

partisan messaging that she knows has zero chance of ever becoming law.

Speaker PELOSI's partisan legislating must come to an end, and we must get back to working together in the interest of the American people.

12 DAYS OF SALT

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

Ms. SHERRILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the taxpayers of New Jersey. There are 12 days left in the legislative calendar, and I urge the House to close 2019 by lifting the cap on the State and local tax deduction cap, or SALT.

I will be here on the floor every day this holiday season highlighting the impact of SALT on my constituents and on Americans across the country for the 12 days of SALT.

And on this first day of SALT my constituents have said to me that SALT is the number one concern they have. I meet teachers, firefighters, homeowners, and small business owners who owed thousands more on their taxes this year as a result of the \$10,000 deduction cap.

Capping SALT deductions is an attack on New Jersey residents, businesses, homeowners, and unfairly imposes a marriage penalty on couples filing jointly. It is an attack on States that invest in their communities—investments in roads, libraries, schools, first responders, and teachers.

So I urge my colleagues to pass SALT legislation immediately and to stop double taxing hardworking Americans.

THE OPIOID EPIDEMIC IS A PUBLIC HEALTH CRISIS

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss H.R. 5249, the Supporting Healthy Outcomes for Mothers and Infants Act. I am proud to cosponsor this bill alongside my colleague, Congressman DAVID TRONE.

The opioid epidemic is a public health crisis. It does not discriminate. Opioid abuse impacts all of our communities, and sadly, expectant mothers and children are particularly vulnerable.

This bill will help address the crisis by properly investing in opportunities for both education and prevention. Equally important, the bill works to destigmatize addiction and rightfully treat it as an illness.

Specifically, the Supporting Healthy Outcomes for Mothers and Infants Act instructs the Health and Human Services Secretary and the Agriculture Secretary to develop evidence-based nutrition education material for WIC-eligible

pregnant women and caregivers to infants impacted by neonatal abstinence syndrome.

It ensures WIC conducts outreach to those who may be eligible for the program or impacted by substance abuse disorder.

Lastly, the bill makes any nutrition education and training materials developed available to State agencies through an online clearinghouse.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to urge my colleagues to cosponsor and support H.R. 5249.

RURAL COMMUNITIES FACE DANGERS FROM ILLICIT DRUG TRAFFICKING

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

Mr. RIGGLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, “Right under your nose: A Mexican cartel turned this rural area into a hidden cocaine hub,” reads the headline from over the weekend from our newspaper in southern Virginia.

This article goes on to explain how a drug cartel has smuggled super pure meth, cocaine, heroin, fentanyl, and other drugs throughout the southern Virginia countryside.

I have spoken on this floor about the dangers our rural communities face from illicit drug trafficking, and now in my district, Mexican cartels, famous for their extreme violence, are tearing local communities to shreds.

I have taken action. I voted to provide funding that will help CBP agents stop drugs at the border. Securing our border cuts the head off the snake of these violent cartels. I have aided local law enforcement and pushed for drug trafficking designations in my district, and I have worked to fund treatment programs that help those battling addiction.

We need to fight back against drug trafficking and take back the communities we call home.

RECOGNIZING MURRAY POOLE

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Murray Poole, who is retiring after 54 years of covering local sports in the news in towns across coastal Georgia.

The long-time sports editor of The Brunswick News, Mr. Poole was known throughout the Golden Isles as both fair and supportive of all the local players and the teams. Mr. Poole simply never wrote a bad word about anyone.

Mr. Poole interviewed nearly every major sports star who came through the Golden Isles, including Mickey Mantle, Davis Love III, and Adam Wainwright, and made it a point to ask them only feel-good questions.

But more importantly, Mr. Poole gave his undivided attention to local sporting events. Murray would highlight everyone from the high school region championship golf team to the second-string freshman football player.

Mr. Poole's journalism in the Golden Isles is simply irreplaceable.

Mr. Speaker, may Mr. Poole enjoy his retirement. We thank him for his service to our community.

HONORING DR. BARBARA JONES

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

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Barbara Jones on her retirement from South Arkansas Community College.

Dr. Jones has served as the President of South Arkansas Community College for more than 10 years and has always been dedicated to promoting higher education.

Dr. Jones brought an impressive resume to south Arkansas with a background in health science and educational leadership. She has served on the American Association of Community Colleges Board of Directors as well as several other professional educational organizations.

Prior to Barbara entering the collegiate sphere, she worked as a laboratory scientist for 22 years in both hospitals and medical facilities. Young people in Arkansas are becoming leaders in their schools and communities, and Dr. Jones played a huge role in many of their lives.

Working in higher education can often be a thankless job, but Dr. Jones was a tireless force for over a decade. By encouraging students in both STEM fields and others, Barbara demonstrated commitment to learning skills for a lifelong career.

Dr. Jones will be greatly missed by the students and alumni of South Arkansas Community College.

We wish her and her family all the best as she retires. It is with great pride that I honor Dr. Jones.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2534, INSIDER TRADING PROHIBITION ACT, AND RELATING TO CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 77, DIRECTING THE PRESIDENT PURSUANT TO SECTION 5(C) OF THE WAR POWERS RESOLUTION TO REMOVE UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES FROM HOSTILITIES IN THE SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC THAT HAVE NOT BEEN AUTHORIZED BY CONGRESS

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 739 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 739

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. 2534) to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to prohibit certain securities trading and related communications by those who possess material, nonpublic information. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-39 shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. 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 with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. (a) At any time on the legislative day of Wednesday, December 11, 2019, it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House a motion to discharge the Committee on Foreign Affairs from further consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 77) directing the President pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution to remove United States Armed Forces from hostilities in the Syrian Arab Republic that have not been authorized by Congress, if offered by Representative Gabbard of Hawaii. The motion shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion except 20 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by Representative Gabbard of Hawaii and an opponent. The question of adoption of the motion may be subject to postponement as though under clause 8 of rule XX.

(b) The provisions of section 7 of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1546) shall not apply during the remainder of the One Hundred Sixteenth Congress to House Concurrent Resolution 77.

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

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gen-

tleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of the resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

□ 1215

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee met last night and reported House Resolution 739, providing for consideration of H.R. 2534, the Insider Trading Prohibition Act, under a structured rule, which makes in order two amendments.

The rule provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services and provides for one motion to recommit. Lastly, the rule makes the motion to discharge H. Con. Res. 77, if offered by Representative GABBARD from Hawaii, in order on December 11 and that the resolution be debatable for 20 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased we are here today to provide for consideration of H.R. 2534, the Insider Trading Prohibition Act, which will establish a statutory prohibition on insider trading.

For millions of hardworking Americans, investing in the stock market is an important tool to save for retirement, send their kids to college, or save for a downpayment on a home. The foundation of an efficient market is rooted in fairness and transparency, that all investors have access to the same information so they can make reasonable and prudent investment decisions.

Insider trading erodes the foundation of fairness and transparency. When company insiders, or market participants with insider knowledge, use non-public information to trade stocks, bonds, or other types of securities, not only do they unfairly gain a financial advantage over families saving for their futures, but the insiders also erode trust in our Nation's financial system. We cannot allow insiders to take advantage of the folks who play by the rules.

Current law on insider trading has been largely developed by the courts based on the antifraud statute in the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, yet there is no specific law prohibiting insider trading. This lack of clarity in the law, combined with recent court decisions limiting the ability of the SEC to prosecute insider trading, has opened the door for bad actors to profit at the expense of average investors.

Insider trading is wrong and undermines our economy. It is time for Congress to act and provide a clear legal standard for insider trading.

This bill passed the Financial Services Committee on a voice vote in May, showcasing the importance of finally codifying a prohibition on insider trading. Since the markup, the sponsor of the legislation, Representative JIM HIMES from Connecticut, has negotiated with Ranking Member McHENRY to address any outstanding issues and incorporate feedback from the SEC.

The text of the bill we are considering today incorporates many of the suggestions from Mr. McHENRY and other Republicans. Discussions between Mr. HIMES and Mr. McHENRY, which concluded late yesterday, have resulted in the McHenry amendment, which enjoys the full support of Mr. HIMES and Chairwoman MAXINE WATERS.

I understand adoption of this amendment, which makes further clarifying changes, will bring the support of Ranking Member McHENRY and many more of my Republican colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Mr. HIMES on his efforts over the years in coming to this bipartisan compromise. This bill will be a big step forward in reinstating trust in our financial system and providing transparency for our markets.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER), my friend, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

We had to hustle over here today, Mr. Speaker. You were already here, and I appreciate your timely beginning of the House, but this is a different kind of day. Ordinarily, we have more 1 minutes, more folks celebrating high school teachers, local newspaper folks, and local philanthropic efforts, but as you might imagine, there are other things going on on the Hill today.

That is unfortunate because I come down here today not with a heavy heart that I often come with, from a Rules Committee perspective. Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee is in charge of deciding whether or not to allow amendments, what to schedule for the floor. As a member of the minority, there are four of us up there on the Rules Committee with nine members in the majority, so we lose a lot. The time for bipartisan partnership happens before a bill gets to the Rules Committee.

Yesterday, what we saw transpire in the Rules Committee, Mr. Speaker, was not at all unprecedented. It is just not as common as I wish it were. That is that the committees of jurisdiction were working all the way up until the eleventh hour to come together on a bipartisan solution so that we wouldn't have to jam something through the Rules Committee.

I see my friend from Connecticut has come down to the floor. Mr. HIMES, representing the majority on the Financial Services Committee, and Mr.

HUIZENGA, representing the minority, talked about the partnership that came together, not to create the perfect bill, not to create the bill that I would have written, and, candidly, not to create the bill that my friend from Colorado would have written, but to have crafted a bill with give-and-take so that instead of spending time on this floor making statements, we are going to spend time on this floor making legislation.

We are going to have an actual opportunity, Mr. Speaker. I don't want to upset anybody's applecart here because so often we do spend more time trying to make a point than make a difference. This is a bill about making a difference today.

Not at all common, there were no Democratic amendments made in order to this bill. The two Republican amendments that were made in order are the perfecting amendments to seal that bipartisan compromise. I think we are going to end up with a big bipartisan vote on the board.

The only thing that gives me a heavy heart today, Mr. Speaker, is that I offered an amendment last night to add suspension authority for the Speaker of the House, Speaker PELOSI, to bring up a bill dealing with the widows and widowers of American servicemen and -women killed in action and the benefits that they are not receiving today. This is also a bipartisan bill. I offered an amendment to make that suspension authority in order. It was rejected on a party-line vote, so I am going to be opposing the rule today because I would like to be able to include those things.

But we did get a motion to recommit that will be made in order today, so I will have an opportunity, if we defeat the previous question, to bring up the NDAA bill, the National Defense Authorization Act, which does contain the widow's tax repeal and gives us an opportunity to do even more things together.

I see my friend from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT) on the floor today. He serves on the Financial Services Committee with my friend Mr. LOUDERMILK from Georgia. We have two Georgians who serve on the committee of jurisdiction for this bill.

I always enjoy the Financial Services Committee because, historically, in my 9 years here, it has not been led by shrinking violets on either side of the aisle. There are those milquetoast committees on Capitol Hill, Mr. Speaker, that never make the news. Nobody ever gets a one-liner. Not so with the committee that my friend from Colorado and my friend from Georgia serve on.

But I like watching the vote tally because so often my friend Mr. SCOTT from Georgia and my friend Mr. LOUDERMILK from Georgia end up on the same side of the issue because, sadly, the only Financial Services Committee bills that make the headlines are those that highlight our stri-

dent differences here. But time and time again, the Financial Services Committee has had a record of producing bills that can go to the President's desk. They could go to President Obama's desk for his signature, and they can go to President Trump's desk for his signature.

I hope this turns out to be one of those exercises today, again, not an exercise in making a point but an exercise in making a difference.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my friend from Colorado that his expertise on the Financial Services Committee is valued by all of us on the minority side of the aisle.

It is a special kind of pain being in the minority on the Rules Committee, Mr. Speaker, because minority members have wonderful ideas, and friends on the other side of the aisle are constrained from how many of those ideas they can support, but we always get a word of encouragement from our friend from Colorado.

I know if he were sitting on the minority side, I would be feeling his pain, and he feels ours. He is always a voice for encouragement on that committee. We see that come back from the witnesses who have a chance to serve with the gentleman from Colorado, talking about how much they enjoy that partnership.

That is why I am particularly pleased I was assigned this rule today, because it exemplifies the kind of work that we want out of all of our committees, that we have gotten out of the Financial Services Committee this day and that my friend from Colorado works each and every day to bring forward, sometimes with more success than others, but nonetheless, it is appreciated.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I always enjoy doing these rules with my friend from Georgia. He is very kind in his compliments, and he makes points that are well taken.

One, though, that I would take some issue with that he raised was with respect to the widow's tax, the bill that he brought up in committee last night. I would just say that particular bill was incorporated in the National Defense Authorization Act, which this House passed months ago, which, like so many other things, was caught up in a logjam over in the Senate where at least 275 bills, bipartisan bills, are sitting on Senate Majority Leader MITCH MCCONNELL's desk and have not seen any action being taken.

□ 1230

But we are here today to talk about the Insider Trading Prohibition Act, which really has come a long way. Mr. HIMES from Connecticut has been working on this piece of legislation for some time. And, as Mr. WOODALL said, there has been a lot of collaboration

which has resulted, and, upon the passage of Mr. MCHENRY's amendment, will result in a pretty good bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. HIMES) to speak on this rule and his bill.

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado for yielding me a little bit of time. I also thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) for acknowledging the bipartisan quality of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in the hope that this body will support the rule. The rule, in particular, obviously, made at least one, possibly two, Republican amendments in order.

I just want to reflect for one moment on what my intention was in the underlying bill.

First of all, this is a fix to a problem that we have had in American financial services law for a very long time, which is that there is no specific statute prohibiting insider trading.

Yes, we have prosecuted insider trading for a very long time using fraud provisions and other provisions of the securities law. As a result of there being no explicit prohibition on insider trading, much of the law that has grown up around this is court-made law.

I know I speak for everyone in this Chamber when I say we are here to make the laws of the land and, hopefully, guard that job jealously.

This is a good fix, but, to me, it was important how it was done. The Senate is controlled by the Republican Party. The House is controlled by the Democratic Party.

It was very important to me to get Republican support for this bill, number one, because I believe that that is the way that we get good, resilient legislation done and, number two, because it afforded me the opportunity to work very closely with people like Ranking Member MCHENRY and my Republican colleagues on the Financial Services Committee in a larger effort to build the trust and to build the relationships that, hopefully, will open the aperture for us doing more of these bipartisan things.

We do two big things around here: We stand by the values that our parties represent, but, at the end of the day, we try to come together to get something done. Honestly, in the years I have been here, we have done way too much of the former and not enough of the latter.

I really am very pleased with the way this bill has turned out. I think it has a shot of becoming law if we can get the Senate to move on it. I am delighted by the bipartisan support it has received.

Mr. Speaker, I would just close by again thanking my Republican colleagues, Mr. PERLMUTTER from Colorado, and hope that this body will support this rule.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with my friend from Connecticut. It has been true that we have spent too much time making policy statements and not enough time making policy. That has been true under leadership of both parties here. Though, the truth is, Mr. Speaker—and because I take great pride in this institution, I want to say it—we do spend more time making policy than we get credit for.

You can't see behind you, Mr. Speaker, but I am looking at the press gallery today, all the folks who are covering us reclaiming our Article I responsibilities today. We are not going to let the courts legislate in this area; we are going to legislate in this area. There is approximately one outlet there covering this today; others are elsewhere.

Again, we worked until the eleventh hour to put something together, a bipartisan compromise between the chairman and ranking member on the Financial Services Committee. The collective national presence to highlight that partnership is, again, one.

I don't know what we can do here to try to let success beget success. So often, these kinds of successes go right underneath the radar screen, and, thus, it makes it harder to accomplish these things. If I could make it clear to America that the tag team of WATERS and McHENRY can come together to get good things done, that certainly sends a message that there is hope for all of us in this space.

I want to go back to what my friend from Colorado said, though. He is absolutely right about the widow's tax. We did incorporate that bill in the NDAA. It has been sitting in the Senate doing nothing.

I wish we would have passed it as a stand-alone bill. That is a different conversation for a different day.

But it is sitting in the Senate, and there is nothing I can do, Mr. Speaker, to move the Senate along any faster. I can't get their conferees to work any harder.

But what I can do is I can get the House to take up the Senate-passed NDAA, and we can take back the authority in this institution to move the NDAA forward. It is important for the widow's tax, but, Mr. Speaker, it is important for so many other things absolutely essential to the defense of this country.

It has been one of those bills that we have come together in a bipartisan way to be successful on decade after decade after decade, and it is a stain on the success of the House and the Senate this cycle that we have not been able to move that forward in a bipartisan way.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, in the same way that I can't speak to insider trading in that legislation any better than the gentleman from Connecticut does as a member of jurisdiction, I also cannot speak to the NDAA in any better words than my friend from Wyoming (Ms. CHENEY), a former member of the Rules Committee, the Conference chairman for the House Republicans here, and an unabashed defender of providing the very best for our men and women in uniform.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. CHENEY).

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague, Mr. WOODALL, for yielding. I miss our time together on the Rules Committee. I look forward to a Rules Committee under majority leadership in the near future, and we would like to have Mr. WOODALL back. I thank him for all of his great service to our Nation and to this institution.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, we will amend the rule and begin immediate consideration of the 2020 National Defense Authorization Act. I urge the House to move forward on this measure and give our men and women in uniform the resources they deserve and tools they need to defend all of us.

As matters stand, Mr. Speaker, we are facing a grave situation. Combining the already delayed NDAA with the most recent continuing resolution is bad enough. But further delay on this defense bill, combined with the potential of yet one more continuing resolution, that, Mr. Speaker, is a national security nightmare.

Timely, stable, adequate funding is a prerequisite for a strong military. It is the first step toward ensuring the security of each and every American. That is why, Mr. Speaker, it is vital that we, as a body, fulfill this, our most important constitutional duty, which is to provide for the common defense. If we fail to do so, nothing else we do in this body will matter.

If this Chamber fails to do so, Mr. Speaker, make no mistake, the Democrats will be held to account. The partisan tactics and the baseless impeachment exercises we have seen will be to blame. Speaker PELOSI's leadership has cast a cloud over the defense authorization and appropriations processes in this body.

In July, Mr. Speaker, the House voted on a hyperpartisan defense bill on an unprecedent party-line basis. This legislation was loaded with poison pills, but it did not have to be this way. The Senate passed its bill on a bipartisan basis, carrying on a decades-long tradition.

Then, as if this partisanship on the defense bill wasn't enough, Democrats decided to begin a closed-door impeachment inquiry, an inquiry which has served only to distract and delay the NDAA process further.

Not only that, Mr. Speaker, but the Democrats have hijacked the Intelligence Committee, one of the single most important committees in this body responsible for the security of this Nation. They have hijacked it with an impeachment process that we have now seen as an absolute and clear waste of valuable time, with huge costs to the American people.

Think for a moment about the sacrifices our men and women in uniform are making right now, as I speak. Our troops are hunting down ISIS and al-Qaida terrorists; they are deterring rogue regimes; and they are working with vital allies around the world. They are securing the freedom of millions of Americans.

Ensuring their ability to do so is not a matter for partisan tactics or delay. Protecting our men and women on the front lines should be Congress' first priority. Unfortunately, our men and women in uniform are, once again, being held hostage in order for the Democrats to chase an impeachment fantasy.

The fact is that our adversaries are not pressing pause. China and Russia are developing hypersonic strike weapons, modernizing their nuclear forces, advancing their air and missile defenses, and increasingly making advances in emerging technologies such as artificial intelligence.

These threats will not go away. In fact, the longer our national security is subject to partisan distractions, the harder it will become for America to match and overpower these threats.

When Democrats choose partisanship over providing for our Nation's security, as they have since this Congress was sworn in, they are helping the Chinese, the Russians, rogue regimes, and terrorist groups. The American people will hold the Democrats accountable for their gross neglect of our constitutional obligations.

Mr. Speaker, we must act now to pass a bipartisan NDAA to support our troops and to strengthen our security.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would remind the body that we are here to talk about insider trading prohibition and not specifically the National Defense Authorization Act. But let's talk about some of the differences between the House and the Senate that my colleague from Wyoming would, apparently, just give up.

She doesn't, apparently, care or is recommending that we forget about the widow's tax, which the gentleman from Georgia has really eloquently discussed the need for it. But, obviously, that is something that is in the House-passed bill and not in the Senate bill.

Secondly, in the House-passed bill, there is parental leave for members of our military. That certainly is not part of the Senate bill.

There is a whole section on upgrading and improving military housing for

those who serve our Nation and protect us; and I know there is a specific provision in there to assist nuclear weapons workers who have become sick or ill due to all the toxicity and radiation that they suffered during, particularly, the Cold War period and, since then, in dealing with our nuclear weapons arsenal.

I would suggest to the gentlewoman from Wyoming that she is just wrong on wanting to give up, recede, and let the Senate control all of this. Those priorities are serious priorities for the men and women of our military, for our nuclear weapons workers, and for widows. I appreciate her comments.

We certainly want to see the National Defense Authorization Act passed as quickly as possible, but it, like so many other things, has gotten stuck in the Republican majority Senate: 275 bills, minimum, bipartisan in nature, sitting on Senate Majority MITCH McCONNELL's desk, no action having been taken.

I would say that there is a lot of bipartisan legislation that certainly can be passed today if the Senate majority leader would actually take some action instead of just sitting there doing nothing.

But coming back to this particular piece of legislation, this is a good bill; it is done in collaboration between Democrats and Republicans; and it needs to be passed. I would urge that we need to proceed with this process, move forward, get this rule passed, so we can get on with this particular piece of legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I was walking down the hall one day between the Capitol and the Budget Committee room, and I was walking with the now-chairman of the Budget Committee, Mr. YARMUTH from Kentucky. We were arguing because he is a committed budgeteer and I am a committed budgeteer. We were arguing about process and how it was that we were going to deliver the results that our constituents are demanding and that the Nation expects.

We were about halfway down that tunnel, past all that brilliant artwork that high schoolers send in, when we realized that we were saying exactly the same thing. I was just saying it in Republican terms; he was saying it in Democrat terms. We had been arguing then for about 5 minutes on what should have been bringing us together.

We end up in that space a lot here. Because my friend from Colorado does work so hard to reach out and be collaborative, I want to make sure that he didn't misunderstand my friend from Wyoming.

□ 1245

I could hear the frustration in her voice. My friend did not have the pleasure of serving with her on the Rules Committee, but when national security

issues came up, she has been living this commitment as a member of the committee. When we do a continuing resolution, for my friend and me it is about an extra 2 weeks to solve disagreements. For her it is 2 weeks of lost ability to plan for national security.

When we get things done by December 31 and a deadline, we think of this as a great success. For her, it is an entire quarter that we couldn't plan for new threats and new challenges that are confronting the U.S. intelligence and defense establishment.

It is not just personal, it is truly life and death in a national security way.

If we defeat the previous question, what the gentlewoman from Wyoming was proposing is that we take up the Senate bill and amend it with all of those ideas that our conferees have already gotten together on.

Now, my friend is correct. The Senate has some challenges. I would argue it is a challenge that nobody has 60 votes over there, and so whether Republicans are leading the Senate or Democrats are leading the Senate, there is still no ability to move things past the filibuster threshold. But we can take up that bill, because I would say it is Democrats in the Senate holding it up. My friend from Colorado might say it is Republicans in the Senate holding it up. But we all agree that it is critically important that we get it done. So I don't want to slow down the insider trading bill, Mr. Speaker, and that is not what I am suggesting.

What I am suggesting is: If we defeat the previous question, we have already got section 1 and section 2 of the rule that covers the insider trading bill. Let's add a section 3 to the rule. In the same way the insider trading bill reclaims Article I responsibility from Article III courts, section 3 is going to reclaim from the Senate the House prerogative to move forward on legislation. We will bring up the Senate bill, we will add in all of the amendments that the Democratic chairman of the Armed Services Committee and the Republican ranking member want to include, and then we will move that bill forward.

Mr. Speaker, the insider trading bill is important, and we are going to get that done together. National security is even more important.

Again, while it is not the subject of national news coverage, this is something we have gotten done in a bipartisan collaborative way no matter who runs the U.S. House, no matter who runs the U.S. Senate, and no matter who sits in the White House for almost 60 years. Every single year bills fail, bills succeed, Presidents come, and Presidents go. We have gotten this done because it is important to 330 million Americans.

Keep section 1 of the rule and keep section 2 of the rule. Let's move forward on the bipartisan product of the Financial Services Committee. Let's add section 3. Let's defeat the previous question, let's reclaim from the Senate

the NDAA papers, let's move forward with a House amendment, and let's send the Senate a bill that they can pass tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, I don't see any other speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I don't have any other speakers as well, so I will close. I assume that was my friend's closing.

Mr. WOODALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I have got my Mars 2033 bumper sticker here if we are prepared to talk about other collaborative things moving forward, but I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, along with Mr. WOODALL, I want to thank my colleagues for joining me here today to speak on the rule and the Insider Trading Prohibition Act.

The Insider Trading Prohibition Act has been a long time coming. Since passage of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, the SEC has relied on its anti-fraud statute and mounting case law without an explicit statute prohibiting insider trading. This legislation provides the clarity our regulators need in order to do their job and ensure the fundamental foundation of fairness and transparency in our financial system. We owe it to our constituents to ensure that their savings in the stock market are on an equal footing with all investors.

My friend from Georgia and I have spent a lot of time talking about bipartisanship today and how we can work together across party lines to tackle the tough issues facing our constituents. That is what the House has been doing this year under the Democratic majority. We have passed over 275 bipartisan bills that are sitting on the Senate majority leader's desk awaiting action in the Senate. These 275 bills represent progress that the Democratic majority is delivering for the people to strengthen the health, economic security, and well-being of every family in every community in America.

The House has passed bipartisan and commonsense gun violence prevention bills, we have strengthened background checks, we have passed reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act, and we have passed dozens of bipartisan bills to care for our Nation's veterans. We want to see those particular pieces of legislation move from the Senate to the White House and be passed into law for all Americans.

I hope the Insider Trading Prohibition Act doesn't get caught up in this graveyard over in the Senate and is instead taken up quickly by the Senate along with all these other important bipartisan bills our colleagues have worked together to pass this year.

I appreciate the bipartisan nature of Mr. HIMES and Mr. McHENRY in coming

together with this particular piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage a “yes” vote on the rule and the previous question.

The material previously referred to by Mr. WOODALL is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 739

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 3. The House being in possession of the official papers, the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on S. 1790 shall be, and they are hereby, discharged. It shall then be in order without intervention of any point of order for the chair of the Committee on Armed Services or his designee, after consultation with the ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, to move that the House recede from its amendment and agree to an amendment to the Senate bill (S. 1790). The motion shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except for one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services.

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on the motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

The House will resume proceedings on the postponed question at a later time.

PALLONE-THUNE TELEPHONE ROBOCALL ABUSE CRIMINAL ENFORCEMENT AND DETERRENCE ACT

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 151) to deter criminal robocall violations and improve enforcement of section 227(b) of the Communications Act of 1934, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 151

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 “Pallone-Thune Telephone Robocall Abuse Criminal Enforcement and Deterrence Act” or the “Pallone-Thune TRACED Act”.

SEC. 2. COMMISSION DEFINED.

In this Act, the term “Commission” means the Federal Communications Commission.

SEC. 3. FORFEITURE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 227 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by adding at the end the following:

“(4) CIVIL FORFEITURE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Any person that is determined by the Commission, in accordance with paragraph (3) or (4) of section 503(b), to have violated this subsection shall be liable to the United States for a forfeiture penalty pursuant to section 503(b)(1). Paragraph (5) of section 503(b) shall not apply in the case of a violation of this subsection. A forfeiture penalty under this subparagraph shall be in addition to any other penalty provided for by this Act. The amount of the forfeiture penalty determined under this subparagraph shall be determined in accordance with subparagraphs (A) through (F) of section 503(b)(2).

“(B) VIOLATION WITH INTENT.—Any person that is determined by the Commission, in accordance with paragraph (3) or (4) of section 503(b), to have violated this subsection with the intent to cause such violation shall be liable to the United States for a forfeiture penalty pursuant to section 503(b)(1). Paragraph (5) of section 503(b) shall not apply in the case of a violation of this subsection. A forfeiture penalty under this subparagraph shall be in addition to any other penalty provided for by this Act. The amount of the forfeiture penalty determined under this subparagraph shall be equal to an amount determined in accordance with subparagraphs (A) through (F) of section 503(b)(2) plus an additional penalty not to exceed \$10,000.

“(C) RECOVERY.—Any forfeiture penalty determined under subparagraph (A) or (B) shall be recoverable under section 504(a).

“(D) PROCEDURE.—No forfeiture liability shall be determined under subparagraph (A) or (B) against any person unless such person receives the notice required by section 503(b)(3) or section 503(b)(4).

“(E) STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.—Notwithstanding paragraph (6) of section 503(b), no forfeiture penalty shall be determined or imposed against any person—

“(i) under subparagraph (A) if the violation charged occurred more than 1 year prior to the date of issuance of the required notice or notice of apparent liability; or

“(ii) under subparagraph (B) if the violation charged occurred more than 4 years prior to the date of issuance of the required notice or notice of apparent liability.

“(F) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Notwithstanding any law to the contrary, the Commission may not determine or impose a forfeiture penalty on a person under both subparagraphs (A) and (B) based on the same conduct.”;

(2) in subsection (e)(5)(A)—

(A) in clause (ii), by adding at the end the following: “Paragraph (5) of section 503(b) shall not apply in the case of a violation of this subsection.”; and

(B) in clause (iv)—

(i) in the heading, by striking “2-YEAR” and inserting “4-YEAR”; and

(ii) by striking “2 years” and inserting “4 years”; and

(3) by striking subsection (h) and inserting the following:

“(h) ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS ON ROBOCALLS AND TRANSMISSION OF MISLEADING

OR INACCURATE CALLER IDENTIFICATION INFORMATION.—

“(1) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this subsection, and annually thereafter, the Commission, after consultation with the Federal Trade Commission, shall submit to Congress a report regarding enforcement by the Commission of subsections (b), (c), (d), and (e) during the preceding calendar year.

“(2) MATTERS FOR INCLUSION.—Each report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

“(A) The number of complaints received by the Commission during each of the preceding 5 calendar years, for each of the following categories:

“(i) Complaints alleging that a consumer received a call in violation of subsection (b) or (c).

“(ii) Complaints alleging that a consumer received a call in violation of the standards prescribed under subsection (d).

“(iii) Complaints alleging that a consumer received a call in connection with which misleading or inaccurate caller identification information was transmitted in violation of subsection (e).

“(B) The number of citations issued by the Commission pursuant to section 503(b) during the preceding calendar year to enforce subsection (d), and details of each such citation.

“(C) The number of notices of apparent liability issued by the Commission pursuant to section 503(b) during the preceding calendar year to enforce subsections (b), (c), (d), and (e), and details of each such notice including any proposed forfeiture amount.

“(D) The number of final orders imposing forfeiture penalties issued pursuant to section 503(b) during the preceding calendar year to enforce such subsections, and details of each such order including the forfeiture imposed.

“(E) The amount of forfeiture penalties or criminal fines collected, during the preceding calendar year, by the Commission or the Attorney General for violations of such subsections, and details of each case in which such a forfeiture penalty or criminal fine was collected.

“(F) Proposals for reducing the number of calls made in violation of such subsections.

“(G) An analysis of the contribution by providers of interconnected VoIP service and non-interconnected VoIP service that discount high-volume, unlawful, short-duration calls to the total number of calls made in violation of such subsections, and recommendations on how to address such contribution in order to decrease the total number of calls made in violation of such subsections.

“(3) NO ADDITIONAL REPORTING REQUIRED.—The Commission shall prepare the report required by paragraph (1) without requiring the provision of additional information from providers of telecommunications service or voice service (as defined in section 4(a) of the Pallone-Thune TRACED Act).”.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—The amendments made by this section shall not affect any action or proceeding commenced before and pending on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) DEADLINE FOR REGULATIONS.—The Commission shall prescribe regulations to implement the amendments made by this section not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 4. CALL AUTHENTICATION.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) STIR/SHAKEN AUTHENTICATION FRAMEWORK.—The term “STIR/SHAKEN authentication framework” means the secure telephone identity revisited and signature-based