



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 118<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 170

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, APRIL 12, 2024

No. 63

## Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, April 15, 2024, at 3 p.m.

## House of Representatives

FRIDAY, APRIL 12, 2024

The House met at 8 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. NEWHOUSE).

### DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,  
April 12, 2024.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DAN NEWHOUSE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

MIKE JOHNSON,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

### PRAYER

Reverend Robert Suhr, Christ Church, Mequon, Wisconsin, offered the following prayer:

Holy God, mighty Lord, and gracious Father, You are the sovereign God who is the author of all time. You hold all history in Your righteous and merciful hands. Nations rise and fall by Your will, for Your purposes, and by Your grace.

So in this time and on this day, we humbly call upon You to exercise Your will, to show Your compassion, and to loose Your spirit upon the Members of this sacred body, those near to You and those far from You, that this would not be an ordinary day but an extraordinary day.

Open hearts to hear Your guidance and help their ears to hear the voices of Your will speaking. Let the Members of this House today govern with com-

passion, understanding, and a determination to accomplish that which is good and pleasing in Your sight and that which is good for the people of this Nation.

Holy spirit, we entrust ourselves to You that at the end of this day we may rest in peace and this great Nation will remain a light that shatters the darkness, a city that brightly shines on a hill, and that all nations may see Your handiwork and the work of this body today.

All this we ask relying on Your grace, and we ask through the power of Jesus' holy and precious name.  
Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

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

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

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. NEGUSE led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

### WELCOMING REVEREND ROBERT SUHR

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Pastor Suhr for that wonderful prayer this morning. He and his family have been friends of mine for a long time. His church, as we said, is in Mequon, Wisconsin.

While, sadly for our country, in so many parishes or churches the attendance has been down, he has grown a much bigger church than he found it. It is truly booming, and it is a great success story for Christianity in Mequon.

In any event, again, congratulations to Reverend Suhr. I am so honored to be here today for that prayer.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 7888, REFORMING INTELLIGENCE AND SECURING AMERICA ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 529, EXTENDING LIMITS OF U.S. CUSTOMS WATERS ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 1112, DENOUNCING THE BIDEN ADMINISTRATION'S IMMIGRATION POLICIES; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 1117, OPPOSING EFFORTS TO PLACE ONE-SIDED PRESSURE ON ISRAEL WITH RESPECT TO GAZA

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H2321

up House Resolution 1137 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

#### H. RES. 1137

*Resolved*, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 7888) to reform the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees and the chair and ranking minority member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence or their respective designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. An amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 118-27 shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such further amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 529) to extend the customs waters of the United States from 12 nautical miles to 24 nautical miles from the baselines of the United States, consistent with Presidential Proclamation 7219. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 1112) denouncing the Biden administration's immigration policies. The resolution shall be considered as read.

The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees.

SEC. 4. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 1117) opposing efforts to place one-sided pressure on Israel with respect to Gaza. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs or their respective designees.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 1 hour.

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

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, the committee granted by a recorded vote of 8-4 a rule providing for consideration of the following measures: H.R. 7888, the Reforming Intelligence and Securing America Act; H.R. 529, the Extending Limits of U.S. Customs Waters Act; H. Res. 1112, Denouncing the Biden Administration's Immigration Policies; and H. Res. 1117, Opposing Efforts to Place One-Sided Pressure on Israel With Respect to Gaza.

The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 7888, the Reforming Intelligence and Securing America Act, under a structured rule.

The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule provides 1 hour of general debate equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees and the chair and ranking minority member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence or their respective designees.

Let's talk about the rule for H.R. 7888, the highly anticipated and heavily debated Reforming Intelligence and Securing America Act.

There will be six amendments allowed for this bill, and they break down into three different categories.

There are three amendments from the Judiciary Committee that basically limit or constrain the government in its use of the FISA 702 program.

The first one is Mr. BIGGS' amendment. It is probably the most discussed amendment, and it would prohibit warrantless searches of U.S. person communications in the FISA 702 database.

The second is Mr. ROY's amendment, which requires the FBI to report to Congress on a quarterly basis the number of U.S. person queries conducted.

Mr. CLINE's amendment prohibits the resumption of "abouts" collection under section 702.

The intel amendments basically expand the FISA program.

Mr. CRENSHAW's amendment expands the definition of foreign intelligence to allow targeting and collection of information about illicit drugs. Instead of just being about terrorism, it will expand the program to include illicit drugs.

Mr. WALTZ' amendment expands the use of section 702 by allowing it to be used to vet foreigners traveling into the United States.

Mr. TURNER's amendment expands the definition of "electronic communication service provider" under section 702.

We will have a full and robust debate on those amendments after this rule passes.

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

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

I thank my friend, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE), for the customary 30 minutes.

(Mr. NEGUSE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, today's rule, as Mr. MASSIE articulated, again provides for the consideration of four bills.

Mr. Speaker, I suspect that you will be familiar with these four bills because these four bills were under a rule 2 days ago.

What happened to that rule? It failed, and that is part and parcel of the chaos and dysfunction that House Republicans have engulfed this august Chamber in for the better part of the last 15 months.

As of 2 days ago, seven rules—seven—have failed on the House floor, Mr. Speaker. You might be wondering and those watching from home might be wondering how many rules failed when Democrats had the majority under Speaker NANCY D'ALESSANDRO PELOSI.

□ 0815

In fact, from 1999 to 2023, only two rules failed on the House floor, neither of which happened when House Democrats were in control of this Chamber.

The last bill, Mr. Speaker, to pass the Rules Committee and make its way to the President's desk without suspension of our rules was almost 1 year ago. That is unprecedented.

It is not hyperbole to say that Republicans have literally presided over the most ineffective session of Congress in history.

Despite, by the way, Mr. Speaker, the pressing challenges that our Nation faces, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle repeatedly show that Republicans have no capacity or desire to govern, instead prioritizing unwarranted censures, sham impeachments, and nonbinding resolution after nonbinding resolution.

Instead of debating core issues, like lowering costs, growing the middle class, building safer communities, addressing our critical national security needs, we have spent yet another week here in Washington wasting time.

This is the third time that we are considering a variation of one of these nonbinding resolutions today. Stunts over solutions, Mr. Speaker, has become unfortunately, the majority's motto. This is not how governing is supposed to work.

I have served in this body for some time now. I know there are serious Members on the other side of the aisle. I wish Republicans would pull back their caucus and this institution from the brink and work with us in a bipartisan way to address core needs of the American people. Unfortunately, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have yet to show any desire to do so, but hope springs eternal.

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

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), in his appointment as the new chairman of the Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), chairman of the Rules Committee.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE), my friend, for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, I do rise today in support of the rule and the underlying legislation. It is a new day in the House of Representatives, and I intend to make certain that this process works and it works for all of us; that all Members get to be heard and at the end of the day, as Mr. MASSIE points out; and that after a fulsome debate, we are able to move forward for the American people.

I will specifically talk today on H.R. 7888, the Reforming Intelligence and Securing America Act, and H. Res. 1117, Opposing Efforts to Place One-Sided Pressure on Israel with Respect to Gaza.

Republicans remain concerned about the abuses that occurred under 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act in previous administrations. The rule before us provides consideration for reforms to FISA, including greater transparency and greater oversight for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, in total, 56 reforms were made in response to concerns raised by our constituents. These reforms include prohibiting searches by the FBI unrelated to national security and prohibits political appointees from being involved in the FBI's query process.

The Rules Committee met last night to report this rule out of committee. It was a bit of a process. There are two significant changes to highlight from earlier in the week. The Rules Committee print changes the reauthorization from 5 years to 2 years, which is important.

The reforms that are now incorporated in the new FISA reauthorization will be reevaluated by the next Congress as to whether or not they are actually working. Therefore, rather than a 5-year reauthorization, we can look again in 2 years to make certain, for our constituents, for the American people, that these reforms are actually working.

I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY), my friend, for bringing that forward.

There are also changes in the reauthorization that strike section 19(c) from the text altogether. The latter action was taken amid some confusion about whether 19(c) would have unintentionally permanently reauthorized section 702. To help clear up any ambiguity, that section has now been removed. Ultimately, this legislation will ensure that the appropriate guardrails are in place to safeguard Americans' constitutional rights and help keep Americans safe.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, I express my support for H. Res. 1117, offered by Ms. SALAZAR from Florida.

Israel has a right to defend itself, especially after the notorious attack by Hamas on October 7.

On April 4, after a call between President Biden and Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, the White House released a press release stating that an immediate cease-fire is necessary.

I would remind the White House that a cease-fire was in existence prior to the attack by Hamas. It is not right for the United States to pressure an ally to end a conflict that that ally did not begin. Mr. Speaker, Israel has a right to exist and a right to self-defense. The United States does not get to decide that for Israel.

I would underscore the pathways for ensuring humanitarian aid, being able to enter Gaza and actually reach the Palestinian people and not be hijacked by their Hamas overlords. On April 5, Israel opened up three new corridors for humanitarian aid. I appreciate the efforts to take responsibility for something Hamas has proven unwilling to do and hope that the conflict can soon come to an end.

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

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding additional time.

However, one-sided pressure by the White House is not the way to ensure that end.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of this rule from our committee, and I urge passage of the underlying legislation.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, while I congratulate the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), the chairman of the distinguished Rules Committee, I must say I am confounded by the audacity of any House Republican to come to the floor and lecture any of us about national security when my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have held hostage a bill that passed the United States Senate on a bipartisan basis to address the national security needs of this country. For months, the majority has held that bill hostage and refuse to put the bill on the floor.

Republicans also have the audacity to come to the floor and lecture us or the White House. The White House needs no reminder about the necessity of supporting our allies. My colleagues have implored this institution to do its job in supporting our allies abroad. It is the Speaker and the House Republican caucus that refuse to do the same.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, for starters, we need to examine why we are being hustled to do this today.

When we extended FISA earlier, there was a provision in the bill that allowed the FISA court to extend, and they have taken advantage of that. They have extended FISA until June of 2025, and so I think we are being hustled here today for a reason, which is to prevent the Constitution from being applied to FISA.

Mr. Speaker, under the amendment being offered, a warrant would be required for a search of the data of U.S. persons. This is important. It would exclude imminent threats; exigent circumstances, as any warrant does; or exclude cases where a person consents to a search or where there is cybersecurity. It excludes metadata.

It is important to note that the FBI executed more than 200,000 warrantless searches of U.S. persons in 2022, including 141 Black Lives Matter protesters, 2 Members of Congress, journalists, commentators, political parties, donors to political campaigns. It is really outrageous. The base bill is insufficient to protect us. There are two major points that it makes. Neither makes any sense or any difference.

The big deal is a prohibition on U.S. person queries that are conducted solely for the evidence of a crime. That sounds good until it is realized that the FBI almost never does that. In fact, in 2022, there were only two cases in which that provision would have been a prohibition.

The second issue is codifying the regulations about searches by the FBI today. Obviously, that doesn't do any good because the FBI, under the current regulations, continues to violate our rights and to do warrantless searches.

The only way to end the abuse is to approve the warrant requirement that is being offered in the amendment. The

American public agrees with us, with 76 percent of Americans supporting a requirement that the government get a warrant before searching in these cases.

Mr. Speaker, to hear the administration talk about it, getting a warrant here would be like the end of the world. In literally any other context, law enforcement or intelligence agencies who want to read Americans' communications have to get a warrant.

Actually, for the last 46 years, the government has had to get a FISA title I order to read Americans' communications in foreign intelligence investigations. These are investigations in which Americans are suspected of terrorism, espionage, cybercrimes, et cetera.

Hence, somehow a warrant for title I is consistent with national security, but it will plunge us into a dystopian nightmare if we apply this basic constitutional requirement where Americans aren't even suspected of wrongdoing.

This is not a wild idea. We have had, under the Obama administration, intelligence experts convene to examine this issue. The experts included former CIA directors, national security people from both parties. The experts unanimously agreed that we should have a warrant requirement in these circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, someone said that no court has ever required a warrant in these circumstances. That is incorrect. The Second Circuit Court of Appeals did point out that lawful collection alone isn't enough to justify a search.

In fact, when it comes to examining the need for this, the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board, which Congress created to take a look at the data that is classified, concluded that there was little justification on the relative value of the close to 5 million searches conducted by the FBI from 2019 to 2022.

The chair of the Board said this: "In the strongest examples offered by the FBI, such as the 'victim' or 'defensive' query examples . . . the government would likely be able to meet the probable cause standard or one of the exceptions contemplated," namely, consent or exigent circumstances.

With a 15-year track record to draw on, the government has failed time and again to show it had derived unique and significant national security value from a U.S. person query that could not have been conducted—

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

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I would note that the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board did recommend by a majority vote that a warrant requirement be imposed.

Mr. Speaker, to ignore this advice is to ignore our Constitution. We take an oath every Congress to support and defend the Constitution of the United

States. This is a significant opportunity for us to uphold that oath.

The Fourth Amendment matters. If we do not take this opportunity to protect the privacy of Americans when it comes to this matter, we will, in my belief and my view, have failed in our obligation and our duty to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States.

□ 0830

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. TIFFANY), my colleague on the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. TIFFANY. Mr. Speaker, I stand today in support of the warrant amendment. I will speak on the warrant amendment here for a couple minutes that were about to vote on today.

I hold in my hands here a document that states all the reasons why the warrant amendment should not be adopted by this Congress, and I will cite one item, specifically. Number 5 cites the current FBI director. He goes on to say that Russia has launched the most violent ground war in Europe since the 1940s as a justification for not passing this amendment.

Will Americans giving up their civil rights prevent that?

China has rapidly proliferated its nuclear weapons capabilities. Will Americans giving up their civil rights prevent that proliferation? Will it prevent China in—clearly, they are a threat to the free world with their seeking global hegemony, but do Americans have to give up their civil rights?

It goes on to talk about Afghanistan falling to the Taliban, ISIS revived, Houthi terrorists putting our troops under attack, Israeli men, women, and children slaughtered by Hamas. Will Americans giving up their civil rights prevent those things from happening?

It won't.

These words ring very hollow by the current FBI director when he is targeting Americans, when we have seen the leadership of our FBI target Americans. We have a powerful word in the English language, and I think it is one of the most beautiful words out there. It is liberty.

And encapsulated in that liberty is freedom, and the Founders used liberty as often as they used the term "freedom." Liberty encapsulates freedom, but it also says you have to be accountable for that freedom. There are those in our government who have chosen not to be accountable. This great system we have allows us to provide that accountability, and that is what we are here to do today is to provide that accountability for those intelligence agencies.

The choice is simple before us today. We can protect the powerful with their Praetorian guard here in Washington, D.C., or do we protect the American people with the most powerful document created in the history of mankind, the Constitution?

Today, Mr. Speaker, I will be choosing the people and the Constitution.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, I have great respect for my colleague from Wisconsin. We served together on the Subcommittee on Federal Lands, and I certainly agree with him about the preservation of liberty and the importance of liberty in our founding documents as the core fabric, core threat in our country, but I must also just say that I don't think the American people share House Republicans' priorities. Let me explain why.

On Monday, the Rules Committee will be meeting to consider a number of bills. House Republicans put out a notice yesterday what those bills would include. Let me just give you a sampling, Mr. Speaker: the Refrigerator Freedom Act, the Hands Off Our Home Appliances Act, the Clothes Dryers Reliability Act, and—this may be my favorite—the Liberty in Laundry Act.

While I appreciate the gentleman from Wisconsin's very passionate defense of liberty, I am not so sure the American people had that in mind. I don't think they are thinking of the Liberty in Laundry Act. I think they expect this House Republican majority to actually address the consequential challenges that face our country, not waste time on petty games and non-sense bills.

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

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. HAGEMAN), my friend and colleague on the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. HAGEMAN. Mr. Speaker, the security state's abuse of their foreign intelligence authorities to unlawfully surveil American citizens and search their records has been exposed for all to see.

In 2021, the FBI conducted over 3 million FISA searches of Americans. In 2022, the FBI was still conducting hundreds of such warrantless queries per day.

In the 2020 and early 2021 time period, the FBI conducted over 278,000 searches of the 702 FISA database that violated the Justice Department's own rules and often lacked national security connections.

The FBI is querying Americans of all political and religious affiliations. The FBI is even using section 702 to target elected and appointed government officials.

The FBI's abuses are well-known—using the 702 database to search for information on those individuals that it perceives to be political enemies of liberal orthodoxy, seeking to infiltrate the Catholic church, spying on parents at school board meetings, and working with Big Tech to censor Americans it disagrees with.

This is Stasi level abuse, and it must be stopped.

So my question for this body is, if catching the government violating the Constitution and our civil liberties is not the time for significant reform, then when is?

The proposed changes to FISA are a good first step, but they don't go far

enough. There are three additional amendments to assure accountability. One includes a warrant requirement to query the 702 database for Americans. There is no national security exception to the Fourth Amendment and we must ensure that these agencies adhere to the bill of rights.

This warrant amendment would not prevent the government from using all of the available national security tools. It simply requires the government to get a warrant.

Now there are some who would argue that requiring the intelligence agencies to obtain a warrant before spying on American citizens would be too burdensome and unreasonably delay their efforts to keep the homeland safe. My first response is to note that if these agencies sincerely cared about national security, they would be doing everything in their power to convince President Biden and Mayorkas to close the border, but that has not been their priority and their silence is deafening.

My second response is to note that this reauthorization is only for 2 years. We can pass the warrant amendment and reassess the situation in 2 short years, making the necessary tweaks at that time.

The second amendment offered by Mr. CLINE would end, once and for all, "abouts" collection, and the third amendment by Mr. ROY would enhance reporting requirements and bring more transparency to the FISA court process.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support these three amendments. If these three amendments do not pass, section 702 should not be reauthorized. I also urge my colleagues to reject the three additional amendments that we will be taking up, amendments that are actually designed to expand FISA. It is simply unacceptable to reward an agency's abuse of power.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for the rule and the three amendments.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, again, I appreciate the passion of the speakers on the other side of the aisle, including the gentlewoman from Wyoming, but facts matter, Mr. Speaker. And this body must dispense with the notion that any of this, the ills that they have spent all this time describing, are attributable to the Biden administration.

Mr. Speaker, I will read you a quote. This is from January 2018: "I would have preferred a permanent reauthorization"—let me repeat that—"permanent reauthorization of title VII to protect the safety and security of the Nation. By signing this act today, however, I am ensuring that this lawful and essential intelligence program will continue to protect Americans for at least the next 6 years. We cannot let our guard down in the face of foreign threats to our safety, our freedom, and our way of life," President Donald J. Trump.

I understand we are going to have robust debates about the mechanics and

the nuances with respect to this particular bill but spare us lectures about the need for a shorter runway and a shorter reauthorization, when the former President, whom apparently the House Republican caucus continues to take orders from, made clear and abundant his desire for a permanent reauthorization of this program with none of these reforms, by the way. None of them.

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

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. GREENE), my good friend.

Ms. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the question today is: Do you trust the government?

We often hear the claim that it is for your safety, and any time the government tells us it is for your safety, the American people really question what that means.

The same intelligence community that spied on President Trump's campaign has been deeply invested in reauthorizing FISA. The same intelligence community that wrote the letter lying, saying that the Hunter Biden's laptop is not real, deeply wants FISA reauthorized.

These are also the same people in the intelligence community that abused FISA and spied on hundreds of thousands of Americans, and I would argue they will continue to do it.

These are also the same people who oppose the FBI having to get a warrant before they can search Americans' data. Yet, we have a clause in this bill today that protects Members of Congress and requires Congress to be notified before they can search Members of Congress' data.

It is always the rules for thee, but not for me. The problem is that this process to reauthorize FISA has received more effort than Congress has actually given securing the border. If the government really cared about protecting Americans, then they would shut the border down and mass deport terrorists out of our country and criminal illegal aliens, but they are not doing that. No. They are telling us we have got to reauthorize FISA so the government can continue to spy on Americans.

There has been a lot of games played here in the swamp this past week when it comes to authorizing this bill. We were even told on Wednesday that FISA was completely stopped; yet, here we are voting on virtually the same rule and virtually the same text. The only change has been from a 5-year sunset to a 2-year sunset.

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

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Georgia.

Ms. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I would argue that changing that timeframe does nothing.

If Congress wants to change FISA to protect Americans or get rid of it alto-

gether, we can do that. We make the laws. The question today is: Do you trust the Department of Justice to hold the FBI accountable?

I don't.

The warrants aren't added to the bill text unless we pass the amendment after this vote and change the bill text. A vote to change the bill text and add warrants will not get me to pass the final bill, to pass FISA, because I don't trust the government and neither should you.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, I just want to read from an article from a few days ago. This is from FOX 5 in Atlanta. The headline: "Marjorie Taylor Greene standing by eclipse, NE Earthquake comments."

"Georgia Congressman Marjorie Taylor Greene is standing by comments she made about last week's earthquake in the Northeast and Monday's eclipse."

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado will suspend.

Mr. NEGUSE. Yes, sir.

Mr. MASSIE. Did the gentleman address his remarks to somebody on this side of the aisle?

Mr. NEGUSE. No, I am addressing the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I am reading an article, a newspaper article. Has that become objectionable now in this body?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized.

Mr. NEGUSE. I thank the Speaker. I will dispense with it quickly. I will just simply say, again, this is quoting from the article here that: "The Republican Representative then posted on X, the social media site formerly known as Twitter, that 'God is sending America strong signs to tell us to repent.' Greene also pointed to Monday's eclipse, saying there are 'many more things to come.'"

To the extent that my friend from Kentucky was looking for me to make a connection here to the debate that we are having, I suspect it is self-evident, but I am not so sure that the American people should necessarily be taking much stock into the arguments that are being made by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, including from the speaker that we just heard from.

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

□ 0845

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. MOORE), my friend.

Mr. MOORE of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, 3,394,053. That is the estimated number of U.S. person queries conducted by the FBI during my first year here in Congress. The number of improper searches by the FBI is in the hundreds of thousands, according to a DOJ audit.

We may be voting to reauthorize the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, but the people of Alabama clearly see

it is being used to spy on Americans like themselves and President Trump.

That is why I voted in the Judiciary markup and will continue to support the Biggs amendment that requires a warrant or a court order before the query of a U.S. person under section 702.

We, as Members of Congress, owe it to our constituents to protect their civil liberties. We cannot allow the intelligence community, which recently spent its resources weaponizing against pro-life grandmothers, concerned parents at school boards, Catholics, and Biden's political opponents, to freely spy on American citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to adopt the rule, and I urge the adoption of the warrant amendment.

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

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON), my friend and colleague.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, freedom surrendered is rarely reclaimed. Today, we have an opportunity to make progress. After 9/11, the PATRIOT Act passed. One Senator voted "no." Sixty-three Members of the House of Representatives voted "no." Both parties failed with that vote.

FISA has been reauthorized, and it never gets a full, clean vote. It is little tranches. In 2020, we ended the business records surveillance program, section 215. The government didn't stop collecting business records; they just stopped doing it in conformance with section 215 of FISA.

Section 702 is an important program. The Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act is supposed to stop foreign threats to our country, but there is a reason there is not a domestic surveillance act. It is because there is a Fourth Amendment to the Constitution, and that amendment does not say that if you have nothing to hide, you have nothing to fear. It says, as an American citizen, you have a right to privacy, that your records cannot be searched without probable cause and a warrant or subpoena. Due process should not be infringed.

The Fourth Amendment is probably the most disregarded protection given to us by the Bill of Rights. Our right to privacy is supposed to be defended, and we have this chance today but not a complete chance.

We have a bill that people will claim has 56 reforms, and it does. Of those, 45 are from the Intelligence Committee. Now, some of these were comparable to the Judiciary bill, but they are weaker and more watered down than the Judiciary bill. Three of them actually protect Members of Congress, so only two are clean from the Judiciary Committee's bill.

One of the amendments we cannot cover today, one of the reasons that the rule failed, was to say that even if the warrant passes, the government can't buy your data to circumvent the

need to get a warrant in the first place. That is what they are doing. They are buying data. They are structuring markets to collect the data, and they are circumventing the Fourth Amendment. We need to turn that off.

There is a lot of ground to make up on the right to privacy, but I hope we take this chance today. I remind my colleagues that we don't work at a think tank; we work in a legislature. The opportunity before us today is to make progress on reclaiming this freedom that we have surrendered.

I will support this bill in the final passage if we have a warrant requirement and if the Intel threats to the Fourth Amendment fail. If those expansions of warrantless spying pass, even if the warrant is there, I will vote "no" on final passage. I encourage all of my colleagues to do the same.

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

Again, I am going to go through this list of bills that they have noticed for Monday: the Liberty in Laundry Act, the Clothes Dryer Reliability Act, and the Refrigerator Freedom Act. I can assure the gentleman from Ohio, I don't think any of the American people believe that he works in a think tank, given these bills that they have apparently noticed for this House to consider next week.

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

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. SPARTZ).

Mrs. SPARTZ. Mr. Speaker, I guess under the current version of the bill, Americans should feel better that Congress will be authorizing to spy on them only for 2 years, not for 5, but I really want to bring up some other issues that are the essence of this bill that the bill is not addressing.

We have been talking about warrants, which is extremely important. This is a search, so government is able to search without a warrant. That is a violation of the Fourth Amendment. It is unconstitutional.

On top of it, when we are talking about lawfully collected information, in reality, it could be very unlawful information there. We do not know. It is never addressed. We know for a fact that government unlawfully collected information in 2016. We know the government acknowledged that they have a lot of data there. They don't know how much it could be. They call it all incidental.

There is nothing in this bill addressing actually if this is for lawfully collected information. There is no auditing, no checking, and they want us to trust. If we pass with a warrant, at least we will have a warrant to potentially search unlawfully collected information, but if this bill passes as it is, Congress will be authorizing the government to conduct unconstitutional searches of unlawfully collected information for 2 years. It almost sounds ironic for us, an institution

that should be protecting the constitutional rights of Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle are paying attention to what we will be voting for, and I hope Congress will wake up to start protecting the American people, not playing circuses here.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Today's rule, put simply, is a testament to the Republican playbook since assuming the majority 15 months ago: chaos, gridlock, and infighting. Over the past year, honestly, it has been difficult to understand what my colleagues across the aisle truly want.

At the beginning of this Congress, the other side of the aisle voted for a House rules package that they promised would entail an open rules process for amendments, yet this Congress is on pace to have more closed rules than any Congress in the last 100 years, over a century.

A minority of House Republicans now dictate what proposals will even have a chance to be considered in this Chamber, to stand in the marketplace of ideas that our colleagues claim to love so dearly.

Mr. Speaker, our colleagues across the aisle reject compromises at every turn. My Republican colleagues rejected a bipartisan immigration deal that came out of the Senate before even reading the bill text. The bill passed with 70 votes, Mr. Speaker, in the United States Senate.

Our allies around the world have literally been left stranded, and House Republicans won't even bring the bill up for an up-or-down vote. Instead, their top priority is the Refrigerator Freedom Act, Mr. Speaker.

The American people deserve better. They expect better. Enough of the political stunts. Enough of the infighting. Let's get back to work, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose the previous question and the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close. We are here today to pass a rule that will bring up a program for a vote that has been abused hundreds of thousands of times, abused by the FBI's own standards hundreds of thousands of times. Every time they have used it, they have actually abused it because they have not followed the constitutional requirement in the Fourth Amendment.

Today, if we pass this rule, we will have votes on six different amendments. Three of these amendments will expand the program, and three of these amendments will constrain the program.

There are people who say this bill is fine as is, that it doesn't need any amendments. Here is the problem with that: If we believed that, why would we put exemptions for Congress in this bill?

There are exemptions for Congress in the base bill of 702. What do they do?

They say that if a Congressman is going to have their privacy violated with the 702 program by the FBI, the FBI has to notify Congress. It goes on to say in this bill that if the FBI is going to tell us that they are doing it for our own good, they have to get permission from the Congressman whose privacy is going to be violated. Why does that only apply to Members of this body?

The Constitution provides that we should give these protections to everybody. The Constitution requires a warrant. That is one of the amendments that will be offered here today.

In fact, the chairman and the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee—the committee of jurisdiction for this legislation, the committee that many years ago created the 702 program—have said that if the warrant provision is not adopted, they will not vote to renew this program. I applaud them for taking that stand because the Fourth Amendment to our Constitution says: “The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.”

The FISA 702 program is clearly in violation of the Fourth Amendment. We can fix it, for the most part, with one amendment. There will still be other defects in the FISA program.

I will just close by saying this: America is watching us today. They are going to watch the results of this vote. What will we do here today? Are we going to carve out exemptions for Congress? Are we going to protect ourselves but not the American people, or are we going to provide them with the protections that our Founding Fathers enshrined in our Constitution?

We swore an oath to do that when we took these offices as legislators, and we need to follow that oath. That is why I urge adoption of this rule. I urge people to vote for the warrant amendment, and I urge people not to vote for the final bill if the protections of the warrant amendment are not there.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time and move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 208, nays 202, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 112]

#### YEAS—208

Aderholt	Gallagher	Miller (WV)
Alford	Garcia, Mike	Miller-Meeks
Allen	Gimenez	Mills
Amodei	Gonzales, Tony	Molinaro
Armstrong	Good (VA)	Moolenaar
Arrington	Gooden (TX)	Moore (AL)
Bacon	Gosar	Moore (UT)
Baird	Granger	Moran
Balderson	Graves (LA)	Murphy
Banks	Graves (MO)	Nehls
Barr	Green (TN)	Newhouse
Bean (FL)	Greene (GA)	Norman
Bentz	Griffith	Nunn (IA)
Bice	Grothman	Obornolte
Biggs	Guest	Ogles
Billirakis	Guthrie	Owens
Bishop (NC)	Hageman	Palmer
Bost	Harris	Pence
Brecheen	Harshbarger	Perry
Buchanan	Hern	Pfluger
Bucshon	Higgins (LA)	Posey
Burchett	Hill	Reschenthaler
Burgess	Hinson	Rodgers (WA)
Burlison	Houchin	Rogers (AL)
Calvert	Hudson	Rogers (KY)
Cammack	Huizenga	Rose
Carey	Hunt	Rosendale
Carl	Issa	Rouzer
Carter (GA)	Jackson (TX)	Roy
Carter (TX)	James	Rutherford
Chavez-DeRemer	Johnson (LA)	Salazar
Ciscomani	Johnson (SD)	Scalise
Cline	Jordan	Schweikert
Cloud	Joyce (OH)	Scott, Austin
Clyde	Joyce (PA)	Self
Cole	Kean (NJ)	Sessions
Collins	Kelly (MS)	Simpson
Comer	Kelly (PA)	Smith (NE)
Crane	Kiggans (VA)	Smith (NJ)
Crawford	Kiley	Smucker
Crenshaw	Kim (CA)	Spartz
Curtis	Kustoff	Stauber
D'Esposito	LaHood	Steel
Davidson	LaLota	Stefanik
De La Cruz	LaMalfa	Steil
DesJarlais	Lamborn	Steube
Diaz-Balart	Langworthy	Strong
Donalds	Latta	Tenney
Duarte	LaTurner	Thompson (PA)
Duncan	Lawler	Tiffany
Dunn (FL)	Lee (FL)	Timmons
Edwards	Letlow	Turner
Ellzey	Loudermilk	Valadao
Emmer	Lucas	Van Drew
Estes	Luna	Van Duyne
Ezell	Luttrell	Wagner
Fallon	Mace	Walberg
Feenstra	Malliotakis	Waltz
Ferguson	Maloy	Weber (TX)
Finstad	Mann	Webster (FL)
Fischbach	Massie	Wenstrup
Fitzgerald	Mast	Williams (NY)
Fitzpatrick	McCaul	Williams (TX)
Fleischmann	McClain	Wilson (SC)
Flood	McClintock	Wittman
Foxx	McCormick	Womack
Franklin, Scott	McHenry	Yakym
Fry	Meuser	Zinke
Fulcher	Miller (IL)	
Gaetz	Miller (OH)	

#### NAYS—202

Adams	Carter (LA)	Davis (NC)
Aguilar	Cartwright	Dean (PA)
Allred	Casar	DeGette
Amo	Casten	DeLauro
Auchincloss	Castor (FL)	DeBene
Balint	Castro (TX)	Deluzio
Barragán	Cherfilus-	DeSaulnier
Beatty	McCormick	Dingell
Bera	Chu	Escobar
Beyer	Clark (MA)	Eshoo
Bishop (GA)	Clarke (NY)	Españillat
Blumenauer	Cleaver	Evans
Blunt Rochester	Clyburn	Fletcher
Bonamici	Cohen	Foster
Bowman	Connolly	Foushee
Boyle (PA)	Correa	Frankel, Lois
Brown	Costa	Frost
Brownley	Courtney	Garamendi
Budzinski	Craig	Garcia (IL)
Bush	Crockett	Garcia (TX)
Caraveo	Crow	Golden (ME)
Carbajal	Cuellar	Goldman (NY)
Cárdenas	Davids (KS)	Gomez
Carson	Davis (IL)	

Gonzalez,	McCollum	Scanlon
Vicente	McGarvey	Schakowsky
Gottheimer	McGovern	Schiff
Green, Al (TX)	Meeks	Schneider
Harder (CA)	Menendez	Scholten
Hayes	Meng	Schrier
Himes	Mfume	Scott (VA)
Horsford	Moore (WI)	Scott, David
Houlahan	Morelle	Sewell
Hoyer	Moskowitz	Sherman
Hoyle (OR)	Moulton	Sherrill
Huffman	Mrvan	Slotkin
Ivey	Mullin	Smith (WA)
Jackson (IL)	Nadler	Sorensen
Jackson (NC)	Napolitano	Soto
Jackson Lee	Neal	Spanberger
Jacobs	Neguse	Stansbury
Jayapal	Nickel	Stanton
Jeffries	Norcross	Stevens
Kamlager-Dove	Ocasio-Cortez	Suozi
Kaptur	Omar	Sykes
Keating	Pallone	Takano
Kelly (IL)	Panetta	Thanedar
Khanna	Pappas	Thompson (CA)
Kildee	Pascrell	Thompson (MS)
Kilmer	Pelosi	Tlaib
Kim (NJ)	Peltola	Tokuda
Krishnamoorthi	Perez	Tonko
Kuster	Peters	Torres (CA)
Landsman	Pettersen	Torres (NY)
Larsen (WA)	Phillips	Trahan
Larson (CT)	Pingree	Trone
Lee (CA)	Pocan	Underwood
Lee (NV)	Porter	Vargas
Lee (PA)	Pressley	Vasquez
Leger Fernandez	Quigley	Veasey
Levin	Ramirez	Velázquez
Lieu	Raskin	Wasserman
Lofgren	Ross	Schultz
Lynch	Ruiz	Waters
Magaziner	Ruppersberger	Watson Coleman
Manning	Ryan	Weston
Matsui	Salinas	Wild
McBath	Sánchez	Williams (GA)
McClellan	Sarbanes	

#### NOT VOTING—21

Babin	Garcia, Robert	Smith (MO)
Bergman	Grijalva	Strickland
Boebert	Johnson (GA)	Swalwell
Case	Lesko	Titus
Doggett	Luetkemeyer	Van Orden
Gallego	Mooney	Westerman
Garbarino	Payne	Wilson (FL)

□ 0920

Ms. SCHOLTEN changed her vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. BERGMAN. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 112.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 112.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MEUSER). The question is on the resolution.

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

#### RECORDED VOTE

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 213, noes 208, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 113]

#### AYES—213

Aderholt	Armstrong	Balderson
Alford	Arrington	Banks
Allen	Bacon	Barr
Amodei	Baird	Bean (FL)



Bentz	Gosar	Moolenaar	Jacobs	Mullin	Sewell
Bergman	Granger	Moore (AL)	Jayapal	Nadler	Sherman
Bice	Graves (LA)	Moore (UT)	Jeffries	Napolitano	Sherrill
Biggs	Graves (MO)	Moran	Kamlager-Dove	Neal	Slotkin
Bilirakis	Green (TN)	Murphy	Kaptur	Neguse	Smith (WA)
Bishop (NC)	Greene (GA)	Nehls	Keating	Nickel	Sorensen
Boebert	Griffith	Newhouse	Kelly (IL)	Norcross	Soto
Bost	Guest	Norman	Khanna	Ocasio-Cortez	Spanberger
Brecheen	Guthrie	Nunn (IA)	Kildee	Omar	Stansbury
Buchanan	Hageman	Obernolte	Kilmer	Pallone	Stanton
Buchson	Harris	Ogles	Kim (NJ)	Panetta	Stevens
Burchett	Harshbarger	Owens	Krishnamoorthi	Pappas	Suoizzi
Burgess	Hern	Palmer	Kuster	Pascrell	Swalwell
Burlison	Higgins (LA)	Pence	Landsman	Pelosi	Sykes
Calvert	Hill	Perry	Larsen (WA)	Peltola	Takano
Cammack	Hinson	Pfluger	Larson (CT)	Perez	Thanedar
Carey	Houchin	Posey	Lee (CA)	Peters	Thompson (CA)
Carl	Hudson	Reschenthaler	Lee (NV)	Pettersen	Thompson (MS)
Carter (GA)	Huizenga	Rodgers (WA)	Lee (PA)	Phillips	Titus
Carter (TX)	Hunt	Rogers (AL)	Leger Fernandez	Pingree	Tlaib
Chavez-DeRemer	Issa	Rogers (KY)	Levin	Pocan	Tokuda
Ciscomani	Jackson (TX)	Rose	Lieu	Porter	Tonko
Cline	James	Rosendale	Lofgren	Pressley	Torres (CA)
Cloud	Johnson (LA)	Rouzer	Lynch	Quigley	Torres (NY)
Clyde	Johnson (SD)	Roy	Magaziner	Ramirez	Trahan
Cole	Jordan	Rutherford	Manning	Raskin	Trone
Collins	Joyce (OH)	Salazar	Matsui	Ross	Underwood
Comer	Joyce (PA)	Scalise	McBath	Ruiz	Vargas
Crane	Kean (NJ)	Schweikert	McClellan	Ruppersberger	Vasquez
Crawford	Kelly (MS)	Scott, Austin	McCollum	Ryan	Veasey
Crenshaw	Kelly (PA)	Self	McGarvey	Salinas	Velázquez
Curtis	Kiggans (VA)	Sessions	McGovern	Sánchez	Wasserman
D'Esposito	Kiley	Simpson	Meeks	Sarbanes	Schultz
Davidson	Kim (CA)	Smith (MO)	Menendez	Scanlon	Waters
De La Cruz	Kustoff	Smith (NE)	Meng	Schakowsky	Watson Coleman
DesJarlais	LaHood	Smith (NJ)	Mfume	Schiff	Wexton
Diaz-Balart	LaLota	Smucker	Moore (WI)	Schneider	Wild
Donalds	LaMalfa	Spartz	Morelle	Scholten	Williams (GA)
Duarte	Lamborn	Stauber	Moskowitz	Schrier	Wilson (FL)
Duncan	Langworthy	Steel	Moulton	Scott (VA)	
Dunn (FL)	Latta	Stefanik	Mrvan	Scott, David	
Edwards	LaTurner	Steil			
Ellzey	Lawler	Steube			
Emmer	Lee (FL)	Strong	Babin	Johnson (GA)	Payne
Estes	Letlow	Tenney	Gallego	Lesko	Strickland
Ezell	Loudermilk	Thompson (PA)	Grijalva	Luetkemeyer	
Fallon	Lucas	Tiffany	Grothman	Mooney	
Feenstra	Luna	Timmons			
Ferguson	Luttrell	Turner			
Finstad	Mace	Valadao			
Fischbach	Malliotakis	Van Drew			
Fitzgerald	Maloy	Van Dyne			
Fitzpatrick	Mann	Van Orden			
Fleischmann	Massie	Wagner			
Flood	Mast	Walberg			
Foxx	McCaul	Waltz			
Franklin, Scott	McClain	Weber (TX)			
Fry	McClintock	Webster (FL)			
Fulcher	McCormick	Wenstrup			
Gaetz	McHenry	Westerman			
Gallagher	Meuser	Williams (NY)			
Garbarino	Miller (IL)	Williams (TX)			
Garcia, Mike	Miller (OH)	Wilson (SC)			
Gimenez	Miller (WV)	Wittman			
Gonzales, Tony	Miller-Meeks	Womack			
Good (VA)	Mills	Yakym			
Gooden (TX)	Molinaro	Zinke			

## NOES—208

Adams	Castro (TX)	Espallat
Aguilar	Cherfilus-	Evans
Allred	McCormick	Fletcher
Amo	Chu	Foster
Auchincloss	Clark (MA)	Foushee
Balint	Clarke (NY)	Frankel, Lois
Barragán	Cleaver	Frost
Beatty	Clyburn	Garamendi
Bera	Cohen	Garcia (IL)
Beyer	Connolly	Garcia (TX)
Bishop (GA)	Correa	Garcia, Robert
Blumenauer	Costa	Golden (ME)
Blunt Rochester	Courtney	Goldman (NY)
Bonamici	Craig	Gomez
Bowman	Crockett	Gonzalez,
Boyle (PA)	Crow	Vicente
Brown	Cuellar	Gottheimer
Brownley	Dauids (KS)	Green, Al (TX)
Budzinski	Davis (IL)	Harder (CA)
Bush	Davis (NC)	Hayes
Caraveo	Dean (PA)	Himes
Carbajal	DeGette	Horsford
Cárdenas	DeLauro	Houlahan
Carson	DelBene	Hoyer
Carter (LA)	Deluzio	Hoyle (OR)
Cartwright	DeSaulnier	Huffman
Casar	Dingell	Ivey
Case	Doggett	Jackson (IL)
Casten	Escobar	Jackson (NC)
Castor (FL)	Eshoo	Jackson Lee

the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 7888.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEUSER) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 0940

## IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7888) to reform the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978, with Mr. MEUSER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed 1 hour equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, or their respective designees, and the chair and ranking minority member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN), the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER), and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. CROW) each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER).

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This bill is about the extension of section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act. That is the act under which we are able to spy on our adversaries, those individuals who intend to do our Nation harm.

There has been great debate and great discussion among the Members in this body. Everyone is in agreement that there have been unbelievable abuses by the FBI of access to foreign intelligence. The underlying bill, for which there is broad support, punishes the FBI. It criminalizes the FBI's abuses, limits and restricts the FBI's access to foreign intelligence, and further puts guardrails to punish the FBI.

What is also in agreement here on this House floor is the protection of Americans' civil liberties. You have to have a warrant, and there is absolute constitutional protection of Americans' data. There is no place in this statute where Americans' data becomes at risk.

Debate today, though, is not about FISA. It is not about spying on our adversaries. The debate today is about a warrant requirement in an amendment that has been offered by Representatives BIGGS and JAYAPAL.

This amendment, largely drafted by Senator WYDEN and cosponsored by Senator WARREN, would for the first time in history provide constitutional rights to our adversaries. It would provide constitutional rights to our enemies. No law has ever come out of this body that would provide constitutional rights to our adversaries.

## NOT VOTING—10

Babin	Johnson (GA)	Payne
Gallego	Lesko	Strickland
Grijalva	Luetkemeyer	
Grothman	Mooney	

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 0931

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on rollcall No. 113.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to cast my vote for rollcall Nos. 112 and 113. Had I been present, I would have voted nay on rollcall Vote No. 112, Motion on Ordering the Previous Question on H. Res. 1137, and nay on rollcall Vote No. 113, H. Res. 1137.

REFORMING INTELLIGENCE AND  
SECURING AMERICA ACT

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TURNER. 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. 7888.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LANGWORTHY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1137 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on