

Lewis  
Lieu, Ted  
Lipinski  
Loebsock  
Lofgren  
Long  
Loudermilk  
Lowenthal  
Lowey  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Luján  
Luria  
Lynch  
Mallinowski  
Maloney,  
Carolyn B.  
Maloney, Sean  
Marshall  
Mast  
Matsui  
McAdams  
McBath  
McCarthy  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McCollum  
McEachin  
McGovern  
McKinley  
McNerney  
Meeks  
Meng  
Meuser  
Mfume  
Miller  
Mitchell  
Moolenaar  
Mooney (WV)  
Moore  
Morelle  
Moulton  
Mucarsel-Powell  
Mullin  
Murphy (FL)  
Murphy (NC)  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Neguse  
Newhouse  
Norcross  
Norman  
Nunes  
O'Halleran  
Ocasio-Cortez  
Olson  
Omar  
Palazzo  
Pallone  
Palmer  
Panetta  
Pappas  
Pascrell  
Payne  
Pelosi

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  
Scanlon  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Schrader  
Schrier  
Schweikert  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, Austin  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Shalala  
Sherman  
Sherrill  
Shimkus  
Simpson  
Sires  
Slotkin  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (WA)  
Smucker  
Soto  
Spanberger  
Spano

Speier  
Stanton  
Stauber  
Stefanik  
Steil  
Steube  
Stevens  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Suozi  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Taylor  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiffany  
Timmons  
Tipton  
Titus  
Tlaib  
Tonko  
Torres (CA)  
Torres (MS)  
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  
Zeldin

## NAYS—1

Massie

## NOT VOTING—13

Abraham  
Brooks (IN)  
Buchanan  
Carter (TX)  
Crawford

Granger  
Hollingsworth  
LaHood  
Marchant  
McHenry

Rooney (FL)  
Sensenbrenner  
Young

## □ 1312

Mr. DUNN changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. YOUNG. Madam Speaker, I was unable to vote on May 28, 2020. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye” on rollcall No. 114, on passage of H.R. 7010, as amended.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ABRAHAM. Madam Speaker, on Thursday, May 28, I was unavoidably detained on

Roll Call Votes No. 113 and No. 114. Had I been present to vote, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 113 and “yea” on rollcall No. 114.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE  
RESOLUTION 965, 116TH CONGRESS

Barragán	Hastings	Mucarsel-Powell
(Gallego)	(Wasserman)	(Wasserman)
Bass (Cicilline)	Schultz	Schultz
Bera (Aguilar)	Heck (Kilmer)	Napolitano
Blumenauer	Horsford (Kildee)	(Correa)
(Beyer)	Huffman (Kildee)	Payne
Bonamici	Jayapal (Raskin)	(Wasserman)
(Raskin)	Johnson (TX)	Schultz
Brownley (CA)	(Jeffries)	Peters (Rice)
(Kuster (NH))	Khanna	(NY)
Cárdenas	(Sherman)	Pingree (Kuster)
(Sánchez)	Kirkpatrick	(NH)
Chu, Judy	(Gallego)	Pocan (Raskin)
(Takano)	Krishnamoorthi	Porter (Weston)
Cisneros	(Brown (MD))	Price (NC)
(Houlahan)	Lawrence	(Butterfield)
Cohen (Beyer)	(Kildee)	Roybal-Allard
Crist (Murphy)	Lawson (FL)	(Sánchez)
(FL)	(Evans)	Ruiz (Aguilar)
Davis (CA) (Wild)	Levin (CA)	Rush
DeSaulnier	(Kildee)	(Underwood)
(Matsui)	Levin (MI)	Schneider
Deutch (Rice)	(Raskin)	(Houlahan)
(NY)	Lewis (Kildee)	Schrader
Doggett (Raskin)	Lieu, Ted (Beyer)	(O'Halleran)
Escobar (Garcia)	Lipinski (Cooper)	Schrier (Kilmer)
(TX)	Lofgren (Boyle)	Serrano (Meng)
Eshoo	Brendan F.)	Speier (Scanlon)
(Thompson)	Lowenthal	Suozi (Panetta)
(CA)	(Beyer)	Tlaib (Dingell)
Foster (Beyer)	Lowey (Meng)	Tonko
Frankel (Kuster)	Maloney	Vargas (Keating)
(NH)	Carolyn B.	Veasey (Beyer)
Garamendi	(Rose (NY))	Vela (Gallego)
(Sherman)	McEachin	Watson Coleman
Gonzalez (TX)	(Wexton)	(Pallone)
(Cuellar)	McNerney	Welch
Grijalva (Clay)	(Raskin)	(McGovern)
Harder (CA)	Moore (Beyer)	Wilson (FL)
(Haaland)		(Hayes)

## □ 1315

## MOMENT OF SILENCE IN REMEMBRANCE OF THE OVER 100,000 AMERICANS WHO HAVE PASSED AWAY FROM THE COVID-19 VIRUS

The SPEAKER. The Chair asks that all Members in the Chamber, as well as Members and staff throughout the Capitol and Members wherever they are, rise for a moment of silence in remembrance of the over 100,000 Americans who have passed away from the COVID-19 virus.

MOTION TO GO TO CONFERENCE  
ON H.R. 6172, USA FREEDOM RE-AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2020

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, pursuant to clause 1 of rule XXII, and by direction of the Committee on the Judiciary, I offer a motion on 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.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. JACKSON LEE). The Clerk will designate the Senate amendments.

Senate amendments:

(1) In subsection (a)(2)(B) of section 602 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1872), as added by section 301(b)(3), insert after “section 103(i)” the following: “, a proceeding in the Foreign Intelligence Court of Review resulting from the peti-

tion of an amicus curiae under section 103(i)(7), or a proceeding in which an amicus curiae could have been appointed pursuant to section 103(i)(2)(A).”

(2) In section 302, strike subsections (a) and (b) and insert the following:

(a) EXPANSION OF APPOINTMENT AUTHORITY.—(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 103(i)(2) (50 U.S.C. 1803(i)(2)) is amended—

(A) by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

“(A) shall appoint one or more individuals who have been designated under paragraph (1), not less than one of whom possesses privacy and civil liberties expertise, unless the court finds that such a qualification is inappropriate, to serve as amicus curiae to assist the court in the consideration of any application or motion 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;

“(ii) presents significant concerns with respect to the activities of a United States person that are protected by the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States, unless the court issues a finding that such appointment is not appropriate;

“(iii) presents or involves a sensitive investigative matter, unless the court issues a finding that such appointment is not appropriate;

“(iv) presents a request for approval of a new program, a new technology, or a new use of existing technology, unless the court issues a finding that such appointment is not appropriate;

“(v) presents a request for reauthorization of programmatic surveillance, unless the court issues a finding that such appointment is not appropriate; or

“(vi) otherwise presents novel or significant civil liberties issues, unless the court issues a finding that such appointment is not appropriate; and”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking “an individual or organization” each place the term appears and inserting “one or more individuals or organizations”.

(2) DEFINITION OF SENSITIVE INVESTIGATIVE MATTER.—Subsection (i) of section 103 (50 U.S.C. 1803) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(12) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term ‘sensitive investigative matter’ means—

“(A) an investigative matter involving the activities of—

“(i) a domestic public official or political candidate, or an individual serving on the staff of such an official or candidate;

“(ii) a domestic religious or political organization, or a known or suspected United States person prominent in such an organization; or

“(iii) the domestic news media; or

“(B) any other investigative matter involving a domestic entity or a known or suspected United States person that, in the judgment of the applicable court established under subsection (a) or (b), is as sensitive as an investigative matter described in subparagraph (A).”

(b) AUTHORITY TO SEEK REVIEW.—Subsection (i) of section 103 (50 U.S.C. 1803), as amended by subsection (a) of this section, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4)—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by inserting “; AUTHORITY” after “DUTIES”;

(B) by redesignating subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) as clauses (i), (ii), and (iii), respectively, and adjusting the margins accordingly;

(C) in the matter preceding clause (i), as so designated, by striking “the amicus curiae shall” and inserting the following: “the amicus curiae—

“(A) shall”;

(D) in subparagraph (A)(i), as so designated, by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: “, including legal arguments regarding any privacy or civil liberties interest of any United States person that would be significantly impacted by the application or motion”; and

(E) by striking the period at the end and inserting the following: “; and

“(B) may seek leave to raise any novel or significant privacy or civil liberties issue relevant to the application or motion or other issue directly impacting the legality of the proposed electronic surveillance with the court, regardless of whether the court has requested assistance on that issue.”;

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (7) through (12) as paragraphs (8) through (13), respectively; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (6) the following:

“(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 Foreign Intelligence Surveillance 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) **DECLASSIFICATION OF REFERRALS.**—For purposes of section 602, a petition filed under subparagraph (A) or (B) of this paragraph and all of its content shall be considered a decision, order, or opinion issued by the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court or the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review described in paragraph (2) of section 602(a).”.

(3) In section 302(c), redesignate paragraph (2) as paragraph (3).

(4) In section 302(c), strike paragraph (1) and insert the following:

(1) **APPLICATION AND MATERIALS.**—Subparagraph (A) of section 103(i)(6) (50 U.S.C. 1803(i)(6)) is amended to read as follows:

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—

“(i) **RIGHT OF AMICUS.**—If a court established under subsection (a) or (b) appoints an amicus curiae under paragraph (2), the amicus curiae—

“(I) shall have access to, to the extent such information is available to the Government—

“(aa) the application, certification, petition, motion, and other information and supporting materials, including any information described in section 901, submitted to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court in connection with the matter in which the amicus curiae has been appointed, including access to any relevant legal precedent (including any such precedent that is cited by the Government, including in such an application);

“(bb) an unredacted copy of each relevant decision made by the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court or the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review in which the court decides a question of law, without regard to whether the decision is classified; and

“(cc) any other information or materials that the court determines are relevant to the duties of the amicus curiae; and

“(II) may make a submission to the court requesting access to any other 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.

“(ii) **SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION REGARDING ACCURACY.**—The Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court, upon the motion of an amicus cu-

riae appointed under paragraph (2) or upon its own motion, may require the Government to make available the supporting documentation described in section 902.”.

(2) **CLARIFICATION OF ACCESS TO CERTAIN INFORMATION.**—Such section is further amended—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking “may” and inserting “shall”; and

(B) by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:

“(C) **CLASSIFIED INFORMATION.**—An amicus curiae appointed by the court shall have access to, to the extent such information is available to the Government, unredacted copies of each opinion, order, transcript, pleading, or other document of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court and the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review, including, if the individual is eligible for access to classified information, any classified documents, information, and other materials or proceedings.”.

(5) Redesignate section 207 as section 208.

(6) Insert after section 206 the following:

**SEC. 207. DISCLOSURE OF RELEVANT INFORMATION; CERTIFICATION REGARDING ACCURACY PROCEDURES.**

(a) **DISCLOSURE OF RELEVANT INFORMATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

**“TITLE IX—DISCLOSURE OF RELEVANT INFORMATION**

**“SEC. 901. DISCLOSURE OF RELEVANT INFORMATION.**

“The Attorney General or any other Federal officer making an application for a court order under this Act shall provide the court with—

“(1) all information in the possession of the Government that is material to determining whether the application satisfies the applicable requirements under this Act, including any exculpatory information; and

“(2) all information in the possession of the Government 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 that are required to be made under the applicable provision of this Act in order for the court order to be issued.”.

(2) **TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of contents of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 is amended by adding at the end the following:

**“TITLE IX—DISCLOSURE OF RELEVANT INFORMATION**

“Sec. 901. Disclosure of relevant information.”.

(b) **CERTIFICATION REGARDING ACCURACY PROCEDURES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Title IX of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978, as added by subsection (a), is amended by adding at the end the following:

**“SEC. 902. CERTIFICATION REGARDING ACCURACY PROCEDURES.**

“(a) **DEFINITION.**—In this section, the term ‘accuracy procedures’ means specific procedures, adopted by the Attorney General, to ensure that an application for a court order under this Act, including any application for renewal of an existing order, is accurate and complete, including procedures that ensure, at a minimum, that—

“(1) the application reflects all information that might reasonably call into question the accuracy of the information or the reasonableness of any assessment in the application, or otherwise raises doubts about the requested findings;

“(2) the application reflects all material information that might reasonably call into question the reliability and reporting of any information from a confidential human source that is used in the application;

“(3) a complete file documenting each factual assertion in an application is maintained;

“(4) the applicant coordinates with the appropriate elements of the intelligence community (as defined in section 3 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003)), concerning any prior or existing relationship with the target of any surveillance, search, or other means of investigation, and discloses any such relationship in the application;

“(5) before any application targeting a United States person is made, the applicant Federal officer shall document that the officer has collected and reviewed for accuracy and completeness supporting documentation for each factual assertion in the application; and

“(6) the applicant Federal agency establish compliance and auditing mechanisms on an annual basis to assess the efficacy of the accuracy procedures that have been adopted and report such findings to the Attorney General.

“(b) **STATEMENT AND CERTIFICATION OF ACCURACY PROCEDURES.**—Any Federal officer making an application for a court order under this Act shall include with the application—

“(1) a description of the accuracy procedures employed by the officer or the officer’s designee; and

“(2) a certification that the officer or the officer’s designee has collected and reviewed for accuracy and completeness—

“(A) supporting documentation for each factual assertion contained in the application;

“(B) all information that might reasonably call into question the accuracy of the information or the reasonableness of any assessment in the application, or otherwise raises doubts about the requested findings; and

“(C) all material information that might reasonably call into question the reliability and reporting of any information from any confidential human source that is used in the application.

“(c) **NECESSARY FINDING FOR COURT ORDERS.**—A judge may not enter an order under this Act unless the judge finds, in addition to any other findings required under this Act, that the accuracy procedures described in the application for the order, as required under subsection (b)(1), are actually accuracy procedures as defined in this section.”.

(2) **TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of contents of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978, as amended by subsection (a), is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 901 the following:

“Sec. 902. Certification regarding accuracy procedures.”.

(7) In section 208, as so redesignated, strike [section 501 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1861)] and insert: the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.) (if applicable)

(8) At the end, add the following:

**SEC. 409. ANNUAL REPORTING ON ACCURACY AND COMPLETENESS OF APPLICATIONS.**

Section 603 (50 U.S.C. 1873) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (f); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (d) the following:

“(e) **ANNUAL REPORT BY DOJ INSPECTOR GENERAL ON ACCURACY AND COMPLETENESS OF APPLICATIONS.**—

“(1) **DEFINITION OF APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.**—In this subsection, the term ‘appropriate committees of Congress’ means—

“(A) the Committee on the Judiciary and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

“(B) the Committee on the Judiciary and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

“(2) **REPORT.**—In April of each year, the Inspector General of the Department of Justice shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress and make public, subject to a declassification review, a report setting forth, with respect to the preceding calendar year, the following:

“(A) A summary of all accuracy or completeness reviews of applications submitted to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

“(B) The total number of applications reviewed for accuracy or completeness.

“(C) The total number of material errors or omissions identified during such reviews.

“(D) The total number of nonmaterial errors or omissions identified during such reviews.

“(E) The total number of instances in which facts contained in an application were not supported by documentation that existed in the applicable file being reviewed at the time of the accuracy review.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Nadler moves to take from the Speaker's table the bill, H.R. 6172, with the Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN), and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, bills like the USA Freedom Reauthorization Act touch deeply held beliefs on all sides.

The bill we intended to consider last night strengthened privacy protections and made substantial improvements to the law. The bill, as amended by the Senate, is a good and important package of reforms.

Now, you may disagree with that assessment, you may genuinely believe that the bill doesn't go far enough to reform the FISA system or perhaps that it goes too far with those reforms. If you disagree with me on the merits of the bill, I respect that disagreement.

What I cannot accept, and what I suspect many Americans will not accept, is a transparent, inexplicable, totally unjustified flip-flop on this bill, a bill important both to the security and the privacy of the United States.

Just a few weeks ago, 126 Republicans joined 152 Democrats in support of a nearly identical measure, different only in that the Senate has added one amendment, a good amendment with almost universal support. Virtually all of those 126 Republicans changed their position in the past 24 hours.

Madam Speaker, the American people see through those excuses. Nobody believes that this sudden reversal has anything to do with complaints about proxy voting. Nobody believes that the flip-flop is about Michael Flynn or Roger Stone, or even President Trump, whose cases have nothing to do with the authorities we hope to reform.

There have been no real policy demands to explain the sudden reversal, no demands for changes in the bill. If my Republican colleagues had asked for substantive changes to the bill, we would have heard them out and tried to address their concerns.

But that is not what happened. The Republicans abandoned this bipartisan project for one reason, and one reason

only: the President tweeted, on a whim, and told them to oppose this bill.

Madam Speaker, this is just one more example of how the President and his enablers in this body have stood in the way of national security, of civil liberties, and of our responsibility as Members of Congress.

I refuse to let our efforts to reform FISA die simply because Republicans are unwilling to stand up to the President's whims.

This legislation ends the NSA's call detail records program; it applies the cutting edge of Fourth Amendment privacy protections to section 215; it forces the government to disclose years of secret FISA court opinions; it increases transparency across the board; it raises the stakes for any government attorney who would dare mislead the court; and it dramatically expands the role of the amicus to be an advocate for privacy and civil liberties and to push back against claims that should have been rejected by the court long ago.

It is our responsibility to continue our work, to pass this bill, to send it to the President's desk, and to ensure that these reforms are made law.

None of us should rest until we have done that work.

I would be very interested to hear what changed in the bill between yesterday morning and yesterday evening that caused the Republicans to withdraw their support from a bill they had agreed to, from provisions they said were improvements to national security, from provisions they said were improvements to civil liberties of American citizens, and suddenly all oppose it. What changed, other than the President's tweet?

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this motion and send the bill to conference where we can do the job we were sent here to do.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, everything has changed. The main change is it is worse than we thought.

Since March 10, when this body last dealt with the FISA legislation, all kinds of things have changed.

We have learned from the declassified transcripts how bad the situation was in the prior administration when they went after the Trump campaign.

We have learned about the concerted effort to frame General Flynn, a three-star general, 30 years serving our country, and everything they did.

We learned about January 4, when the FBI agents said: We should no longer pursue going after General Flynn. But what happened? Jim Comey told Peter Strzok: No, no, no. Go tell those agents we are going to continue to go after this guy.

We learned the very next day, January 5, Jim Comey met with the President, President Obama, and talked about General Flynn.

We learned on January 6 what happened that day. We learned that then-FBI Director Comey goes to Trump Tower and meets with then-President-elect Trump and talks to him about the dossier that they already know is false, that they know is Russian disinformation, they know is paid for by the Clinton campaign.

Then what did we learn just 2 weeks later? January 20, 2017, what did they do? They sneak two agents into the White House, two FBI agents, to set up General Flynn.

What else have we learned since we dealt with this issue on March 10?

We have learned about the unmasking of Michael Flynn, 39 people unmasking General Flynn's name, six people in Treasury. What are six Treasury officials doing unmasking the guy who is going to be the National Security Director in the incoming administration?

□ 1330

Finally, and probably most importantly, we have the report from Inspector General Horowitz; not the report he did on the Carter Page FISA—we already got that; we know how scathing that was. We know all the wrongdoings that took place there—but the investigation he is just starting on FISA in general.

He has looked at 29 cases involving American citizens—29 cases—and found in every single one of those cases multiple problems when they were surveilled; again, American citizens. In 4 of those 29 cases they couldn't even find the Woods file. They couldn't even find the file that you have to keep that has the basic evidence that you are then going to take to the FISA court. They couldn't even find it.

So he does something that you hardly ever see. He does what is called a management alert, basically pulling the fire alarm saying this is so bad, I am going to tell you what is going on now; and I have just gotten started on looking at the overall FISA.

So that is what has changed since March 10 when this body dealt with this issue.

And when the President of the United States, a pretty important person in this debate, when he says, you know what? I think we should hit the pause button. We should wait here a little bit until we get to the bottom of everything that took place; what Mr. Horowitz is looking at; what Mr. Barr is looking at; what U.S. Attorney John Durham is looking at. Maybe we should just kind of hit the pause button and figure all this out. That is all he said, and that is all we have advocated. That is why we took the position we did at the conference yesterday, and I appreciate the fact that Leader MCCARTHY and our conference took that position.

So let's wait and get all the facts. Let's wait until we actually hold people accountable before we renew this program which, as the President said yesterday, does allow some warrantless

searches of American citizens. So let's make sure we get it right. That is our position as Republicans.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I am glad the gentleman learned all this since noon yesterday when he testified in front of the Rules Committee in favor of this bill.

I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The information I had was, as the chairman has indicated, that the gentleman who just spoke appeared before the Rules Committee in support of this bill. And we can get the transcript. I don't have it right now, but perhaps somebody can get that transcript for me.

For my entire career in public service, I have supported efforts to make America both strong and safe and a force for peace and reconciliation. In the course of those years, I have striven to draw an acceptable balance between our national security and the protection of our personal liberty and the right to privacy central to our unique extraordinary democracy; a government of laws, not men.

Pursuant to that principle, as the majority leader, I scheduled the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act for floor consideration over 2 months ago.

Previously, in 2008, ROY BLUNT, then the minority whip, and myself, the majority leader; Senator Kit Bond, Senator from Missouri; and Senator Jay Rockefeller, Senator from West Virginia, worked together, at a time of great controversy with respect to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, to forge a bill that would garner bipartisan support. It was a difficult bill, with the same kind of principle differences that Chairman NADLER spoke of earlier and I am going to speak about again.

We passed that bill in a bipartisan fashion with, as we have today, people on the right and people on the left concerned about its content. So there was bipartisan support and bipartisan opposition. Speaker PELOSI and to-be President Obama, then in the Senate representing Illinois, voted for that bill. I have tried to continue to forge that balance through the years.

The bill I brought to the floor a few months ago was a bipartisan effort to achieve that critical balance, and when it came to a vote, it received two-thirds of the votes from both Democrats and Republicans. This bill essentially had two-thirds of the votes on the Republican side and two-thirds of the votes on the Democratic side, so obviously, two-thirds of the votes of this House.

As I observed yesterday, Americans must have been heartened by the fact that we could reach a bipartisan agreement on such a difficult bill. It was not

a partisan bill. The leaders, all three top leaders, on both sides of the aisle supported, essentially, this bill.

That bill, upon Senate consideration, was amended by an overwhelmingly bipartisan vote to strengthen the protections of privacy, which should have been heartening to those on the right and the left, and it was certainly heartening to me.

And then, what did they do? They passed it, with 80 Senators, 48 Republicans supporting this bill; 48 out of 53 supporting this bill. But this is not a partisan bill; and this bill is about that balance.

Mr. NUNES and Mr. SCHIFF supported this bill and supported this balance. And two-thirds of us made a judgment that they had done a job worthy of support.

So two-thirds of the Democrats in the Senate, two-thirds of the Republicans in the Senate, two-thirds of the Republicans in this House, and two-thirds of the Democrats in this House have supported this bill. I believe that support was garnered because an assumption was made, a premise was adopted by the overwhelming majority of us, that it was a carefully crafted balance between security and individual liberties. It may not be perfect, but we have a responsibility to protect this country and our people.

In consultation, therefore, with other leaders, I scheduled this bill for consideration yesterday. The night before, I got a call from my friend, the minority leader, that the President was urging Republicans in the House to change their votes to "no."

In the twinkling of a presidential tweet, without any substantive logic to justify their actions, I was told that the 126 Republicans who had voted for this bill when it was considered in the House would now change their votes and vote "no."

Chairman NADLER has said this, and I want to share this because it is worth repeating. I believe when FISA passed the House in March, every Member, those who voted "yes" and those who voted "no" voted their principles and their conviction on what they believed was in the security interests of the United States. Every one of the 435 people—I don't think there were quite 435—that voted on that bill, in my view, voted on principle and out of conviction.

I, of course, believed that the two-thirds of the Members who voted for the bill, on principle, and pursuant to conviction about making this country safe, were voting, not for party, but for principle.

Therefore, I was surprised because I saw, not then nor now, any reason that either principle or conviction should be changed, particularly in light of the fact that 80 Senators—80 Senators—48 Republican colleagues of yours, Madam Speaker, voted for this bill.

Therefore, I assumed that we could bring Members back. We had a controversy where some didn't come back.

We had a new rule you don't like. We could bring the Congress back and vote on a bipartisan bill for America.

But, as a result of the President's antipathy toward Federal law enforcement and his personal sense of grievance, authorities that have expired will continue to be lapsed.

The complicity of those who believe that the reauthorizing of these authorities was in the best interest of the United States, in preventing its passage last night and today, is, I think, both sad and irresponsible.

Madam Speaker, I regret that we did not bring this bill to the floor for a vote.

This is a result, in my view, Madam Speaker, of patently political and indefensible abandonment of principle and responsibility, both as a coequal branch of government and its policy-making branch as well.

Madam Speaker, we need to send this bill to conference. I urge my colleagues to vote to send it to conference. And if you think this needs to be perfected in some way, as Mr. NADLER said, that is the place to do it now that we are not going to have it on the floor.

Let me repeat. I would have had it on the floor. But we will not get an opportunity to vote on it, so I will wait to see the result of a conference with the Republican-led Senate on the bill that the President has threatened to veto.

Two-thirds of us believed that this was a bill that was good for America. This is a serious issue with serious consequences, and I urge you to vote "yes." Do not kill this bill.

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

I just want to correct a couple of things that the majority leader said. You guys are the ones that let the FISA law lapse. There was a 75-day extension sent over here. You guys got the majority. You let it lapse.

We want to fix it. We want to correct it. We want to make sure it is not abused like it has obviously been abused. We didn't let it lapse, you guys did.

And frankly, if you guys got the votes for this bill, you got the majority, you could pass it today. You don't have the votes because we need more work to be done on this to correct it.

The leader also said something that was not accurate. He said the President had no basis for the tweet he issued yesterday.

Are you kidding me? Are you kidding me?

They spied on two American citizens associated with his campaign, and he has got no basis for the tweet he did yesterday?

They used a dossier to go to the secret court to get a warrant to spy on one of those individuals; a dossier that they knew was false; a dossier they knew was paid for by the Clinton campaign; a dossier that Jim Comey said—not me—Jim Comey said was salacious and unverified; a dossier where the author had already told the Justice Department that he was desperate to stop

Trump from getting elected, and they used it to go spy on the Trump campaign.

And the President has no basis for the tweet he issued yesterday?

□ 1345

Are you kidding me? You guys let it lapse. We are trying to fix it because we know how bad it is.

Finally, I would just reiterate 29 cases where American citizens were surveilled by the FBI, and every single one of those was a major problem when they went to the FISA court. As I said before, four of those cases, they couldn't even find the Woods File.

We want to fix this, and we are willing to take as long as it takes.

I agree with the chairman of the Judiciary Committee. There are good things in the legislation. I said that yesterday at the Rules Committee. But what I also said at the Rules Committee is: Let's get it right.

If the President is saying that we are not going to do this until we figure out everything that went wrong, I agree with him 100 percent. More importantly, the American people agree with that. They want this fixed. They don't want anything done on this until we get to the bottom of everything that took place in the Comey FBI.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ). Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT). The judge is my good friend and fellow Judiciary Committee member.

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, one of the advantages we have seen from having a typed speech is you don't forget things like I often do that are important points, but one of the weaknesses is you can't respond to the myriad of points that somebody just made explaining why we need massive reform to the FISA bill and the information that has come out.

Now, I got here 15 years ago, and I was part of the reauthorization back in those days. We got lied to by the Justice Department about how this would be used. They came back in the private meetings: Oh, we don't go after Americans.

We have seen from the information that has come out in recent weeks that they do exactly what they told us by behind closed doors they never did.

This thing needs to be massively reformed.

What happened in the last 24 hours? Something called a Rules Committee, and it wouldn't allow our reforms. It wouldn't allow this body to vote on important reforms.

Go reread the Fourth Amendment. We are not supposed to authorize searches and seizures against Americans without the proper due process, without a probable cause, and without particularly describing the places to be searched and what to be seized. And the FISA court has violated that.

Oh, some say, we just add an amicus in there and that will take care of it.

The FISA judges did not even have the honor of their courts after finding out they were lied to repeatedly and fraud was committed against them to do something about it. That tells you we need massive reform.

A vote to go to conference is a total abdication of this body's job to put out a good bill that does reform.

Madam Speaker, I ask everybody, vote "no" to go to conference so that we can force this House to do its job.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, let me just say, first of all, of course, much of what the distinguished gentleman from Ohio said is fiction, as we all know.

But, second of all, this bill as of yesterday noon was supported by Republicans and was supported by the gentleman from Ohio as making sufficient reforms, as making the reforms that we all recognize we need in the FISA system.

Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), who is the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, this is testimony dated 5/27/2020. I am going to read you some passages from that testimony:

"Thank you for the opportunity to talk about this important legislation."

I will go down, skip a couple of paragraphs. Perhaps he will want to point those out.

"Fortunately," the gentleman said, "this bill makes important structural reforms to the program to combat abuses."

He then said: "Most importantly, this bill includes accountability measures."

He went on to say: "It also includes reforms that strengthen Congress' oversight powers."

"Finally," he said, "I would like to thank Senators Lee and Leahy for their amendment to the House-passed bill which strengthens the amicus role in these proceedings by extending them to any sensitive investigative matter involving any U.S. persons. And I also fully support this inclusion as well of the Lofgren-Davidson amendment," which is not on the bill, "to limit the FBI's ability to obtain internet browsing history of Americans."

I am trying to find a word of opposition to this bill, clearly, taken by the Rules Committee as support of the passage of this bill.

My, my, my. As I have pointed out earlier, the consequences of a twinkling of a tweet from the President of the United States: Like that, changing the votes of 126 people, whom I believed voted on principle and on conviction for this bill for America.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, let me first point out, I already said that

I supported the legislation. I said that, but I also said we could make it better. And the President, in light of what we have learned in the last 2 months—we need to make it better. I think we can do that.

We should never forget the President of the United States plays a pretty important role. In fact, he has to sign the bills, last time I checked, so his position does have real impact.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the great State of Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON).

Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, as the majority leader well knows better than most of us in the room, for a bill to become law, the President of the United States must sign it, and he has made clear that he is not going to sign this product. So, it is a complete waste of everyone's time to send over a bill that has no chance to become law.

Rather than make this bill better, rather than make this bill something that could become law, we are going to run out the clock on more broken process. Why are we going to do that? We are going to do that because the people who are working to preserve the broken status quo of warrantless spying on American citizens want to keep that status quo in place.

So, rather than allow real reform, we have had a process that bypassed the Judiciary Committee. When Chairman NADLER realized he didn't have the votes to move his own product through the committee, he pulled the whole committee process. In a committee process, amendments would be able to be offered, and because they knew the amendments would be offered in accordance with the rules of the House and would be adopted if they were given a chance to vote, they had to pull it.

So, they didn't run it through the committee. The people who are represented by all 435 of us in this body had no chance to have their voices heard in a regular process. Leadership jammed through this broken bill to try to put some window dressing of reform on it.

Some of them are important; they are better than the status quo. But they are just modest reforms. That is why they had so much support from the people who want to preserve it. Then, when there was a real reform, you saw that drop off. Then, when there was the Lofgren-Davidson amendment that really would reform it and stop warrantless spying on Americans' internet browser data, when it was spying on Americans, they stopped it—not a single vote on an amendment in the people's House of the United States of America to preserve and protect the freedoms guaranteed in the Fourth Amendment.

Yes, we must make our Nation secure. But we must do it constitutionally in full compliance with the

Bill of Rights. No one is exempt, Article I, Article II, or Article III.

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

Madam Speaker, I listened to the distinguished gentleman a moment ago: We shouldn't pass any legislation that the President won't sign.

The King of England used to have the royal prerogative, an absolute veto. The President of the United States does not.

This House and the Senate should do its job and pass proper legislation, and let the President do his job. We had two-thirds of the votes in this House for this bill.

Yes, the gentleman from Ohio mentions the Lofgren-Davidson amendment. I support that amendment. If we had gone forward, we could have gone with it. But the fact of the matter is, they have withdrawn their support because of the President's tweet, and for no other reason, we are where we are now.

To preserve the ability to have the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act and preserve national security as well as the improvements in the act embodied in this bill and in the Senate version of the bill that improves security while improving privacy protections against surveillance, we must approve this motion to go to conference.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I repeat what I said before. We have a choice. The Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, as everybody agrees, is not in good shape. FISA is necessary to preserve the security of the United States. I think everyone agrees with that. But we need improvements to FISA to make sure that while we protect the security of the United States against foreign aggression and foreign subversion, such as the Russian attempt to subvert our elections 4 years ago, we also must improve FISA to provide greater protections against unwarranted surveillance and provide greater protections for American civil liberties and privacy.

This bill does that. It may not do it as much as some people want, but it goes a heck of a lot further than what we have now. This bill must be passed if we are going to have the protections of civil liberties that we want.

Madam Speaker, this bill is a decent balance. I urge its adoption. To do that, we have to go to conference. I urge the adoption of the motion to go to conference, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. DEGETTE). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 965, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 284, nays 122, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 115]

YEAS—284

Adams	Espallat	Luria
Aguilar	Evans	Lynch
Allred	Ferguson	Malinowski
Axne	Finkenauer	Maloney
Bacon	Fitzpatrick	Carolyn B.
Baird	Fletcher	Maloney, Sean
Balderson	Foster	Matsui
Barr	Fox (NC)	McAdams
Bass	Frankel	McBath
Beatty	Fudge	McCarthy
Bera	Gallagher	McCaul
Bergman	Gallego	McCollum
Beyer	Garamendi	McEachin
Bishop (GA)	Garcia (CA)	McGovern
Blunt Rochester	Garcia (TX)	McKinley
Bonamici	Gomez	McNerney
Bost	Gonzalez (OH)	Meeks
Boyle, Brendan	Gonzalez (TX)	Mfume
F.	Gottheimer	Moore
Brady	Graves (GA)	Morelle
Brindisi	Graves (LA)	Moulton
Brown (MD)	Graves (MO)	Mucarsel-Powell
Brownley (CA)	Green, Al (TX)	Murphy (FL)
Bustos	Grijalva	Murphy (NC)
Butterfield	Grothman	Nadler
Calvert	Haaland	Napolitano
Carbajal	Harder (CA)	Neal
Cárdenas	Hartzler	Neguse
Carson (IN)	Hastings	Newhouse
Cartwright	Hayes	Norcross
Case	Heck	Nunes
Casten (IL)	Higgins (NY)	O'Halleran
Castor (FL)	Hill (AR)	Pallone
Castro (TX)	Himes	Panetta
Chabot	Holding	Pappas
Cheney	Horn, Kendra S.	Pascarell
Cicilline	Horsford	Payne
Cisneros	Houlahan	Pelosi
Clark (MA)	Hoyer	Perlmutter
Clay	Hudson	Peters
Cleaver	Huffman	Peterson
Clyburn	Huizenga	Phillips
Cohen	Hurd (TX)	Pingree
Cole	Jackson Lee	Porter
Collins (GA)	Jeffries	Price (NC)
Conaway	Johnson (GA)	Quigley
Connolly	Johnson (SD)	Raskin
Cook	Johnson (TX)	Reed
Cooper	Joyce (OH)	Rice (NY)
Correa	Kaptur	Richmond
Courtney	Katko	Roby
Cox (CA)	Keating	Rogers (AL)
Craig	Kelly (IL)	Rose (NY)
Crenshaw	Kildee	Rouda
Crist	Kilmer	Rouzer
Crow	Kind	Roybal-Allard
Cuellar	King (NY)	Ruiz
Cunningham	Kinzinger	Ruppersberger
Curtis	Kirkpatrick	Rush
Davids (KS)	Krishnamoorthi	Rutherford
Davis (CA)	Kuster (NH)	Ryan
Davis, Danny K.	Kustoff (TN)	Sánchez
Davis, Rodney	Lamb	Sarbanes
Dean	Langevin	Scalise
DeFazio	Larsen (WA)	Scanlon
DeGette	Larson (CT)	Schakowsky
DeLauro	Lawrence	Schiff
DeBene	Lawson (FL)	Schneider
Delgado	Lee (NV)	Schrader
Demings	Levin (CA)	Schrier
DeSaulnier	Levin (MI)	Scott (VA)
Deutch	Lewis	Scott, Austin
Diaz-Balart	Lieu, Ted	Scott, David
Dingell	Lipinski	Serrano
Doggett	Loeb sack	Sewell (AL)
Doyle, Michael	Lofgren	Shalala
F.	Lowe	Sherman
Escobar	Lucas	Sherrill
Eshoo	Luján	Shimkus

Simpson	Thompson (MS)	Wagner
Sires	Thornberry	Walberg
Slotkin	Timmons	Waltz
Smith (NJ)	Titus	Wasserman
Smith (WA)	Tonko	Schultz
Soto	Torres (CA)	Waters
Spanberger	Torres Small	Watson Coleman
Speier	(NM)	Webster (FL)
Stanton	Trahan	Welch
Stefanik	Trone	Wenstrup
Steil	Turner	Weston
Stevens	Underwood	Wild
Stewart	Upton	Wilson (FL)
Stivers	Vargas	Womack
Suozzi	Veasey	Woodall
Swalwell (CA)	Vela	Yarmuth
Taylor	Velázquez	
Thompson (CA)	Visclosky	

NAYS—122

Aderholt	Gohmert	Mullin
Allen	Golden	Norman
Amash	Gooden	Ocasio-Cortez
Amodei	Gosar	Omar
Armstrong	Green (TN)	Palazzo
Arrington	Griffith	Palmer
Babin	Guest	Pence
Banks	Guthrie	Perry
Barragán	Hagedorn	Pocan
Biggs	Harris	Posey
Bilirakis	Herrera Beutler	Pressley
Bishop (NC)	Hice (GA)	Reschenthaler
Bishop (UT)	Higgins (LA)	Rice (SC)
Blumenauer	Jayapal	Riggleman
Brooks (AL)	Johnson (LA)	Rodgers (WA)
Buck	Johnson (OH)	Roe, David P.
Bucshon	Jordan	Rogers (KY)
Budd	Joyce (PA)	Rose, John W.
Burchett	Keller	Roy
Burgess	Kelly (MS)	Schweikert
Byrne	Kelly (PA)	Smith (MO)
Carter (GA)	Kennedy	Smith (NE)
Chu, Judy	Khanna	Smucker
Clarke (NY)	Kim	Spano
Cline	King (IA)	Stauber
Cloud	Latta	Takano
Comer	Lee (CA)	Thompson (PA)
Davidson (OH)	Lesko	Tiffany
DesJarlais	Long	Tipton
Duncan	Loudermilk	Tlaib
Emmer	Lowenthal	Van Drew
Engel	Luetkemeyer	Watkins
Estes	Marshall	Weber (TX)
Fleischmann	Massie	Westerman
Flores	Mast	Williams
Fortenberry	McClintock	Wilson (SC)
Fulcher	Meng	Wittman
Gabbard	Meuser	Wright
Gaetz	Miller	Yoho
Garcia (IL)	Moolenaar	Zeldin
Gianforte	Mooney (WV)	

NOT VOTING—25

Abraham	Hern, Kevin	Rooney (FL)
Brooks (IN)	Hollingsworth	Sensenbrenner
Buchanan	LaHood	Steube
Carter (TX)	LaMalfa	Walden
Costa	Lamborn	Walker
Crawford	Marchant	Walorski
Dunn	McHenry	Young
Gibbs	Mitchell	
Granger	Olson	

□ 1510

Mses. HERRERA BEUTLER, OCASIO-CORTEZ, Messrs. GUTHRIE, and KIM changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. BALDERSON and CONAWAY changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. YOUNG. Madam Speaker, I was unable to vote on May 28, 2020. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on rollcall No. 115, a motion to disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to go to conference on H.R. 6172.



Mr. ABRAHAM. Madam Speaker, on Thursday, May 28, I was unavoidably detained on rollcall vote No. 115. Had I been present to vote, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall vote No. 115.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE  
RESOLUTION 965, 116TH CONGRESS

Barragán (Gallego)	Hastings (Wasserman Schultz)	Napolitano (Correa)
Bass (Cicilline)	Heck (Kilmer)	Payne (Wasserman Schultz)
Bera (Aguilar)	Horsford (Kildee)	Peters (Rice (NY))
Blumenauer (Beyer)	Huffman (Kildee)	Pingree (Kuster (NH))
Bonamici (Raskin)	Jayapal (Raskin)	Pocan (Raskin)
Brownley (CA)	Johnson (TX)	Porter (Wexton)
(Kuster (NH))	(Jeffries)	Price (NC)
Cárdenas (Sánchez)	Khanna (Sherman)	(Butterfield)
Chu, Judy (Takano)	Kirkpatrick (Gallego)	Roybal-Allard (Sánchez)
Cisneros (Houlahan)	Krishnamoorthi (Brown (MD))	Ruiz (Aguilar)
Cohen (Beyer)	Lawrence (Kildee)	Rush
Crist (Murphy (FL))	Lawson (FL)	(Underwood)
Davis (CA) (Wild)	(Evans)	Schneider (Houlahan)
DeSaulnier (Matsui)	Levin (CA)	Schrader (O'Halleran)
Deutch (Rice (NY))	(Kildee)	Schrier (Kilmer)
Doggett (Raskin)	Levin (MI)	Serrano (Meng)
Escobar (Garcia (TX))	(Raskin)	Speier (Scanlon)
Eshoo (Thompson (CA))	Lewis (Kildee)	Suozi (Panetta)
Foster (Beyer)	Lieu, Ted (Beyer)	Talb (Dingell)
Frankel (Kuster (NH))	Lipinski (Cooper)	Tonko (Meng)
Garamendi (Sherman)	Loftgren (Boyle, Brendan F.)	Trahan (McGovern)
Gonzalez (TX)	Lowenthal (Beyer)	Vargas (Keating)
(Cuellar)	Lowey (Meng)	Veasey (Beyer)
Grijalva (Clay)	Maloney, Carolyn B. (Rose (NY))	Vela (Gallego)
Harder (CA)	McEachin (Wexton)	Watson Coleman (Pallone)
(Haaland)	McNerney (Raskin)	Welch (McGovern)
	Moore (Beyer)	Wilson (FL)
	Mucarsel-Powell (Wasserman Schultz)	(Hayes)

On his 25th combat mission in Vietnam, he was shot down, severely injured, and spent the next 7 years as a prisoner of war in the prison known as the Hanoi Hilton.

Many Members have read his book "Captive Warriors," which describes the hellish conditions and the courage and fortitude of Sam and his fellow prisoners as they fought to survive.

After serving in the Texas State House, Sam was elected to Congress in 1990 and served until January 2019, including, for a time, as acting chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

He now goes to join his wonderful wife, Shirley, and his son, Bob.

Madam Speaker, I know of no one in the House who was more universally admired across the Chamber than Sam Johnson.

Sam sacrificed much in service of our Nation, but always with courage and good humor and a deep, deep love of country.

He inspired those of us who worked with him, and his memory will continue to be an inspiration to follow his example of service, sacrifice, and love of country.

Madam Speaker, I ask that the House observe a moment of silence in memory and in honor of this great American.

The SPEAKER. Will all Members please rise, and those who are in their offices and staff throughout the Capitol, for a moment of silence in honor of our dear Sam.

□ 1515

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, as we face the crisis that COVID-19 has confronted us with, the House must do its duty in full and do so in a way that contributes to the safety and welfare of our people, not in a way that harms it.

Members are advised there will be no votes expected in the House next week. Members are further advised that an updated 2020 legislative calendar will be released in the coming days.

I expect conversations to continue on additional legislation addressing COVID-19 and the legislation we passed honoring our heroes. In the event that an agreement is reached on a bipartisan or partisan bill—I don't know how an agreement can be reached on a partisan bill, but a bipartisan bill—then we will make sure that the House has 72 hours before they need to come back to vote on that legislation.

I am disappointed that Leader MCCONNELL said, when asked about the next phase of coronavirus relief, he said, I think that's a decision to be made a month from now.

As we know, we have a lot of people in crisis. We see food lines that are very, very long. We see unemployment rising steeply. There are many people

in this country that think waiting is not appropriate.

I am pleased the House has adopted a resolution to allow the committees to work remotely, Madam Speaker. I expect to use the coming weeks to get our committees back up and running so that they can begin having hearings and markups on critical legislation.

As my friend, Mr. SCALISE, knows, we have a number of must-pass bills that need to be addressed; the National Defense Authorization Act, the 12 appropriation bills, the surface transportation bill, and the WRDA bill as well. As committees begin consideration of these bills, I will be in touch with Members about when they will be scheduled this summer.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the minority whip.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend from Maryland for walking through those items.

I first want to start by sharing and associating myself with the comments made by my friend from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) about the loss of our dear friend, Sam Johnson.

Sam and I got to be close friends, and I can picture him sitting right over there by General Lafayette's painting, in his scooter, as he was voting and sharing stories with friends in his last few months when he served here with us with distinction for so long, and the conversations and just the understanding of a giant that we served with, someone who served our country, spent 7 years in the Hanoi Hilton, as we talked about.

They never broke him. They probably broke every bone in his body trying, but he and those other brave men in that prison never once faltered in their love and dedication to our country and to their family.

He missed his wife. We know now he is with her and in a special place, and we are all better for having served with Sam Johnson. He truly is missed and was a special friend.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I want to echo the gentleman's comments. Although the Congressman, the patriot, the hero, did not always vote with me, nor I with him, we became good friends. And I shared with the gentleman and others in this body a deep respect for who he was as a person, a decent man, a patriotic man, a good man and, obviously, as the gentleman pointed out, a very courageous man as well.

He served many missions, was shot down, imprisoned, but they did not break Sam Johnson, nor did they break the love he had for his country, and we honor the service he gave.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the Speaker as well for leading that tribute, and I am sure at some time in the future we will spend an appropriate amount of time here on the floor where colleagues can share

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON  
H.R. 6172, USA FREEDOM REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2020

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees on H.R. 6172:

Messrs. NADLER, SCHIFF, Ms. LOFGREN, Messrs. JORDAN, and NUNES.

There was no objection.

MOMENT OF SILENCE HONORING  
REPRESENTATIVE SAM JOHNSON

(Mr. THORNBERRY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. THORNBERRY. Madam Speaker, yesterday, we lost a former colleague, a patriot, and a true American hero.

Calling the gentleman from Texas, Sam Johnson, a hero is not some sort of inflated rhetoric or hyperbole; it is the best description I know of Sam Johnson and his life.

Born in San Antonio, raised in Dallas, a graduate of SMU, Sam then served 29 years in the United States Air Force.

He was a fighter pilot, and some of those fighter pilot traits came through in everything he did, from how fast he drove across the highways of Texas to the way he approached legislation.

Sam was a veteran of the Korean conflict and, of course, the Vietnam war.