clock and 10 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 12, 2020, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker’s table and referred as follows:

4113. A letter from the FPAC-BC, Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Supplemental Agricultural Disaster Assistance Programs [Docket No.: FSA-2019-0011] (RIN: 0560-AI50) received March 10, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4114. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a letter requesting emergency funding in the Public Health and Social Services Emergency Fund at HHS to continue supporting critical response and preparedness activities; to the Committee on Appropriations.

4115. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition and Sustainment, Department of Defense, transmitting a report entitled “Annual National Defense Stockpile Operations and Planning Report”, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 98h-2(a); June 7, 1939, ch. 190, Sec. 11(a) (as amended by Public Law 103-35, Sec. 204(d)); (107 Stat. 103); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4116. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition and Sustainment, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department’s 2nd Quarter FY 2020 Quarterly Briefing on Progress of the Chemical Demilitarization Program, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1521(j); Public Law 99-145, Sec. 1412 (as amended by Public Law 112-239, Sec. 1421(a)); (126 Stat. 204); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4117. A letter from the Alternate OSD FRLO, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Health Promotion [Docket ID: DOD-2019-OS-0111] (RIN: 0790-AK25) received March 10, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4118. A letter from the Senior Counsel, Legal Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting the Bureau’s policy statement — Responsible Business Conduct: Self-Assessing, Self-Reporting, Remediating, and Cooperating received March 6, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Pub-

lic Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4119. A letter from the Attorney and Federal Register Liaison, Bureau of the Fiscal Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Federal Government Participation in the Automated Clearing House [FISCAL-2019-0001] (RIN: 1510-AB32) received March 6, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4120. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration’s final rule — Public Unit and Nonmember Shares (RIN: 3313-AF00) received March 10, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4121. A letter from the Deputy Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation’s final rule — Administrative Review of Agency Decisions (RIN: 1212-AB35) received March 10, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

4122. A letter from the Deputy Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation’s final rule — Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Paying Benefits received March 10, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

4123. A letter from the Attorney, Regulatory Affairs Division, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting the Commission’s direct final rule — Revisions to Safety Standard for Portable Bed Rails [Docket No.: CPSC-2011-0019] received March 10, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4124. A letter from the Assistant Administrator, Diversion Control Division, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department’s direct final rule — Additions to Listing of Exempt Chemical Mixtures [Docket No.: DEA-505F] (RIN: 1117-ZA05) received March 6, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4125. A letter from the Assistant Administrator, Diversion Control Division, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department’s interim final rule — Schedules of Controlled Substances: Placement of Lasmiditan in Schedule V [Docket No.: DEA-558] received March 6, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4126. A letter from the Associate Chief, Mobility Division, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communication’s Commission, transmitting the Commission’s Major final rule — Expanding Flexible Use of the 3.7 to 4.2 GHz Band [GN Docket No.: 18-122] received March 6, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4127. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission’s final rule — Standards for Business Practices and Communication Protocols for Public Utilities [Docket No.: RM05-5-025; Docket No.: RM05-5-026; Docket No.: RM05-5-027; Order No.: 676-I] received March 10, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110

Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4128. A letter from the Chair, Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board, transmitting the Board's report titled "Filling the Gaps: The Critical Role of Underground Research Laboratories in the U.S. Department of Energy Geologic Disposal Research and Development Program; Report to the United States Congress and the Secretary of Energy", pursuant to Public Law 100-203; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4129. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting a report certifying that the export of the listed items to the People's Republic of China is not detrimental to the U.S. space launch industry, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2778 note; Public Law 105-261, Sec. 1512 (as amended by Public Law 105-277, Sec. 146); (112 Stat. 2174); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4130. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Somalia that was declared in Executive Order 13536 of April 12, 2010, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec. 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627) and 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4131. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to significant malicious cyber-enabled activities that was declared in Executive Order 13694 of April 1, 2015, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec. 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4132. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to South Sudan that was declared in Executive Order 13664 of April 3, 2014, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec. 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4133. A letter from the Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a final report titled "Earmark Review: DMPED Can Improve Grant Management", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 455(d); (87 Stat. 803); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

4134. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board, transmitting the Board's final rule — Cost-of-Living Adjustments and Identity Verification received March 10, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

4135. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; 2020 Recreational Accountability Measure and Closure for Gulf of Mexico Gray Triggerfish [Docket No.: 121004518-3398-01; RTID 0648-XS023] received March 10, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4136. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; IFQ Program; Modify Medical and Beneficiary Transfer Provisions [Docket No.: 200206-0048] (RIN: 0648-BJ07) received March 10, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-

121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4137. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 620 in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 180381813-9170-02] (RTID: 0648-XY070) received March 10, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4138. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Blueline Tilefish Fishery; 2020 Specifications [Docket No.: 200212-0053] (RIN: 0648-XX037) received March 10, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4139. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries — SER, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Electronic Reporting for Federally Permitted Charter Vessels and Headboats in Atlantic Fisheries [Docket No.: 200127-0032] (RIN: 0648-BG75) received March 10, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4140. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Southeast Region, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources in the Gulf of Mexico and Atlantic Region; Framework Amendment 7 [Docket No.: 200211-0052] (RIN: 0648-BI83) received March 10, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4141. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting the 2019 Annual Report of the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts and Judicial Business of the United States Courts, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 604(a)(4); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4142. A letter from the Senior Director, Government Affairs and Corporate Communications, National Railroad Passenger Corporation, transmitting other materials as required by 49 U.S.C. 24315(A)(2); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4143. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of Defense, transmitting additional legislative proposals that the Department of Defense requests be enacted during the second session of the 116th Congress; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services, Education and Labor, and Natural Resources.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. OMAR (for herself, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. TRONE, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. JAYAPAL,

Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. WILD, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Ms. SCHRIER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. ADAMS, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. PRESSLEY, and Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ):

H.R. 6187. A bill to allow the Secretary of Agriculture to grant certain waivers under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to address school closures due to COVID-19, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GARAMENDI (for himself and Mr. KIM):

H.R. 6188. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to require that military working dogs be retired in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 6189. A bill to limit employers from requiring employees to use vacation leave before using sick leave, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Reform, House Administration, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana):

H.R. 6190. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to require all-cargo aircraft to be equipped with cockpit doors that meet certain safety requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PETERSON (for himself and Mr. PALAZZO):

H.R. 6191. A bill to establish a regulatory system for sustainable offshore aquaculture in the United States exclusive economic zone, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BARR (for himself, Mr. CLEAVELAND, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. PANNETTA, Mr. UPTON, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. KATKO, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. HILL of Arkansas, and Mr. HUIZENGA):

H.R. 6192. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to honor the 100th anniversary of completion of coinage of the "Morgan Dollar" and the 100th anniversary of commencement of coinage of the "Peace Dollar", and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. PAPPAS (for himself and Mr. ALLRED):

H.R. 6193. A bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to require group health plans and health insurance issuers offering group or individual health insurance coverage to provide benefits under such plan or such coverage for a 30-day refill of prescription drugs to individuals who reside in emergency areas during emergency periods; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee:

H.R. 6194. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to treat certain programs of education converted to distance learning by reason of emergencies and health-related situations in the same manner as programs

of education pursued at educational institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 6195. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide grants to eligible local educational agencies to encourage female students to pursue studies and careers in science, mathematics, engineering, and technology; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia (for himself, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. NADLER, and Mrs. ROBY):

H.R. 6196. A bill to amend the Trademark Act of 1946 to provide for third-party submission of evidence relating to a trademark application, to establish expungement and ex parte proceedings relating to the validity of marks, to provide for a rebuttal presumption of irreparable harm in certain proceedings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERSON (for himself, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. CONAWAY, and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia):

H.R. 6197. A bill to reauthorize the Commodity Futures Trading Commission; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. MURPHY of Florida (for herself, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma, and Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico):

H.R. 6198. A bill to provide emergency paid leave benefits to certain individuals affected by COVID-19, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HORSFORD:

H.R. 6199. A bill to provide for emergency transfers for unemployment compensation administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. FUDGE (for herself and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia):

H.R. 6200. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to provide certain food assistance for eligible children during periods when their schools are closed due to a public health emergency; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. NEAL, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. DELAUNO, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. PETERSON):

H.R. 6201. A bill making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committees on the Budget, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mr. RASKIN, and Ms. DELBENE):

H.R. 6202. A bill to require States to adopt contingency plans to prevent the disruption of Federal elections from the COVID-19 virus, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. BONAMICI (for herself and Mr. COMER):

H.R. 6203. A bill to provide for certain waivers of program requirements under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to appropriately address safety measures with respect to COVID-19, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina, Mr.

CUNNINGHAM, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. HOLDING, and Mr. MCHENRY):

H.R. 6204. A bill to provide for recovery by individuals who were stationed, lived, or worked at Camp Lejeune, for certain actions of omissions by the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. DELBENE:

H.R. 6205. A bill to amend the Trade Act of 1974 to provide adjustment assistance to certain workers adversely affected by disruptions in global supply chains from the Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DELGADO (for himself, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, and Ms. TITUS):

H.R. 6206. A bill to provide that the President may provide additional Federal assistance for an emergency related to a public health emergency, including a pandemic or virus threat, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. KILMER (for himself, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, and Mr. RUTHERFORD):

H.R. 6207. A bill to provide for unemployment benefits to workers affected by the 2019 Novel Coronavirus; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. KINZINGER (for himself, Ms. CHENEY, Mr. TURNER, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. CROW, and Mrs. BUSTOS):

H.R. 6208. A bill to direct the President to develop a strategy to protect the space assets of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, and Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire (for herself and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska):

H.R. 6209. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to establish a program to allow qualified group practices to furnish certain items and services at qualified skilled nursing facilities to individuals entitled to benefits under part A and enrolled under part B of the Medicare program to reduce unnecessary hospitalizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCGOVERN (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. YOHO, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. TLAI, and Ms. WEXTON):

H.R. 6210. A bill ensuring that goods made with forced labor in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region of the People's Republic of China do not enter the United States market, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, the Judiciary, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NORMAN (for himself and Mr. BUDD):

H.R. 6211. A bill to prohibit the consideration in the House of Representatives of any legislation containing an earmark; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 6212. A bill to provide for the continuation of Department of Veterans Affairs edu-

cational assistance benefits during emergency situations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida (for herself, Ms. SCHRIER, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. MORELLE, Mrs. MCBATH, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. SHALALA, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. TRONE, Ms. STEVENS, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia):

H.R. 6213. A bill to provide for coverage (without cost sharing or utilization management requirements) under group health plans and individual and group health insurance coverage of testing for COVID-19; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RESCHENTHALER:

H. Res. 896. A resolution reaffirming support of fundamental United States principles at the United Nations and encouraging the World Health Organization to embrace technological advancements in tobacco control; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

165. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey, relative to Assembly Resolution No. 38, urging the United States Congress and the President to provide funding and other incentives to states to promote hydrogen fuel cell vehicle usage; which was referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Ms. OMAR:

H.R. 6187.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 To make all laws that shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mr. GARAMENDI:

H.R. 6188.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 6189.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Commerce Clause—Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GARCIA of Illinois:

H.R. 6190.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. PETERSON:

H.R. 6191.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Its commerce clause power under Art. I, section 8, clause 3 of the Constitution.

By Mr. BARR:

H.R. 6192.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8. "The Congress shall have the power . . . to coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures."

By Mr. PAPPAS:

H.R. 6193.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 Clause 10 provides Congress with the power "to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee:

H.R. 6194.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, which states "[t]he Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States."

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 6195.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia:

H.R. 6196.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution, which gives Congress the power "[t]o regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes."

By Mr. PETERSON:

H.R. 6197.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Commerce Clause Power Under Article 1 section 8, Clause 3 of the US Constitution

By Mrs. MURPHY of Florida:

H.R. 6198.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, which gives Congress the power to provide for the general welfare of the United States, and Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, which gives Congress the power to regulate commerce among the several states.

By Mr. HORSFORD:

H.R. 6199.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Ms. FUDGE:

H.R. 6200.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power *** To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and wit the Indian Tribes.

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 6201.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states:

"No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by law"

In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides:

"The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . ."

Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 6202.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section IV, Clause I

By Ms. BONAMICI:

H.R. 6203.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 6204.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I; Section 8; Clause 1 of the Constitution states The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . .

By Ms. DELBENE:

H.R. 6205.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DELGADO:

H.R. 6206.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I

By Mr. KILMER:

H.R. 6207.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. KINZINGER:

H.R. 6208.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the US Constitution

By Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire:

H.R. 6209.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution, The Congress shall have the power . . . to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. MCGOVERN:

H.R. 6210.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, and Clause 18

By Mr. NORMAN:

H.R. 6211.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 6212.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 6213.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 510: Mr. FERGUSON.
 H.R. 587: Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. BURCHETT, and Mr. GRIFFITH.
 H.R. 712: Mr. STEUBE.
 H.R. 733: Mr. COLE.
 H.R. 779: Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana.
 H.R. 884: Ms. GABBARD and Ms. DELAURO.
 H.R. 945: Ms. BONAMICI.
 H.R. 1043: Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 1084: Mr. STEUBE.
 H.R. 1174: Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mr. RYAN.
 H.R. 1572: Mr. LAMB.
 H.R. 1695: Ms. SCHRIER.
 H.R. 1713: Mr. FOSTER and Mr. PETERSON.
 H.R. 1776: Mr. CASTEN of Illinois.
 H.R. 1858: Mrs. RODGERS of Washington.
 H.R. 1943: Mr. SARBANES.
 H.R. 1948: Mr. VARGAS.
 H.R. 1953: Mr. SHIMKUS.
 H.R. 1975: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.
 H.R. 1987: Mr. VAN DREW.
 H.R. 2061: Ms. HOULAHAN.
 H.R. 2148: Mr. VELA.
 H.R. 2350: Mr. BYRNE and Ms. BLUNT ROCH-ESTER.
 H.R. 2438: Ms. GARCIA of Texas and Ms. JACKSON LEE.
 H.R. 2457: Mr. SOTO.
 H.R. 2561: Ms. PRESSLEY.
 H.R. 2571: Mr. BARR.
 H.R. 2577: Ms. SPEIER.
 H.R. 2701: Mr. GALLEGO.
 H.R. 2772: Mr. CONNOLLY.
 H.R. 2807: Ms. PORTER.
 H.R. 2896: Mrs. BEATTY.
 H.R. 2912: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.
 H.R. 3138: Mr. SHIMKUS.
 H.R. 3211: Mr. RUIZ.
 H.R. 3219: Mr. FORTENBERRY.
 H.R. 3222: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
 H.R. 3277: Mr. ZELDIN.
 H.R. 3378: Ms. SCHRIER.
 H.R. 3466: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.
 H.R. 3657: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
 H.R. 3742: Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico and Mr. MARCHANT.
 H.R. 3772: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.
 H.R. 3796: Mr. GOODEN and Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma.
 H.R. 4052: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
 H.R. 4070: Mrs. LESKO.
 H.R. 4104: Mr. COHEN, Ms. BASS, and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.
 H.R. 4138: Mr. TONKO.
 H.R. 4141: Mr. VEASEY.
 H.R. 4161: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.
 H.R. 4189: Mr. NEGUSE.
 H.R. 4211: Mr. KILMER.
 H.R. 4236: Ms. PINGREE and Ms. PORTER.
 H.R. 4278: Mr. GOMEZ.
 H.R. 4307: Mr. SOTO.
 H.R. 4341: Mr. NEGUSE.
 H.R. 4439: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.
 H.R. 4527: Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. VAN DREW, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.
 H.R. 4684: Ms. PRESSLEY.
 H.R. 4697: Mr. LYNCH, Ms. PORTER, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. WILD, Mr. EVANS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. NEAL, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
 H.R. 4707: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York and Mr. KIM.
 H.R. 4807: Mr. TAYLOR.
 H.R. 4931: Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 4932: Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. BUDD, and Mr. GRIFFITH.
 H.R. 4945: Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana and Mr. ALLRED.
 H.R. 5010: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 5046: Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 5067: Mr. GOSAR.
 H.R. 5166: Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico.
 H.R. 5170: Mr. PAPPAS.
 H.R. 5236: Mr. MULLIN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. TRONE, Mr. YOUNG, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Mr. ROSE of New York.
 H.R. 5243: Mr. ALLRED.
 H.R. 5248: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.
 H.R. 5269: Mr. PASCRELL and Mr. NORMAN.
 H.R. 5288: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
 H.R. 5293: Mr. STIVERS.
 H.R. 5421: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. BAIRD.
 H.R. 5434: Mr. JORDAN and Mr. LONG.
 H.R. 5447: Mr. RICHMOND and Ms. HOULAHAN.
 H.R. 5491: Mr. CRENSHAW.
 H.R. 5516: Mr. ROUZER and Mr. NEGUSE.
 H.R. 5548: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.
 H.R. 5572: Mrs. HAYES, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. KIM, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. AMODEI, Mrs. AXNE, Mr. REED, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. WOMACK, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, and Mr. MCKINLEY.
 H.R. 5598: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
 H.R. 5602: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, and Mr. HORSFORD.
 H.R. 5610: Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. TITUS, and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.
 H.R. 5660: Mr. OLSON and Mr. WRIGHT.
 H.R. 5701: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER and Mr. STEUBE.
 H.R. 5711: Mr. NUNES and Mr. HARDER of California.
 H.R. 5739: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. WILD, Mr. CLAY, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. GALLEGRO, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. GROTHMAN, and Mr. TIPTON.
 H.R. 5757: Mr. BUCSHON.
 H.R. 5797: Mr. CASE.
 H.R. 5845: Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. KILMER.
 H.R. 5858: Mr. RIGGLEMAN and Mr. MOULTON.
 H.R. 5859: Mrs. LESKO, Mr. ROUZER, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
 H.R. 5870: Mr. HARDER of California.
 H.R. 5873: Mr. RASKIN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. HARRIS.
 H.R. 5875: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
 H.R. 5885: Ms. PORTER.
 H.R. 5887: Mr. GOHMERT.
 H.R. 5957: Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. BYRNE, and Mr. CRENSHAW.
 H.R. 5983: Ms. WATERS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. HUFFMAN.
 H.R. 5995: Mr. GALLEGRO.
 H.R. 6033: Mr. GOMEZ.

H.R. 6050: Mr. CASE.
 H.R. 6065: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
 H.R. 6094: Ms. OMAR.
 H.R. 6100: Ms. GARCIA of Texas.
 H.R. 6112: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
 H.R. 6115: Mr. WENSTRUP.
 H.R. 6129: Mr. CRIST.
 H.R. 6133: Mr. HAGEDORN.
 H.R. 6139: Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. MEEKS, and Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.
 H.R. 6141: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. MOORE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, and Ms. BASS.
 H.R. 6144: Ms. BASS.
 H.R. 6145: Mr. MAST, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. YOHO.
 H.R. 6150: Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. GALLEGRO, Mr. COHEN, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Ms. DEGETTE.
 H.R. 6152: Mr. WRIGHT and Ms. STEFANIK.
 H.R. 6164: Ms. BASS.
 H.R. 6165: Ms. BASS.
 H.R. 6181: Ms. HAALAND, Mr. POCAN, and Ms. NORTON.
 H.J. Res. 2: Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. FUDGE, and Ms. ADAMS.
 H. Res. 224: Mr. WRIGHT.
 H. Res. 285: Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. COMER, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. YOUNG, Ms. FOXF of North Carolina, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. STANTON, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. CISNEROS, and Mr. ALLRED.
 H. Res. 373: Mr. PAPPAS.
 H. Res. 374: Mr. BYRNE, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. ROUDA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. GREEN of Texas, and Mr. COX of California.
 H. Res. 861: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
 H. Res. 882: Mr. COX of California.
 H. Res. 886: Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. RIGGLEMAN, Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina, Mr. BUDD, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. POSEY, Mr. BILLIRAKIS, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. HICE of Georgia, and Mr. WATKINS.
 H. Res. 893: Ms. JAYAPAL.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks,

limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MRS. LOWEY

H.R. 6201, making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes, does not contain any congressional earmark, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. NEAL

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Ways and Means in H.R. 6201 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. PALLONE

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Energy and Commerce in H.R. 6201 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. PETERSON

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Agriculture in H.R. 6201 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. SCOTT OF VIRGINIA

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Education and Labor in H.R. 6201 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of Rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

OFFERED BY MR. YARMUTH

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on the Budget in H.R. 6201 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

89. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Legislative Assembly of Puerto Rico, relative to Joint Resolution No. 126, urging the Congress of the United States of America to enact legislation providing for a five (5)-year transition period to enforce the provisions of the Farm Bill through which the Animal Welfare Act (7 U.S.C. 2156) is applied to Puerto Rico banning any type of animal fighting venture, including cockfights; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture.