

future. It gives them a sense of ownership, and it ties them to the Constitution because intellectual property certainly is part of their constitutional privilege, constitutional rights, and constitutional protection.

Property rights are very important, and that is what intellectual property is. It builds on Congress' work to encourage the creativity of our Nation's youth with the establishment of the Congressional Art Competition and the Congressional App Challenge. Year after year, in both of these competitions, the talent of students displayed is remarkable. I know it well in the candidates that I have seen and the choices that our arts committee in Houston in the 18th Congressional District has made. They are brilliant, and the apps are equally so.

Year after year, in both of these competitions, we see outstanding work. Through both, we continue to see our youth encouraged to develop their artistic and technical talents as Congress intended.

The ARTS Act makes these competitions even more impactful. Under the bill, the students may apply to register a copyright for their winning work or winning app for free. This introduces these students to the intellectual property system and the benefits of copyright protection—again, a constitutional right.

Under current law, the Register of Copyrights cannot waive these fees on her own. The ARTS Act amends the Copyright Act to allow such a fee waiver for these specific circumstances. Building the farm team, again, is so very important.

Once again, I applaud the sponsors of the bill for bringing forward this important legislation, which will aid the next generation of creators and innovators.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support passage, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 169, the Artistic Recognition for Talented Students Act.

The Constitution authorizes Congress "to promote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries."

Our copyright system is designed to help fulfill that mandate by promoting the work of authors, musicians, artists, and other creators.

Creative industries contribute hundreds of billions of dollars to the U.S. economy every year. This bill makes it easier for some of our brightest young creators to obtain copyrights on their award-winning work. This is essentially the same as the bill that passed the House under suspension of the rules last year.

Promoting and encouraging the next generation of American creators en-

sures that our creative economy will remain strong for decades to come.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, again, S. 169 is a short but important bill that promotes education and awareness of intellectual property to the next generation of creators. What an outstanding way to build the farm team, to create a buy-in by the young geniuses of our time, both in terms of the apps and arts and many other aspects.

Again, we recognize the constitutional connection to the idea of property, copyright, intellectual property, and it is important for young people to learn early on and to be protective of the genius of America.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. Speaker, S. 169, the "Artistic Recognition for Talented Students Act" or the "ARTS Act," would help introduce promising young students who have won either the Congressional Art Competition or the Congressional App Challenge to the intellectual property system by waiving the fee for those students to apply for a copyright registration for their winning work.

I applaud my colleague, Mr. JEFFRIES, for introducing the House version of this bipartisan, bicameral legislation with Ms. MACE, along with several of my colleagues on the Judiciary Committee, including Intellectual Property Subcommittee Chairman JOHNSON and Ranking Member ISSA, Mr. CICILLINE, and Ms. SPARTZ.

This bill was passed under suspension last year. We are pleased today to take up passage of the Senate version of the bill, championed by Senators LEAHY and TILLIS, so that the bill will pass both chambers and become law.

We in this Chamber know just how important intellectual property rights are to our country and our economy. Yet studies show that awareness of intellectual property is lacking among the country's students, even if they pursue fields that are IP-intensive. The ARTS Act helps close this awareness gap early on and allows these students to participate in the intellectual property system without a financial burden.

It builds on Congress's work to encourage the creativity of our nation's youth with the establishment of the Congressional Art Competition and the Congressional App Challenge more.

Year after year, in both of these competitions, the talent our students display is remarkable. Through both, we continue to see our youth encouraged to develop their artistic and technical talents, as Congress intended.

The ARTS Act makes these competitions even more impactful. Under the bill, students may apply to register a copyright for their winning artwork or winning app for free. This introduces these students to the intellectual property system and the benefits of copyright protection.

Under current law, the Register of Copyrights cannot waive these fees on her own. The ARTS Act amends the Copyright Act to allow such a fee waiver for these specific circumstances.

Once again, I applaud the sponsors of the bill for bringing this important legislation forward, which will aid the next generation of creators and innovators.

I urge my colleagues to support its passage.

Mr. Speaker, S. 169 is a short but important bill that will promote education and awareness of intellectual property to the next generation of creators. I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 169.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROTECT REPORTERS FROM EXPLOITATIVE STATE SPYING ACT

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4330) to maintain the free flow of information to the public by establishing appropriate limits on the federally compelled disclosure of information obtained as part of engaging in journalism, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4330

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 "Protect Reporters from Exploitative State Spying Act" or the "PRESS Act".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **COVERED JOURNALIST.**—The term "covered journalist" means a person who regularly gathers, prepares, collects, photographs, records, writes, edits, reports, investigates, or publishes news or information that concerns local, national, or international events or other matters of public interest for dissemination to the public.

(2) **COVERED SERVICE PROVIDER.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term "covered service provider" means any person that, by an electronic means, stores, processes, or transmits information in order to provide a service to customers of the person.

(B) **INCLUSIONS.**—The term "covered service provider" includes—

(i) a telecommunications carrier and a provider of an information service (as such terms are defined in section 3 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 153));

(ii) a provider of an interactive computer service and an information content provider (as such terms are defined in section 230 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 230));

(iii) a provider of remote computing service (as defined in section 2711 of title 18, United States Code); and

(iv) a provider of electronic communication service (as defined in section 2510 of title 18, United States Code) to the public.

(3) **DOCUMENT.**—The term "document" means writings, recordings, and photographs, as those terms are defined by Federal Rule of Evidence 1001 (28 U.S.C. App.).

(4) **FEDERAL ENTITY.**—The term "Federal entity" means an entity or employee of the judicial

or executive branch or an administrative agency of the Federal Government with the power to issue a subpoena or issue other compulsory process.

(5) **JOURNALISM.**—The term “journalism” means gathering, preparing, collecting, photographing, recording, writing, editing, reporting, investigating, or publishing news or information that concerns local, national, or international events or other matters of public interest for dissemination to the public.

(6) **PERSONAL ACCOUNT OF A COVERED JOURNALIST.**—The term “personal account of a covered journalist” means an account with a covered service provider used by a covered journalist that is not provided, administered, or operated by the employer of the covered journalist.

(7) **PERSONAL TECHNOLOGY DEVICE OF A COVERED JOURNALIST.**—The term “personal technology device of a covered journalist” means a handheld communications device, laptop computer, desktop computer, or other internet-connected device used by a covered journalist that is not provided or administered by the employer of the covered journalist.

(8) **PROTECTED INFORMATION.**—The term “protected information” means any information identifying a source who provided information as part of engaging in journalism, and any records, contents of a communication, documents, or information that a covered journalist obtained or created as part of engaging in journalism.

SEC. 3. LIMITS ON COMPELLED DISCLOSURE FROM COVERED JOURNALISTS.

In any matter arising under Federal law, a Federal entity may not compel a covered journalist to disclose protected information, unless a court in the judicial district in which the subpoena or other compulsory process is, or will be, issued determines by a preponderance of the evidence, after providing notice and an opportunity to be heard to the covered journalist that—

(1) disclosure of the protected information is necessary to prevent, or to identify any perpetrator of, an act of terrorism against the United States; or

(2) disclosure of the protected information is necessary to prevent a threat of imminent violence, significant bodily harm, or death, including specified offenses against a minor (as defined by section 111(7) of the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (34 U.S.C. 20911(7))).

SEC. 4. LIMITS ON COMPELLED DISCLOSURE FROM COVERED SERVICE PROVIDERS.

(a) **CONDITIONS FOR COMPELLED DISCLOSURE.**—In any matter arising under Federal law, a Federal entity may not compel a covered service provider to provide testimony or any document consisting of any record, information, or other communications stored by a covered provider on behalf of a covered journalist, including testimony or any document relating to a personal account of a covered journalist or a personal technology device of a covered journalist, unless a court in the judicial district in which the subpoena or other compulsory process is, or will be, issued determines by a preponderance of the evidence that there is a reasonable threat of imminent violence unless the testimony or document is provided, and issues an order authorizing the Federal entity to compel the disclosure of the testimony or document.

(b) **NOTICE TO COURT.**—A Federal entity seeking to compel the provision of testimony or any document described in subsection (a) shall inform the court that the testimony or document relates to a covered journalist.

(c) **NOTICE TO COVERED JOURNALIST AND OPPORTUNITY TO BE HEARD.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—A court may authorize a Federal entity to compel the provision of testimony or a document under this section only after the Federal entity seeking the testimony or document provides the covered journalist on be-

half of whom the testimony or document is stored pursuant to subsection (a)—

(A) notice of the subpoena or other compulsory request for such testimony or document from the covered service provider not later than the time at which such subpoena or request is issued to the covered service provider; and

(B) an opportunity to be heard before the court before the time at which the provision of the testimony or document is compelled.

(2) **EXCEPTION TO NOTICE REQUIREMENT.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Notice and an opportunity to be heard under paragraph (1) may be delayed for not more than 45 days if the court involved determines there is clear and convincing evidence that such notice would pose a clear and substantial threat to the integrity of a criminal investigation, or would present an imminent risk of death or serious bodily harm, including specified offenses against a minor (as defined by section 111(7) of the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (34 U.S.C. 20911(7))).

(B) **EXTENSIONS.**—The 45-day period described in subparagraph (A) may be extended by the court for additional periods of not more than 45 days if the court involved makes a new and independent determination that there is clear and convincing evidence that providing notice to the covered journalist would pose a clear and substantial threat to the integrity of a criminal investigation, or would present an imminent risk of death or serious bodily harm under current circumstances.

SEC. 5. LIMITATION ON CONTENT OF INFORMATION.

The content of any testimony, document, or protected information that is compelled under sections 3 or 4 shall—

(1) not be overbroad, unreasonable, or oppressive, and as appropriate, be limited to the purpose of verifying published information or describing any surrounding circumstances relevant to the accuracy of such published information; and

(2) be narrowly tailored in subject matter and period of time covered so as to avoid compelling the production of peripheral, nonessential, or speculative information.

SEC. 6. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed to—

(1) apply to civil defamation, slander, or libel claims or defenses under State law, regardless of whether or not such claims or defenses, respectively, are raised in a State or Federal court; or

(2) prevent the Federal Government from pursuing an investigation of a covered journalist or organization that is—

(A) suspected of committing a crime;

(B) a witness to a crime unrelated to engaging in journalism;

(C) suspected of being an agent of a foreign power, as defined in section 101 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801);

(D) an individual or organization designated under Executive Order 13224 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note; relating to blocking property and prohibiting transactions with persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism);

(E) a specially designated terrorist, as that term is defined in section 595.311 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor thereto); or

(F) a terrorist organization, as that term is defined in section 212(a)(3)(B)(vi)(II) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(3)(B)(vi)(II)).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. FITZGERALD) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Mem-

bers may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 4330.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

□ 1700

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4330, the Protect Reporters from Exploitative State Spying Act, or the PRESS Act.

The PRESS Act would create a strong but qualified Federal statutory privilege that protects journalists from being compelled by the Federal Government to reveal confidential sources and information.

Additionally, the bill prohibits the Federal Government from compelling an electronic service provider that stores a journalist's information to disclose that information, as well as information relating to the journalist's personal account or technology device, to the government unless a court determines that there is a reasonable threat of imminent violence absent the information's disclosure and subject to other requirements and certain specified exceptions.

H.R. 4330 is necessary and long-overdue legislation.

Over the past several decades, Presidential administrations of both parties have attempted to crack down on leaks of classified information to media outlets, and these investigations have included efforts to obtain journalists' records. For example, just last year, The Washington Post, The New York Times, and CNN reported that the Department of Justice under the Trump administration sought the information and records of their reporters.

The most sacred part of our freedom includes the protection and freedom of the press. That is embedded in the Constitution in our First Amendment in the Bill of Rights, so to hear and to see that glaring infraction shows us the necessity of this legislation before us.

In addition, during the Obama administration, the Department reportedly searched FOX News reporter James Rosen's emails and even listed him as a coconspirator in an Espionage Act case it brought against a source of the leaked information.

These and other recent episodes illustrate the need for stronger Federal protections for journalists and their sources.

The truth is cleansing. The truth is democracy.

Indeed, 40 States and the District of Columbia have enacted press shield laws, while other States afford similar privileges through their State constitution of common law.

Moreover, there has been longstanding and bipartisan support in Congress for Federal protections. In

2005, former Vice President Mike Pence, when he was a Member of this body, first introduced the Free Flow of Information Act, which was very similar in concept to H.R. 4330. That legislation subsequently passed the House twice in the 110th and the 111th Congresses, the first time by 398–21, and the second time by voice vote. Unfortunately, the Senate never took action on these bills, but I am pleased that efforts to advance a Federal reporters shield bill continue in the House today.

Again, we must stand for liberty. It is my hope that the Senate will finally take up this important issue.

I thank Congressmen JAMIE RASKIN, TED LIEU, and JOHN YARMUTH for their work on the PRESS Act. I also thank the Judiciary Committee ranking member, JIM JORDAN, for his support.

The need for this legislation is as great, if not greater, than when it was first introduced in an earlier form many years ago.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to vote “yes” on this important bipartisan legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, there is a reason why the Founders chose to enshrine the freedoms of the press in the First Amendment to the Constitution. It is an important part of a functional and informed democracy.

Over the years, versions of this bill have received widespread support from across the political spectrum. In fact, the first version of this bill was introduced by none other than Vice President Pence when he was a Member of this body.

Liberty depends on the freedom of the press. Good reporters are committed to holding our government accountable. A critical aspect of the freedom of the press is the pursuit of truth without intimidation or coercion from the government.

Administrations of both parties have unjustly targeted journalists, but none more so in recent years than the Obama administration. The Obama administration's control on the flow of information has been described as “the most aggressive . . . since the Nixon administration.”

The Biden administration isn't proving to be much better.

In a free country, we need to make sure that the government cannot unmask journalists' sources without good cause. This bill provides those protections and recognizes the importance of independent journalism to our country.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN), the author of the PRESS Act, who has been persistent in his commitment to civil liberties as an important member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding and for her very distinguished and passionate advocacy for civil liberties and civil rights. I thank her for her excellent management of this legislation. I also thank the floor leader on the minority side for his excellent words on the legislation, as well.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my bill, H.R. 4330, the Protect Reporters from Exploitative State Spying Act, or the PRESS Act, which I introduced with Congressmen LIEU and YARMUTH. It is a close successor to the bill that then-Congressman Mike Pence got passed in the House in the 110th Congress by a lopsided vote of 398–21.

Given that the bill passed unanimously in the Judiciary Committee earlier this year, I am very hopeful that this is the Congress in which we can get it done.

Our Founders insisted that the American people must have the means to acquire the truth about their own government, their society, and their world. Those “who mean to be their own governors,” said Madison, “must arm themselves with the power which knowledge gives.”

Newspapers were critical, a form of continuing public education about government and about society. Thomas Jefferson said: “If it were left to me to decide whether we should have a government without newspapers or newspapers without a government, I should not hesitate a moment to prefer the latter.”

The great Tom Paine not only defended but demonstrated the power of the pen as the people's weapon against political tyranny. His sensationally successful pamphlet “Common Sense” argued the central importance of free speech and free press to the survival of political democracy.

In theory, the specific command in the First Amendment that Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of the press was unnecessary because press freedom would already, by definition, be subsumed under the freedom of speech. The Framers insisted upon protecting the structurally distinctive role that the press plays as a watchdog institution in a representative democratic society.

Not everyone can go to congressional hearings or State legislative sessions or county council meetings late into the night. Not all of us can travel to Ukraine to uncover Russian war crimes against the people there or go to Afghanistan to see what it means to have theocratic tyranny oppressing the people. Not everyone can personally go get the Pentagon Papers or break the Watergate scandal or penetrate crime and drug trafficking rings or see with their own eyes how climate change is ravaging the Louisiana coast or Pakistan. As citizens of the United States, we are all equally implicated and affected by these developments, and we are all equally invested in obtaining the truth about them. This is why we need professional journalists and newspapers.

Yet, reporters in our country face violence, threats, intimidation, and even jail time just for doing their jobs, providing news and information.

The Committee to Protect Journalists reported that journalists in the United States faced unprecedented attacks in 2020. At least 110 reporters were arrested or criminally charged in relation to their reporting, and around 300 were assaulted in 2020 alone.

Many families in my State of Maryland are still reeling from the mass shooting at the Capital Gazette newspaper in Annapolis, which took the lives of five different journalists and injured several others in 2018.

Lots of reporters face harsh legal consequences just for reporting and then faithfully maintaining the confidentiality of sources.

One journalist who faced repercussions simply for doing his job I know well—Brian Karem, one of my constituents. In 1990 and 1991, he went to jail four different times to protect confidential sources while working as a TV reporter. The last time, he went to jail for nearly 2 weeks while the Supreme Court considered his case, and he was only spared a long sentence when his source moved from Texas to California and, no longer fearing for her life, came forward.

Now more than ever, we need to make good on the constitutional promise of a free press by establishing a Federal shield law to protect journalists against government overreach and prosecutorial abuses that may occur from one administration to the next.

The PRESS Act is an update of the Free Flow of Information Act that I introduced with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN), the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, in the 115th Congress. It will prevent Federal law enforcement from being able to obtain information from covered journalists through their work devices and accounts, as well as their personal devices and accounts. It will also prevent government officials from conducting an end run around these prohibitions by precluding them from seeking third-party communications held by communications services, except in narrow and carefully cabined exceptional instances.

America favors shield laws to protect the media because our people know that the press is not the enemy of the people. The press is the people's best friend.

Forty-nine States and Washington, D.C., have already passed State shield laws or adopted some kind of reporter's privilege of their own. What better evidence could we have that the American people want a free and aggressive press to expose corruption and safeguard democracy?

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I fervently hope that my colleagues on both

sides of the aisle—indeed, every Member of the House of Representatives—will rise to support this bill, the successor to our 2017 bipartisan bill and the successor to the bill that then-Congressman, now-Vice President Mike Pence navigated to victory in the House on a vote of 398-21 15 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her indulgence.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I would inform you and my colleague from Texas that I have no further speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me just comment, as I determine whether we have any further speakers, that this protection of the First Amendment rights of our journalists are so crucial, and this legislation enjoys bipartisan support.

We have already made the point that we have found some offense of this in bipartisan officeholders, government, so I think it is important, in the spirit of harmony today, that we choose no President to suggest one was more so than the others, and I can't think of any comparison to the previous administration. But, today, we are standing here and wanting to bring people together around the importance of ensuring that the press is protected and shielded, that the truth is cleansing, and that the truth is heard.

Clearly, in the Trump administration, the truth was challenged, and we are grateful that the press stood tall.

I believe this legislation is extremely important to cleanse all persons in public life so that public officials can serve in the spirit of transparency and that journalists can provide the facts to all the people of America.

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

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, H.R. 4330 is a bipartisan effort similar to legislation worked on by Vice President Pence.

□ 1715

The Judiciary Committee reported the bill on a bipartisan basis by voice vote. In addition, H.R. 4330 is supported by numerous civil liberties and journalist organizations, including the American Civil Liberties Union, Demand Progress, the Society of Professional Journalists, the News Media Alliance, the National Association of Broadcasters, the National Press Photographers Association, the Radio Television Digital News Association, the News Leaders Association, MPA—the Association of Magazine Media, the Project for Privacy and Surveillance Accountability, and the Reporters Committee for Freedom of the Press.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4330, the “Protect Reporters from Exploitative State Spying Act” or the “PRESS Act.” The PRESS Act would create a strong, but qualified, federal statutory privilege that protects journalists from being compelled by the federal government to reveal confidential sources and information.

Additionally, the bill prohibits the federal government from compelling an electronic service provider that stores a journalist's information to disclose that information, as well as information relating to the journalist's personal account or technology device, to the government, unless a court determines that there is a reasonable threat of imminent violence absent the information's disclosure, and subject to other requirements and certain specified exceptions.

H.R. 4330 is necessary and long overdue legislation.

Over the past several decades, presidential administrations of both parties have attempted to crack down on leaks of classified information to media outlets, and these investigations have included efforts to obtain journalists' records.

For example, just last year, The Washington Post, The New York Times, and CNN reported that the Department of Justice under the Trump Administration sought the information and records of their reporters.

In addition, during the Obama Administration, the Department reportedly searched Fox News reporter James Rosen's e-mails and even listed him as a co-conspirator in an Espionage Act case that it brought against the source of the leaked information.

These and other recent episodes illustrate the need for stronger federal protections for journalists and their sources.

Indeed, forty states and the District of Columbia have enacted press shield laws, while other states afford similar privileges through their state constitutions and common law.

Moreover, there has been longstanding and bipartisan support in Congress for federal protections.

In 2005, Former Vice President Mike Pence, when he was a member of this body, first introduced the “Free Flow of Information Act,” which was very similar in concept to H.R. 4330. That legislation subsequently passed the House twice, in the 110th and 111th Congresses, the first time by a 398 to 21 vote, and the second time by voice vote.

Unfortunately, the Senate never took action on those bills, but I am pleased that efforts to advance a federal reporters' shield bill continue in the House today. It is my hope that the Senate will finally take up this important issue.

I want to thank Congressmen JAMIE RASKIN, TED LIEU, and JOHN YARMUTH for their work on the PRESS Act. I also thank Judiciary Committee Ranking Member JIM JORDAN for his support.

The need for this legislation is as great, if not greater, than when it was first introduced in its earlier form many years ago.

I urge all my colleagues to vote YES on this important bipartisan legislation.

As I noted earlier, H.R. 4330 and similar federal press shield legislation has long enjoyed strong bipartisan support. The Judiciary Committee reported the bill on a bipartisan basis by voice vote.

In addition, H.R. 4330 is supported by numerous civil liberties and journalists' organiza-

tions, including the American Civil Liberties Union, Demand Progress, the Society of Professional Journalists, the News Media Alliance, the National Association of Broadcasters, the National Press Photographers Association, the Radio Television Digital News Association, the News Leaders Association, MPA—the Association of Magazine Media, the Project for Privacy and Surveillance Accountability, Protect The 1st, and the Reporters Committee for Freedom of the Press.

Given the broad support for the bill and the pressing need for federal protections for journalists and their sources, I urge the House to pass H.R. 4330.

Mr. Speaker, given the broad support of the bill and the pressing need for Federal protections for journalists and their sources, I urge the House to pass H.R. 4330, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4330, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING TITLE 28, UNITED STATES CODE, PROVIDING AN ADDITIONAL PLACE FOR HOLDING COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3034) to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide an additional place for holding court for the Western District of Washington, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3034

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

SECTION 1. ADDITIONAL PLACE FOR HOLDING COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON.

Section 128(b) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting “Mount Vernon,” after “Tacoma,”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. FITZGERALD) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 3034.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.