

SEC. 4. STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION PLAN.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the President shall develop and submit to the appropriate committees of Congress an implementation plan for the Strategy (referred to in this Act as the "Implementation Plan"), which shall include, at a minimum, the following:

(1) A description of United States national and economic security interests pertaining to the deployment of 5th and future generations wireless communications systems and infrastructure.

(2) An identification and assessment of potential security threats and vulnerabilities to the infrastructure, equipment, systems, software, and virtualized networks that support 5th and future generations wireless communications systems, infrastructure, and enabling technologies, which shall, as practicable, include a comprehensive evaluation of the full range of threats to, and unique security challenges posed by, 5th and future generations wireless communications systems and infrastructure, as well as steps that public and private sector entities can take to mitigate those threats.

(3) An identification and assessment of the global competitiveness and vulnerabilities of United States manufacturers and suppliers of 5th and future generations wireless communications equipment.

(4) An evaluation of available domestic suppliers of 5th and future generations wireless communications equipment and other suppliers in countries that are mutual defense allies or strategic partners of the United States and a strategy to assess their ability to produce and supply 5th generation and future generations wireless communications systems and infrastructure.

(5) Identification of where security gaps exist in the United States domestic or mutual defense treaty allies and strategic partners communications equipment supply chain for 5th and future generations wireless communications systems and infrastructure.

(6) Identification of incentives and policy options to help close or narrow any security gaps identified under paragraph (5) in, and ensure the economic viability of, the United States domestic industrial base, including research and development in critical technologies and workforce development in 5th and future generations wireless communications systems and infrastructure.

(7) Identification of incentives and policy options for leveraging the communications equipment suppliers from mutual defense treaty allies, strategic partners, and other countries to ensure that private industry in the United States has adequate sources for secure, effective, and reliable 5th and future generations wireless communications systems and infrastructure equipment.

(8) A plan for diplomatic engagement with mutual defense treaty allies, strategic partners, and other countries to share security risk information and findings pertaining to 5th and future generations wireless communications systems and infrastructure equipment and cooperation on mitigating those risks.

(9) A plan for engagement with private sector communications infrastructure and systems equipment developers and critical infrastructure owners and operators who have a critical dependency on communications infrastructure to share information and findings on 5th and future generations wireless communications systems and infrastructure equipment standards to secure platforms.

(10) A plan for engagement with private sector communications infrastructure and systems equipment developers to encourage the maximum participation possible on standards-setting bodies related to such systems and infrastructure equipment stand-

ards by public and private sector entities from the United States.

(11) A plan for diplomatic engagement with mutual defense treaty allies, strategic partners, and other countries to share information and findings on 5th and future generations wireless communications systems and infrastructure equipment standards to promote maximum interoperability, competitiveness, openness, and secure platforms.

(12) A plan for diplomatic engagement with mutual defense treaty allies, strategic partners, and other countries to share information and findings on 5th and future generations wireless communications infrastructure and systems equipment concerning the standards-setting bodies related to such systems and infrastructure equipment to promote maximum transparency, openness, impartiality, integrity, and neutrality.

(13) A plan for joint testing environments with mutual defense treaty allies, strategic partners, and other countries to ensure a trusted marketplace for 5th and future generations wireless communications systems and infrastructure equipment.

(14) A plan for research and development by the Federal Government, in close partnership with trusted supplier entities, mutual defense treaty allies, strategic partners, and other countries to reach and maintain United States leadership in 5th and future generations wireless communications systems and infrastructure security, including the development of an ongoing capability to identify security vulnerabilities in 5th and future generations wireless communications systems.

(15) Options for identifying and helping to mitigate the security risks of 5th and future generations wireless communications systems and infrastructure that have security flaws or vulnerabilities, or are utilizing equipment sourced from countries of concern, and that have already been put in place within the systems and infrastructure of mutual defense treaty allies, strategic partners, and other countries, when in the security interests of the United States.

(16) A description of the roles and responsibilities of the appropriate executive branch agencies and interagency mechanisms to coordinate implementation of the Strategy, as provided in section 5(d).

(17) An identification of the key diplomatic, development, intelligence, military, and economic resources necessary to implement the Strategy, including specific budgetary requests.

(18) As necessary, a description of such legislative or administrative action needed to carry out the Strategy.

SEC. 5. LIMITATIONS AND BRIEFINGS.

(a) LIMITATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Strategy and the Implementation Plan shall not include a recommendation or a proposal to nationalize 5th or future generations wireless communications systems or infrastructure.

(2) FEDERAL AGENCY AUTHORITY.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to limit any authority or ability of any Federal agency.

(b) PUBLIC COMMENT.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the President shall seek public comment regarding the development and implementation of the Implementation Plan.

(c) BRIEFING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 21 days after the date on which the Implementation Plan is completed, the President shall direct appropriate representatives from the departments and agencies involved in the formulation of the Strategy to provide the appropriate committees of Congress a briefing on the implementation of the Strategy.

(2) UNCLASSIFIED SETTING.—The briefing under paragraph (1) shall be held in an un-

classified setting to the maximum extent possible.

(d) IMPLEMENTATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President and the National Telecommunications and Information Administration, in conjunction, shall—

(A) implement the Strategy;

(B) keep congressional committees apprised of progress on implementation; and

(C) not implement any proposal or recommendation involving non-Federal spectrum administered by the Federal Communications Commission unless the implementation of such proposal or recommendation is first approved by the Commission.

(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to affect the authority or jurisdiction of the Federal Communications Commission or confer upon the President or any other executive branch agency the power to direct the actions of the Commission, whether directly or indirectly.

(e) FORM.—The Strategy and Implementation Plan shall be submitted to the appropriate committees of Congress in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 11, 2020.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on March 11, 2020, at 9:49 a.m.:

That the Senate agrees to House amendments to the bill S. 1822.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

CHERYL L. JOHNSON.

DIRECTING THE REMOVAL OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES FROM HOSTILITIES AGAINST THE ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN THAT HAVE NOT BEEN AUTHORIZED BY CONGRESS

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 891, I call up the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 68) to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran that have not been authorized by Congress, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. JAYAPAL). Pursuant to House Resolution 891, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

S.J. RES. 68

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Congress has the sole power to declare war under article I, section 8, clause 11 of the United States Constitution.

(2) The President has a constitutional responsibility to take actions to defend the United States, its territories, possessions, citizens, service members, and diplomats from attack.

(3) Congress has not yet declared war upon, nor enacted a specific statutory authorization for use of military force against, the Islamic Republic of Iran. The 2001 Authorization for Use of Military Force (Public Law 107-40; 50 U.S.C. 1541 note) against the perpetrators of the 9/11 attack and the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (Public Law 107-243; 50 U.S.C. 1541 note) do not serve as a specific statutory authorization for the use of force against Iran.

(4) The conflict between the United States and the Islamic Republic of Iran constitutes, within the meaning of section 4(a) of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1543(a)), either hostilities or a situation where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances into which United States Armed Forces have been introduced.

(5) Members of the United States Armed Forces and intelligence community, and all those involved in the planning of the January 2, 2020, strike on Qasem Soleimani, including President Donald J. Trump, should be commended for their efforts in a successful mission.

(6) Section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1544(c)) states that “at any time that United States Armed Forces are engaged in hostilities outside the territory of the United States, its possessions and territories without a declaration of war or specific statutory authorization, such forces shall be removed by the President if the Congress so directs”.

(7) More than 100 members of the United States Armed Forces sustained traumatic brain injuries in the Iranian retaliatory attack on the Ain al-Assad air base in Iraq despite initial reports that no casualties were sustained in the attack.

(8) Section 8(c) of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1547(c)) defines the introduction of the United States Armed Forces to include “the assignment of members of such armed forces to command, coordinate, participate in the movement of, or accompany the regular or irregular forces of any foreign country or government when such military forces are engaged, or there exists an imminent threat that such forces will become engaged in, hostilities”.

(9) The United States Armed Forces have been introduced into hostilities, as defined by the War Powers Resolution, against Iran.

(10) The question of whether United States forces should be engaged in hostilities against Iran should be answered following a full briefing to Congress and the American public of the issues at stake, a public debate in Congress, and a congressional vote as contemplated by the Constitution.

(11) Section 1013 of the Department of State Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1984 and 1985 (50 U.S.C. 1546a) provides that any joint resolution or bill to require the removal of United States Armed Forces engaged in hostilities without a declaration of war or specific statutory authorization shall be considered in accordance with the expedited procedures of section 601(b) of the International Security and Arms Export Control Act of 1976.

SEC. 2. TERMINATION OF THE USE OF UNITED STATES FORCES FOR HOSTILITIES AGAINST THE ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN.

(a) **TERMINATION.**—Pursuant to section 1013 of the Department of State Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1984 and 1985 (50 U.S.C. 1546a), and in accordance with the provisions of section 601(b) of the International Security Assistance and Arms Export Control Act of 1976, Congress hereby directs the President to terminate the use of United States Armed Forces for hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran or any part of its government or military, unless explicitly authorized by a declaration of war or specific authorization for use of military force against Iran.

(b) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to prevent the United States from defending itself from imminent attack.

The **SPEAKER** *pro tempore*. The joint resolution shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material in the **RECORD** related to S.J. Res. 68, currently under consideration.

The **SPEAKER** *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this measure, a resolution that will allow Congress to stand up for its constitutional responsibilities over war powers, a resolution that will send a clear message that the American people don't want war with Iran and that Congress has not authorized war with Iran.

In the few months since the House last took up legislation to address the administration's policy toward Iran, much has shifted.

I think we are all relieved that tensions have ratcheted down. After the strike that took out Qasem Soleimani, we appeared to be on the brink of a direct conflict with Iran, but things have cooled off since. Some will say this resolution is no longer needed or has no legal effect because we are not shooting at Iran today. They say we are not in hostilities with Iran.

But that is not an accurate reading of the law. The drafters of the War Powers Resolution accounted for the situation we are in today. They were clear that Congress' powers are not as narrow as the administration would like us to believe and, apparently, as some Members of this body would like us to believe.

The committee report from 1973 says, “In addition to a situation in which fighting actually has begun, hostilities also encompasses a state of confrontation in which no shots have been fired but where there is a clear and present danger of armed conflict.” That sounds a lot like what we are facing today, except shots have been fired on both sides.

Further, the President had to send 6,000 additional troops to the Middle East after the Soleimani incident, precisely because there is a clear and present danger of armed conflict.

Congress doesn't have to wait until the President alone decides to use military force again. Indeed, it is our responsibility to do something because we know that tensions could flare up again at a moment's notice.

□ 1415

Iran has not been deterred, as the administration promised. Indeed, there have already been four attacks on American personnel after the President ordered Soleimani's killing, injuring more than 100 U.S. servicemembers.

This isn't deterrence. The regime is again pushing ahead with research into a nuclear weapon and expanding its stockpile of enriched uranium.

Now, I don't like the Iranian Government. I don't like what they stand for. I don't like what they do. But the reality is this: Following the strike, we are now closer to a war with a country that is closer to possessing a nuclear weapon.

The last few weeks have also shown the administration scrambling to come up with a legal justification for the strike. Contrary to the initial claims, it quickly became clear that there was no imminent threat.

In fact, when the administration sent a legally required report to Congress, laying out the legal and policy justifications, there was no mention of an imminent threat—none whatsoever.

What was in that report, however, was an alarming claim that underscores why it is so important to press ahead with this resolution. According to the administration, the strike on Soleimani was legally authorized by the 2002 Saddam Hussein war authorization. Let me say that again: the 2002 Saddam Hussein, Iraq war authorization.

Madam Speaker, I was here in 2002 when the House considered that resolution, and I can tell you: Congress did not intend for it to authorize a war against Iran. Read it. Nowhere will you find any mention of Iran.

Incidentally, the House has voted to repeal this out-of-date war authorization, thanks to Congresswoman LEE's efforts, which I have supported.

I have heard some arguments that the 2002 authorization wasn't just about Saddam, but was also about terrorism, because that legislation says Saddam Hussein might give al-Qaida weapons of mass destruction. That finding was debunked a long time ago, and it still has nothing to do with Iran.

Some also claim that because the forces in Iraq under the 2001 and 2002 war authorizations have acted in self-defense against Iraqi militias backed by Iran, that somehow means that the 2002 AUMF can be used to attack Iran directly.

Anyone who is confused about this needs to read the administration's legal rationale more closely. They have been all over the map, trying to untangle this confusion, but their official justification is clear. It distinguishes the Soleimani killing from the defensive actions taken against militias—apples and oranges.

The administration, and any administration, should not be relying on the 2002 AUMF for anything, but we should all be able to recognize that attacking Iran is very different from other uses of force in Iraq.

It is an absurd reading of the authorization, and if the administration is going to lean on that outdated law for this, what else do they plan to use it for?

Some executive branch officials, past and present, also argue that the Constitution gives the President sweeping unilateral power to use military force without coming to Congress. I will say that again: without coming to Congress. But even among this group, it is hard to find anyone who actually believes Congress authorized the strike against Soleimani.

What has me worried is that the President made a decision to escalate tensions with Iran; failed to consult Congress, even though he had ample opportunity to do so; misled the American people about why the strike was necessary; and then switched gears and conjured up this dubious, after-the-fact legal justification.

Here is the reality: The American people don't want war with Iran. The Congress has not authorized war with Iran. That should be crystal clear.

Congress has the right to declare war. It is in the Constitution. It doesn't say that the President has the right, any President. It doesn't say the President has the right; Congress has the right.

We are trying to fulfill the Constitution. We are trying to take the Constitution back to the way it was and the way it was interpreted. Congress has the power to declare war.

Many of us are very concerned that since December 7, 1941, when President Franklin Roosevelt stood up and declared war against Japan, we have not had a declared war since then. So, what has that done? It has really rendered Congress impotent. Congress, essentially, has no say, and the President is the one who decides unilaterally.

That cannot be. That should not be. It is going directly against the Constitution, and we should not stand for it any longer.

So, as I said, the American people don't want war. Congress has not authorized war. That should be crystal clear.

However, since the administration is somehow claiming that Congress has already authorized force against Iran, then it becomes that much more important for Congress to go on record saying otherwise, and that is what this joint resolution would do.

We passed a similar measure in January. At the time, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle argued that the House version was unenforceable because it was a concurrent resolution, that it would never go to the President's desk and wouldn't have the power of law.

I disagreed with that assessment. In my view, the House version was a clear exercise of Congress' authority over war powers. We don't have authority over war powers only if the President says so. We have authority over war powers because the Constitution says so.

The House and Senate have both acted, and the Supreme Court has made clear that the President's Article II war powers are at their lowest ebb when he acts against the express will of Congress. We have expressed our will. The President does not have authority for war with Iran.

But the legislation we are considering today takes a step further. It is a joint resolution, not a concurrent resolution, so it will go straight to the President's desk if it passes the House unamended.

It is important that Congress stands up for itself, but more important is that Congress stands up for its constitutional authorities and makes it clear that we don't want war and that we haven't authorized war with Iran.

Advancing this measure would be the right thing to do under any circumstances, but it is especially important in the face of an administration that, again and again, tries to brush Congress aside as though we are an annoyance rather than a constitutionally coequal branch of government.

Now, I will be honest and say that this has been done by subsequent administrations on both sides of the aisle. Well, we don't want it done by any administration. Congress has the power to declare war—not a President, Congress.

We are not an annoyance; we are a constitutionally coequal branch of government. I am glad to support this measure.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I just have to say, here we go again. This is the third time in 2 months that the Democrat leadership has put this divisive and irresponsible debate on the House floor.

I have to ask, Madam Speaker, what are we doing here today on this War Powers Resolution again?

Our constituents are concerned about the impact of coronavirus on American lives and the United States economy,

not partisan posturing. In fact, the WHO just declared that the coronavirus is now a pandemic.

Madam Speaker, that is what we should be focused on here today.

This political War Powers Resolution is based on a false premise. It orders the President to terminate hostilities against Iran. The problem is, for the other side, we are not engaged in hostilities in Iran.

I asked Secretary Pompeo that very question on February 28, 8 weeks after the Soleimani strike, before our Committee on Foreign Affairs: Are we engaged in hostilities against Iran? His response was: "We are not."

Our military commander in the Middle East agrees. General McKenzie was asked yesterday at the Armed Services Committee if we are engaged in hostilities against Iran or Iranian forces. He said, as Secretary Pompeo said: "No, we are not."

I am a strong supporter of our Article I powers, as I know the chairman is as well. If we were to launch strikes in Iran, I believe that the President would need to come before this body to ask for a new authorization.

But that, Madam Speaker, is not what we are facing. This text completely ignores the remarkable restraint that the President has shown over the past few months. He has used force only when necessary to protect American lives.

I was with the President at the White House when he was deciding how to respond to Iran's shooting down of our drone. He would have been justified, I believe, in taking out launch sites, but he decided to deescalate instead. He was very clear, saying: "I do not want to go to war with Iran."

The January 2 strike on Qasem Soleimani inside Iraq, not Iran, was not an escalation by the United States. It was an appropriate response to his deadly targeting of Americans and diplomats in Iraq.

Soleimani has the blood of hundreds of Americans on his hands. Most recently, he organized an escalating series of attacks in Iraq, an escalating series of these attacks which killed an American, wounded multiple U.S. servicemen, and involved the siege of our Embassy, an attack on our Embassy in Baghdad.

The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Milley, said the administration would have been "culpably negligent" had they not acted to take him out.

The strike on Soleimani in Iraq was totally justified as self-defense under the President's Article II constitutional powers.

Jeh Johnson, President Obama's general counsel at the Department of Defense and Secretary of Homeland Security, a person I have great, tremendous respect for and who I worked very closely with when I was chairman of the Homeland Security Committee, in his words, he stated that Soleimani "was a lawful military objective, and

the President, under his constitutional authority as Commander in Chief, had ample domestic legal authority to take him out without an additional congressional authorization."

This is the man in the Obama administration who approved the airstrikes against the terrorists.

More importantly, the Soleimani strike was a success. Let me quote from a recent Washington Post article, where they said: The Revolutionary Guard "now finds itself on the back foot, a notable change after successfully projecting its power in the Middle East over recent years."

The Quds Force—Quds, meaning Jerusalem—that is their ultimate objective, to annihilate the State of Israel. "The Quds Force has been significantly deterred from retaliating further against the United States."

But the Democrats cannot admit anything good can come from this President, and that has consequences. In my judgment, we are wasting precious legislative days and setting a terrible precedent of abusing War Powers procedures.

This will be the fifth time that this Congress, and in this Congress, that we are considering a War Powers Resolution directing the President to withdraw U.S. forces from wars we are not actually fighting—three on Iran and two on Yemen.

Iran and its proxies are watching right now, as we spin our wheels. What they see, Madam Speaker, unfortunately, is not a united America, but a divided America that does not fully support the ability of our Commander in Chief to adequately respond to threats against Americans.

Now is not the time to tie our Commander in Chief's hands. Now is the time to support our troops and to support our diplomats.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1430

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), a distinguished member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend, the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, and I thank my friend, the ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, for their good work.

I understand we have a difference of opinion, and I do deeply respect my friend from Texas and his substantive and thoughtful contributions to our foreign policy debate in our committee, but I must disagree with the argument that we ought to be focused on only one thing right now.

As grave as the coronavirus crisis is—and I would be happy to talk about that and the missteps of this administration in making it worse—Congress is the people's body. We are here defending the legislative branch of government and its constitutional role on

matters of war and peace. What could be more serious?

The fact that we are here the third time doesn't make it any less grave or serious. It underlines the importance of the issue and the fact that many of us in this body are going to continue to be here on the floor until Congress reasserts the role the chairman outlined for us that is the constitutional role.

We have allowed way too much power to gravitate to the executive branch. We have abrogated our responsibilities here in Congress for decades. We like having it both ways. We tsk-tsk when the executive branch, we think, crosses the line, but we don't want to take responsibility for it.

This resolution asks Congress to do just that: stand up and take responsibility, while holding the executive branch accountable.

President Trump ordered a provocative and disproportionate drone strike that killed the Iranian Quds Forces commander, Major General Qasem Soleimani, a bad actor, but that begs the question: Should we have done it?

And, oh, by the way, what level of consultation and intelligence ought to be shared with the legislative branch that has constitutional responsibility for matters of war and peace?

We know the administration had to do some fast footwork to rationalize why now, why him, why there, and, oh, by the way, what are the consequences of doing that? In all of those questions, even with a formal briefing of Congress, the administration simply did not have good answers. In fact, they had contradictory answers.

Taking Soleimani out, my friend from Texas says, was a good thing. Well, it is not without consequences. We evacuated nonessential personnel from Iraq as a consequence of that move because of the terror threat. One hundred U.S. military personnel suffered brain damage or head damage because of the retaliatory strikes on the U.S. base in Iraq. These things have consequences.

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

Mr. ENGEL. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Madam Speaker, reining in the administration is the right thing to do until and unless we get answers and debate and intelligence provided to the legislative branch for justification as we move forward.

The idea that we are not at war with Iran so it is actually a redundant or unnecessary conversation, I think, is not an argument. In fact, now is precisely the time to constrain the executive branch, to set boundaries, to make sure they understand that Congress reasserting itself will set boundaries and legitimate barriers for proceeding down that road without first coming to the legislative branch as, indeed, Franklin Delano Roosevelt did in 1941, walking right down, with great dif-

ficulty, that aisle, asking Congress to declare war; and, indeed, Congress listened and responded. That is how it ought to work.

Mr. McCAUL. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN), a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, who served in the United States Army and fought in Operation Iraqi Freedom.

Mr. ZELDIN. Madam Speaker, thank you to lead Republican McCAUL for important words to start today's debate.

For the third time in 2 months, as he pointed out, we are here to debate an Iran War Powers Resolution. Once again, this resolution requires terminating the use of force against Iran, even though U.S. Forces are not engaged in hostilities against Iran.

As we stand here today, the President has repeatedly said in the past that he does not want a war with Iran. I don't. This body doesn't. My constituents don't.

The President, himself, as lead Republican McCAUL has pointed out, has shown incredible restraint when opportunities have presented, when there was legal justification to strike back.

We must continue to pursue peace through strength. The military option is the last possible option that we should ever use, but we need Iran to understand that it is on the table.

My colleague from the other side of the aisle who just spoke used the term "disproportionate" to describe taking out Qasem Soleimani. As people listen to today's debate, and if you are one of the 600-plus families who lost your son or daughter, your husband or your wife, maybe your mother or father because of Qasem Soleimani, if you are one of the thousands of people who were injured because of Qasem Soleimani, U.S. troops—600 U.S. troops, thousands of U.S. troops were injured because of Qasem Soleimani, and, literally, in the days leading up to this attack, we had U.S. citizens who were killed and wounded because of Qasem Soleimani.

What is the justification? What was Qasem Soleimani doing in Iraq? How about we look at IRGC's own statement of January 3? The IRGC said that Soleimani was in Iraq to "plan a confrontation against the new scheme of the Americans to rebuild DAESH and the Takfiri groups in order to again disrupt Iraq's security."

Anyone who wants to suggest that Soleimani was in Iraq to do anything that was good and not to be planning and engaged in hostilities has to ignore the IRGC's own words.

The IRGC is a designated foreign terrorist organization. Qasem Soleimani is a designated terrorist himself, as sanctioned by the United States and the EU and the U.N., and we took him out. And I say good.

To hear my colleague on the other side of the aisle call it disproportionate, my question is: How many more U.S. troops have to die at the hands of Qasem Soleimani before it is

proportionate? How many more have to lose arms and legs at the hands of Qasem Soleimani until my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will call it proportionate?

I salute the President for making a decision; it was well done.

I encourage all of my colleagues to vote “no” on this resolution.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. OMAR), a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Ms. OMAR. Madam Speaker, it is gratifying to see that Congress is becoming serious about restoring our authority over matters of war and peace. Our oversight responsibilities don't end when the news cycle changes. I hope that the outcome of this vote today will be another bipartisan rejection of war with Iran.

But let's be honest. We know that the eventual outcome will be a Presidential veto. We have been through this already with the Yemen War Powers Resolution when we passed it last year.

But despite the inevitable veto, it is critically important that we are here today voting to insist on our constitutional power. Our Founders understood that these decisions are too important to rest in the hands of one person.

The decision to assassinate General Soleimani was a reckless and badly considered decision that made Americans less safe, and it opened the door to a series of escalating retaliations that makes the world less safe.

But my vote today is not just about this particular strike or preventing a particular war. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle were eager to claim these authorities when there was a Democratic President in the Oval Office. Had I been in office then, I would have joined them in demanding congressional authorization for wars in Libya and Syria. It should not depend on what political power is in the White House.

We should be consistent in our principles. In my view, this means maintaining the momentum of this vote and our previous vote to repeal the 2002 AUMF. It means finally taking up BARBARA LEE's bill to repeal the 2001 AUMF as well.

Madam Speaker, I support this resolution.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WALTZ), a veteran of the war in Afghanistan and the first Green Beret elected to Congress.

Mr. WALTZ. Madam Speaker, I find this interesting and sad. Since the last time we were here, for all the handwringing, all of the hues and cries that the President was taking us to the brink of war, that he was a warmonger, that this was so reckless as we are still hearing today, well, what has actually happened?

The problem with my colleague's argument is that it flies in the face of what is actually happened in the Middle East.

What has happened is deterrence has been restored. It is relatively peaceful at this point.

I say, “relatively.” The fact is that we don't have thousands of boots on the ground in Teheran or in Iran.

What we all know who have actually fought against the Quds Force and fought against the Iranians is they are deterred by strength and emboldened by weakness.

So this bill seeks to restrain the President, who has shown incredible restraint.

Did he respond to the attacks on international shipping? No.

Did he respond to attacks on world energy supplies? No.

Did he respond to the attack on an American drone? No.

Only after another American was killed—yet another American was killed—and our Embassy was attacked did he finally respond. And what did he do? A limited, proportional, targeted strike in Iraq—not Iran—that had zero civilian casualties.

And every American, from the lowest private to the Commander in Chief, has the right to self-defense. It was his duty. It was the President's duty as Commander in Chief to stop the Iranian escalation and to respond.

And, by the way, what did he do? He took down the head of a terrorist organization who was declared, under the Obama administration, a terrorist, no different than Osama bin Laden, no different than al-Baghdadi. A terrorist is a terrorist.

In this case, Soleimani was a massive and serial human rights abuser, responsible for the deaths of tens of thousands of people across the Middle East, and the world is a better place for the fact that he is no longer on this Earth.

Madam Speaker, all this is doing is seeking to tie the President's hands; and the last thing I want is any Commander in Chief—and to my colleague—for any party having to come back to this body to defend Americans, to defend our diplomats, and to exercise his right to take terrorists off the face of this Earth.

I cannot encourage my colleagues more strongly to oppose this resolution. This is politics at its worst.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, I thank the Chairman for yielding and also for his consistent leadership on issues of war and peace and making sure that Congress does its job.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of S.J. Res. 68, which is a resolution terminating the use of U.S. Armed Forces from hostilities against Iran. This critical resolution helps put a check on the administration's reckless and irrational military action against Iran.

The American people do not want, nor can we allow, another unnecessary war of choice in the Middle East. This

resolution is an important step in our efforts to prevent that from happening.

Make no mistake: The assassination of Mr. Soleimani just a few months ago placed us on the brink of war. This did constitute an act of hostility against Iran, and, in fact, injured at least 100 of our brave troops. Also, it hurt our national security and made us less safe.

President Trump's continued and reckless military action without congressional approval or authorization caused this crisis. But we are here today to make clear that the President cannot launch a war with Iran without the explicit authorization of Congress.

Madam Speaker, we have been down this dangerous path before in Iraq, and we cannot afford another ill-advised, destructive, and costly war in the Middle East.

And, yes, I opposed the use of force without congressional authorization during the previous administration. This is not a partisan issue. Congress must do its job, and we must even go further to restore our constitutional duty over military action.

I hope the Senate takes up my bill, H.R. 2456, to repeal the 2002 Iraq AUMF, which the House passed in January, which the administration, mind you, used as the basis for the assassination of Soleimani and its military hostilities toward Iran.

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

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

□ 1445

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, let me remind you that the 2002 Iraq resolution was introduced to address weapons of mass destruction purportedly in Iraq. Now, this was a lie, it was put forth by the Bush administration. And many of us who were here tried to halt the use of force and to allow the inspectors to complete their inspections. Unfortunately—and I had an amendment to do this—it received just 72 votes.

Now, regardless of how one voted, the 2002 authorization was specific to Iraq, not Iran, nor any other country. And so it is past time that Congress reassert our congressional authority on matters of war and peace. We must also return to diplomacy and peace and stop these endless wars.

So I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on this. It is time that we do our job. Congress has been missing in action.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. RIGGLEMAN), who served in the United States Air Force for over a decade and is a veteran of Operation Allied Force and Enduring Freedom.

Mr. RIGGLEMAN. Madam Speaker, I stand in strong opposition to H.R. Res. 68, which is a divisive resolution that ties President Trump's hands during a time when our Nation and regional allies like Israel need our support.

This resolution ignores efforts the President has made to avoid war, instead continuing the Democratic Party's fixation on the President's strike on Qasem Soleimani in Iraq.

My background does give me an expert perspective on the challenges in the Middle East, and an understanding of the current situation on the ground. Not only did I deploy directly after 9/11, I was the counter-IED team chief in 2006 and 2007 for the Counter-IED Operations Intelligence Integration Center. So our team saw firsthand what Iranian Quds Forces could do to U.S. forces based on IED deployment and technology transfer.

This was not some type of reckless assassination. This was a targeted elimination of a terrorist on our target list. President Trump's escalated air strikes against those planning to inflict harm on Americans are warranted responses against Iranian actions.

The United States reserves the right to defend itself, especially against bad actors like Soleimani and Iran. Instead of supporting a President who struck a terrorist, Democrats have retreated to partisan talking points and have flocked to this bill, which undermines the President's actions and shows a lack of American resolve to our enemies abroad. This legislation harms our ability to protect American interests. It harms our military preparedness.

Lines 20–25 of the resolution state that the President must terminate the use of United States Armed Forces for hostilities against Iran “or any part of its government or military?”

Does this include proxies in Iraq, Afghanistan, Lebanon, Algeria, Yemen, Bahrain, and Shia militia groups? The IRGC is a foreign terrorist organization, including its Quds Force.

Soleimani was with a person called al-Muhandis, the center of command and control against American forces, Shia militia groups, and an Iranian proxy. Do we consider force protection conditions? The Commander in Chief needs flexibility in this new Arab warfare.

And I do agree that it is time for Congress to update our authorizations for use of military force. I am eager to participate in this process during this time of asymmetric warfare and rapid response to terrorism. Let's provide solutions. Let's not provide political hyperbole.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL).

Ms. JAYAPAL. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of this War Powers Resolution to ensure that the President cannot start a war with Iran without Congress' approval.

I understand this is the fourth time that the House will vote to say “no” to war with Iran since President Trump ordered an unauthorized, illegal strike on Iranian General Soleimani. We passed our own war powers measure, led by Representative SLOTKIN.

We passed a bill with bipartisan support to cut off funding for unauthorized, offensive military operations against Iran. And we voted to repeal the 2002 Iraq war authorization that the Trump administration has inappropriately used to justify the strike on Soleimani and potential future strikes against Iranian targets.

Madam Speaker, we have to be clear that this is not about whether General Soleimani was a good guy or a bad guy. Nobody is really disputing that.

The question here is: What is Congress' authority to have a say on whether or not the United States is going to war? If we are going to send troops into war, then we have an obligation to vote on that, to debate that, and to make sure that we preserve the congressional authority.

And I think, Madam Speaker, that this is something that both Democrats and Republicans have consistently succumbed to. So we have consistently, Democrats and Republicans, given authority to the Chief Executive that is not theirs to start with. Congress has spoken again and again on this. We should have learned by now.

The American people have spoken. They don't want us in endless wars without authorization from Congress, without a debate here in Congress, without utilizing those Constitutional powers that our Founding Framers gave us. It is time for us to do this, and to ensure that the President listens.

So today, I am urging all of my colleagues to set aside partisanship, to think about this as something that we are reclaiming for ourselves as Congress, to support this resolution that has already passed the Republican-held Senate with bipartisan support.

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

Madam Speaker, I want to, again, state the main reason for us voting on this. I am no fan of the regime in Iran. And I certainly was no fan of Soleimani, who had blood on his hands and did all kinds of heinous things. I don't care so much about them.

What I care about is us. What I care about is the Constitution of the United States of America. It was drafted a certain way. It wasn't drafted to say that the President, no matter who that President is, no matter what party that President is from, the President has authority to do whatever he likes.

It clearly says—and I said this before, but I think it is worth repeating. It clearly says that Congress has the power to declare war. Congress. And what we are trying to do on this side of the aisle is trying to strike that balance, the checks and balances. We all learned them when we went to school, checks and balances.

The Constitution doesn't say the President can do anything he wants and the Congress must follow suit. It says that Congress has the sole right to declare war.

It is really disturbing to me that subsequent Presidents—and this isn't only

the fault of one President or one political party. This is a road that we all share blame for this—we have allowed our branch of government to wither on the vine when it comes to declaring war, when it comes to war powers.

We have essentially said that any President can just declare war, and Congress has got to go along with it. If you don't go along with it, somehow you are unpatriotic or you don't care about the country. Quite the opposite. Quite the opposite.

We care about the country and we are patriotic, and that is why we believe that the Constitution needs to be adhered to.

Now, I would also encourage my colleagues to look more closely at the facts, instead of just accepting what the executive branch is saying about reinterpreting the law.

As I said in my opening statement, the drafters of the War Powers Resolution were clear, that the situation we are in today is in a state of hostility. We are constantly today in a state of hostility.

The committee report passing the War Powers Resolution from 1973, in the Congress, says: “In addition to a situation in which fighting actually has begun, hostilities also encompasses a state of confrontation in which no shots have been fired, but where there is a clear and present danger of armed conflict.”

Certainly, we are in that situation now. That is exactly the situation we are in right now.

So Congress' powers are not as narrow as the administration would like us to believe. I don't care who is President, and I don't care about who is elected in Congress. What I care about is that Congress fulfill its duties; fulfill its duties as the Constitution says that we must.

So we are doing this again because the other body has not been cooperative and doesn't seem to want to make a move on anything. We are doing this because we have to do this. We are doing this because this is important.

And no matter, again, 10 years from now, 20 years from now, there will be other Members here, I would hope that whoever is President then—no matter what party, whoever controls the majority of Congress—no matter what party, this is not political. This is not about party. This is not about trying to do anything, as far as I am concerned, except reestablishing Congress' right to declare war.

I don't know what is more important than war and peace. I certainly don't think Congress ought to start giving away its responsibilities.

I have been in this body a long time, and we have constantly argued against the administration—no matter who was in that administration—from usurping the roles that Congress has, from taking away congressional power, not only on matters of peace and war, but on everything; earmarks or anything you want to say.

Congress has just sort of said to the President: Go ahead, you make the decision. We are just sort of along for the ride. We are kind of observers. We are observers.

Well, we are not observers. We are people who care very dearly about the Constitution.

And, again, I conclude by saying, Congress has the right to declare war. Only Congress has the right to declare war. That is what we are affirming today, and why I hope we get votes from both sides of the aisle. This is not a political discussion. It doesn't matter who is in the White House. It doesn't matter who is in Congress. What matters is that Congress not cede its responsibility to any other branch but its own.

Madam Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, there was reference that the taking out of Soleimani was an assassination. I just want to remind this body of Jeh Johnson's words, President Obama's general counsel at the Department of Defense, Secretary of Homeland Security, who I have tremendous respect for. He signed off on airstrikes under the Obama administration, stating that Soleimani was a lawful military objective, and the President, under his Constitutional authority as Commander in Chief, had ample domestic legal authority to take him out without additional congressional authorization. I think that really puts this matter to rest.

But let me also say that the chairman and I are very bipartisan. We respect this committee. We respect the integrity of this committee. We both see the world very much in the same way. I know the chairman is not a supporter of Soleimani. I believe the chairman believes, as I do, that the world is safer without Mr. Soleimani in it.

The chairman and I are very staunchly pro-Israel, and are for Israel, and very much against the actions of the Ayatollah in Iran. So I don't question the chairman whatsoever.

In fact, I take great pride in the fact that the chairman and I work very well together. When we disagree—and sometimes we do—we agree to disagree, and we do so with civility, which I think has been lost at times in this body, in this town. And so I want to start with that.

I will say that all the hearings I have had, and briefings prove that Soleimani was a terrorist who actively engaged in a campaign of violence against Americans and our interests. And after not one, two, but three times debating this issue on the floor, I think we about said all we can say.

I think we can all agree he was a brutal terrorist and that the world is better off without him.

□ 1500

But I have to question, why now are we debating this? Our country is facing a public health emergency.

Madam Speaker, as I stated, the World Health Organization just announced in the time of this debate that the coronavirus is now a pandemic.

As of today, there are more than 121,000 reported cases of coronavirus worldwide, including over 1,000 right here in the United States. And while the CDC maintains the likelihood of a person catching the disease is low, the fallout from the fear caused by COVID-19 is real and is causing real damage.

Just 2 days ago, people were watching as their 401(k)s and retirement funds were disappearing and Wall Street saw the biggest drop in more than a decade. I know in my district, the city of Austin suffered a significant economic blow with the cancellation of South by Southwest, an event the chairman and I were actually scheduled to speak at regarding how we were the committee that works together and doesn't give in to toxic partisan politics.

Last year, this conference in my hometown brought more than \$350 million to Austin, making it the most profitable event for the city's hospitality industry. More communities are facing economic fallout, as well. And the fear is only rising as we continue to see more stories.

Several Members of Congress themselves, our colleagues, are currently self-quarantining after potentially being exposed to the virus, yet we are talking about this resolution today.

I would just close by saying, I was back in my district over the weekend talking to my constituents. They were really not concerned about the War Powers Resolution. Their number one concern right now is: My God, is my child going to get coronavirus? Am I going to get coronavirus? When is it going to impact my backyard, my neighbors? They want to be safe, and they want Congress to do something.

I am hopeful, Madam Speaker—I know they are in negotiations right now between the leadership of our two parties that we can come together, just as we did last week, in passing a \$7.8 billion supplemental to address this crisis—that we can come together as Republicans and Democrats to do good things for the American people and to protect the American people and to make them safe.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, before I close, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOULTON).

Mr. MOULTON. Madam Speaker, we are here today to fundamentally do our jobs. That is something that we ask of our troops every single day across the world on the front lines in places like Iraq, Syria, Afghanistan, and throughout Africa.

There is bipartisan concern, bipartisan recognition that Iran has ill will

towards the United States, that Iran is an enemy of the United States, that Iran wants nothing more than to see our country and our democracy die.

The most solemn responsibility that we have in ensuring that that doesn't happen is upholding the fundamental principles of our country and of our democracy, of showing that we have the courage here in Congress to uphold that oath, that same oath that we ask our troops to uphold in far more difficult circumstances every single day.

Iran is threatened by us because of the values that we represent and the power that those values carry in the world. It is when we abandon those values, when we undermine those principles, when we forget that oath to our Constitution that our enemies start to win.

I have fought Iranians on the ground in Iraq. I have seen Iranians kill Americans. I remember how much more accurate the Iranian mortars were than the Iraqi ones we were used to facing. I get this, but I also never forget that oath that we took, and this resolution, passing this resolution is about upholding that oath to our Constitution.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS), a member of the Armed Services Committee and the lead Republican of the Homeland Security Committee.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend from Texas for yielding.

Madam Speaker, today, we are dealing with legislation that didn't make sense on January 9, it didn't make sense on January 30, and it doesn't make sense today.

Today marks the third time the House has considered a version of this legislation in just 3 months. I am back to remind my colleagues that our conflict is not with the Iranian people, but with their tyrannical and murderous regime.

The Iranian Government, using agents like General Soleimani and the IRGC, has been arming Shia militias, including Hezbollah and others across the Middle East for decades. General Soleimani's organization was responsible for the deaths of nearly 600 Americans.

This resolution offers safe harbor to those killers.

It offers safe harbor to the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps, a designated foreign terrorist organization.

It offers safe harbor to terrorist groups receiving advanced weapons directly from the Iranian Government.

These forces are critical to the Ayatollah's clear goal of complete influence over the entire Middle East.

But the American people know the regime's legacy. They know the Ayatollah doesn't care about the bloody cost of its terrorism. The legislation before the House today only paves the way for new Iranian aggression.

Halting military operations and putting red tape on the Commander in

Chief does nothing to fix the problems in the Middle East.

I believe this resolution makes America less safe. It makes a mockery of years of dedicated counterterrorism efforts.

I urge my colleagues to vote “no” for the third time in 3 months on coddling Iranian terrorists.

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

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

I believe I have said about everything I can say on this issue, so I won't take up more time of Congress, other than to say we are not at war with Iran. If we were, I would be the first one to say Congress has a responsibility to act. If Soleimani was taken out in Iran, I would be the first to say we need an Authorization for Use of Military Force.

Congress does have the power to declare war under the Constitution, and many colleagues on my side of the aisle agree with that concept, but it is just not factually what is happening on the ground today in Iran. If that day happens, we are fully prepared to have this discussion. This is what I would call a premature argument to make.

And I would say, with respect to updating the 2001 and 2002 AUMFs, I have had several meetings with Members on both sides of the aisle, many of whom were not here when those were passed by Congress in 2001 and 2002, who also agree that we should be working to modernize these Authorizations for Use of Military Force.

I think there is that consensus, Madam Speaker, here today. I would encourage my colleagues on the other side of the aisle—and I know Chairman ENGEL is also supportive of working together—to try to modernize these Authorizations for Use of Military Force.

But that is not the situation on the ground today, and I cannot support this resolution simply for the fact it is based on a false premise. It will tie the hands of our Commander in Chief to respond in self-defense to Americans, our diplomats serving over there very bravely, and our American soldiers who are over there very bravely—it ties his hands to defend from an attack launched by Iran.

And lastly, I say, Mr. Soleimani was not a good man. He was an evil mastermind of terror. For two decades he killed Americans. He brought the Russians into Syria. They slaughtered tens of thousands of innocent people in Syria. He is responsible for so much blood on his hands.

I would close by saying—and I do think there is consensus on this issue, as well—that the world is indeed a better place without this mastermind of terror, the greatest mastermind since bin Laden was removed from the face of this Earth.

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

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

I have said all along that this is not a partisan issue, and it isn't. Executive branch officials from both parties have tried to sideline Congress when it comes to war. It is time we said: “Enough.” It may be in the executive branch's interest to keep Congress out, but that doesn't make it legal or make it right.

Madam Speaker, no one in this body mourns Qasem Soleimani, certainly not me. No one doubts that he was a hardened terrorist with the blood of Americans and others on his hands. But that is not the issue before us today.

The issue is that the Trump administration decided to kill him without authorization from Congress, without any prior consultation with Congress, then misled the American people about why that was necessary. And then, when the administration's explanation couldn't withstand scrutiny, they tell us Congress had already authorized military action against Iran.

Madam Speaker, I think we would know if we had voted to authorize military action against Iran. Those aren't the kinds of votes you easily forget.

So, today, we will vote on this resolution and send it to the President's desk. And it carries with it a very clear, very important message: Congress has not authorized war, and Congress has not authorized war against Iran.

It is remarkable that we even need to say this, but as is often the case, up is down, down is up, laws don't matter, and Congress doesn't matter because the Constitution doesn't matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. JAYAPAL). The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered on the joint resolution.

The question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of S.J. Res. 68 is postponed.

□ 1515

USA FREEDOM REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2020

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 891, I call up the bill (H.R. 6172) to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to prohibit the production of certain business records, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. DEGETTE). Pursuant to House Resolu-

tion 891, the amendment printed in House Report 116-415 is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 6172

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “USA FREEDOM Reauthorization Act of 2020”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. Amendments to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978.

TITLE I—FISA BUSINESS RECORDS

Sec. 101. Repeal of authority to access on an ongoing basis call detail records.
Sec. 102. Protection of certain information.
Sec. 103. Use of information.
Sec. 104. Limitation on retention of business record information.

TITLE II—ACCURACY AND INTEGRITY OF FISA PROCESS

Sec. 201. Certifications regarding accuracy of FISA applications.
Sec. 202. Description of techniques carried out before targeting United States person.
Sec. 203. Investigations relating to Federal candidates and elected Federal officials.
Sec. 204. Removal or suspension of Federal officers for misconduct before Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court.
Sec. 205. Penalties for offenses related to FISA.
Sec. 206. Contempts constituting crimes.
Sec. 207. Effective date.

TITLE III—FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE COURT

Sec. 301. Declassification of significant decisions, orders, and opinions.
Sec. 302. Appointment of amici curiae and access to information.
Sec. 303. Effective and independent advice for Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court.
Sec. 304. Transcripts of proceedings and communications regarding applications.
Sec. 305. Information provided in annual reports.

TITLE IV—TRANSPARENCY, SUNSETS, AND OTHER MATTERS

Sec. 401. Congressional oversight.
Sec. 402. Establishment of compliance officers.
Sec. 403. Public reports on information obtained or derived under FISA and protection of First Amendment activities.
Sec. 404. Mandatory reporting on certain orders.
Sec. 405. Report on use of FISA authorities regarding protected activities and protected classes.
Sec. 406. Improvements to Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board.
Sec. 407. Sunsets.
Sec. 408. Technical amendments.

SEC. 2. AMENDMENTS TO THE FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE ACT OF 1978.

Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment