

regulators hold probing hearings on rate requests which often lead to lower rates being approved. Most State insurance regulators have consumer protection advocates who resolve disputes between insurers and individual consumers. State regulators do not tolerate unfair or anticompetitive practices. As the National Association of Insurance Commissioners wrote to the leaders of the Senate and the Senate Judiciary Committee, “The potential for bid rigging, price-fixing and market allocation is of great concern to state insurance regulators and we share your view that such practices would be harmful to consumers and should not be tolerated. However, we want to assure you that these activities are not permitted under state law. Indeed, the state insurance regulators in all states actively enforce their antitrust rules and review rates to ensure they are actuarially justified, sufficient for solvency and nondiscriminatory.”

Based on this experience, I have consistently raised concerns about legislation that could interfere with the current State-level regulation of insurance and could ultimately harm Maine consumers and smaller insurers. These concerns extend to the Competitive Health Insurance Reform Act.

While the bill does not directly modify the portion of McCarran-Ferguson that affirms State regulatory authority, it, however, does add a layer of Federal review, and we need to ensure that in doing so we do not create increased confusion, cost, and possible conflicts between State and Federal efforts.

This is why it is very important to make clear Congress’s intent that along with the changes specified in the bill, it is Congress’s expectation that the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission must notify State bureaus of insurance and attorneys general of any complaints or investigations they have received or are performing that involve entities in their state. I appreciate Senator DAINES’ willingness to join me today to ensure this intent is clearly stated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Given the agreement to provide formal clarification of the expectation that DOJ and FTC shall provide notification to States regarding complaints or investigations they have received or are performing, I will withdraw my objection to passage of this legislation.

Thank you.

CONFIRMATION OF ERIC J. SOSKIN

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, for over 40 years, inspectors general have acted as independent, nonpartisan watchdogs tasked with preventing and uncovering fraud, waste, and abuse in the Federal Government. Simply put, inspectors general make sure government is doing what it’s supposed to do. To accomplish this immense task, inspectors general must be experienced in oversight, trusted by both political parties,

and ready to hit the ground running on any audits, investigations, and other reviews of their agencies.

Unfortunately, the nominee for inspector general that we considered last week does not meet this basic test.

The Department of Transportation is charged with ensuring that America has the safest, most efficient and modern transportation system in the world, so that Americans are able to travel safely and efficiently by road, rail, or air. The Department has an annual budget of over \$87 billion and employs over 55,000 personnel, with a footprint in every State.

The DOT inspector general must be ready to oversee the full range of these activities, from every dollar that funds our highways to every safety decision issued by DOT regulators. To meet this task, the office employs over 400 personnel, with an annual budget of over \$94 million.

Eric Soskin, the nominee for DOT inspector general, is not qualified to oversee an agency of this size and scope, or to lead the activities of one of the largest Offices of Inspector General in the Federal Government. Mr. Soskin does not have any experience managing large organizations. He has never worked in an Office of Inspector General, and he does not have experience in many of the basic activities of such an office, like audits or inspections. Although he has legal experience, he has not focused on DOT or transportation issues at any point in his career.

While I appreciate Mr. Soskin’s service at the Department of Justice and his enthusiasm for the position, he simply lacks the qualifications to ensure DOT is fulfilling its responsibilities.

I am most troubled, however, by the increasing politicization of inspectors general by the President and by the majority.

Since 1981, this body has confirmed over 150 inspectors general; until last week, all but two of these nominees had been confirmed by unanimous consent, a voice vote, or a unanimous vote. The reason for this is simple: To do their jobs, inspectors general must be trusted by each member of Congress and by every American, regardless of political party.

Until this Congress, when an inspector general has faced significant opposition, the Senate either worked through any concerns or declined to advance the nomination. The majority did not force through partisan or unqualified nominees. That is how we have upheld this institution. That is how we have maintained trust in the independence, qualifications, and integrity of inspectors general.

This Congress, we held our first party-line vote in 40 years to confirm a deeply partisan inspector general nominee. We have now confirmed yet another inspector general on a party-line vote during a lame-duck session, with a nominee who was already rejected by nearly half of the Commerce

Committee and as well as on the Senate floor.

The inspector general is a position that continues across administrations. It is one with tremendous authority to look at every agency record, to interview any employee, and to carry out criminal investigations. We cannot transform this institution into one of Democratic inspectors general and Republican inspectors general. This is not and cannot become a political position.

Inspectors General hold government accountable to the law and to the American people. And it is our responsibility to protect this institution and reject any nomination that will undermine their independent, nonpartisan work.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 2019, the Secretary of the Senate, on December 22, 2020, during the adjournment of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BEYER) had signed the following enrolled bills:

H.R. 1240. An act to preserve United States fishing heritage through a national program dedicated to training and assisting the next generation of commercial fisherman.

H.R. 4031. An act to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to reauthorize the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5458. An act to modify the boundary of the Rocky Mountain National Park, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5852. An act to redesignate the Weir Farm National Historic Site in the State of Connecticut as the “Weir Farm National Historical Park”.

H.R. 6535. An act to deem an urban Indian organization and employees thereof to be a part of the Public Health Service for the purposes of certain claims for personal injury, and for other purposes.

H.R. 7460. An act to extend the authority for the establishment by the Peace Corps Commemorative Foundation of a commemorative work to commemorate the mission of the Peace Corps and the ideals on which the Peace Corps was founded, and for other purposes.

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 2019, the enrolled bills were signed on December 24, 2020, during the adjournment of the Senate, by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. BLUNT).

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 2019, the Secretary of the Senate, on December 24, 2020, during the adjournment of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BEYER) had signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 133. An act making consolidated appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2021, providing coronavirus emergency response and relief, and for other purposes.

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 2019, the enrolled bill was signed on December 24, 2020, during the adjournment of the Senate, by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. BLUNT).

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:02 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House of Representatives having proceeded to reconsider the bill (H.R. 6395) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, returned by the President of the United States with his objections, to the House of Representatives, in which it originated, it was resolved, that the said bill pass, two-thirds of the House of Representatives agreeing to pass the same.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 9051. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase recovery rebate amounts to \$2,000 for individuals, and for other purposes.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bills were read the first time:

H.R. 9051. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase recovery rebate amounts to \$2,000 for individuals, and for other purposes.

S. 5085. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the additional 2020 recovery rebates, to repeal section 230 of the Communications Act of 1934, and for other purposes.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. McCONNELL:

S. 5085. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the additional 2020 recovery rebates, to repeal section 230 of the Communications Act of 1934, and for other purposes; read the first time.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. McCONNELL:

S. 5085. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the additional 2020 recovery rebates, to repeal section 230 of the Communications Act of 1934, and for other purposes; read the first time.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 5085

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

SECTION 1. INCREASE IN 2020 RECOVERY REBATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 6428A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (as added by the COVID-related Tax Relief Act of 2020) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1), by striking “\$600 (\$1,200” and inserting “\$2,000 (\$4,000”;

(2) in subsection (g)(1), by striking “\$600” and inserting “\$2,000”, and

(3) in subsection (g)(2)—

(A) by striking “\$1,200” in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) and inserting “\$4,000”, and

(B) by striking “\$600” in subparagraph (A) and inserting “\$2,000”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if included in section 272 of the COVID-related Tax Relief Act of 2020.

SEC. 2. REPEAL OF SECTION 230.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 230 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 230) is repealed.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934.—The Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 151 et seq.) is amended—

(A) in section 223(h) (47 U.S.C. 223(h)), by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) The term ‘interactive computer service’ means any information service, system, or access software provider that provides or enables computer access by multiple users to a computer server, including specifically a service or system that provides access to the Internet and such systems operated or services offered by libraries or educational institutions.”; and

(B) in section 231(b)(4) (47 U.S.C. 231(b)(4)), by striking “or section 230”.

(2) TRADEMARK ACT OF 1946.—Section 45 of the Act entitled “An Act to provide for the registration and protection of trademarks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes”, approved July 5, 1946 (commonly known as the “Trademark Act of 1946”) (15 U.S.C. 1127) is amended by striking the definition relating to the term “Internet” and inserting the following:

“The term ‘Internet’ means the international computer network of both Federal and non-Federal interoperable packet switched data networks.”

(3) TITLE 17, UNITED STATES CODE.—Section 1401 of title 17, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (g).

(4) TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE.—Part I of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in section 2257(h)(2)(B)(v), by striking “, except that deletion of a particular communication or material made by another person in a manner consistent with section 230(c) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 230(c)) shall not constitute such selection or alteration of the content of the communication”; and

(B) in section 2421A—

(i) in subsection (a), by striking “(as such term is defined in defined in section 230(f) the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 230(f)))” and inserting “(as that term is defined in section 223 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 223))”; and

(ii) in subsection (b), by striking “(as such term is defined in defined in section 230(f) the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C.

230(f)))” and inserting “(as that term is defined in section 223 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 223))”.

(5) CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES ACT.—Section 401(h)(3)(A)(iii)(II) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 841(h)(3)(A)(iii)(II)) is amended by striking “, except that deletion of a particular communication or material made by another person in a manner consistent with section 230(c) of the Communications Act of 1934 shall not constitute such selection or alteration of the content of the communication”.

(6) WEBB-KENYON ACT.—Section 3(b)(1) of the Act entitled “An Act divesting intoxicating liquors of their interstate character in certain cases”, approved March 1, 1913 (commonly known as the “Webb-Kenyon Act”) (27 U.S.C. 122b(b)(1)) is amended by striking “(as defined in section 230(f) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 230(f)))” and inserting “(as defined in section 223 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 223))”.

(7) TITLE 28, UNITED STATES CODE.—Section 4102 of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (c); and
(B) in subsection (e)—

(i) by striking “construed to” and all that follows through “affect” and inserting “construed to affect”; and

(ii) by striking “defamation; or” and all that follows and inserting “defamation.”.

(8) TITLE 31, UNITED STATES CODE.—Section 5362(6) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by striking “section 230(f) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 230(f))” and inserting “section 223 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 223)”.

(9) NATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION ORGANIZATION ACT.—Section 157 of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration Organization Act (47 U.S.C. 941) is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (e); and
(B) by redesignating subsections (f) through (j) as subsections (e) through (i), respectively.

SEC. 3. 2020 BIPARTISAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established within the Election Assistance Commission the 2020 Bipartisan Advisory Committee (referred to in this section as the “Advisory Committee”).

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) COMPOSITION.—The Advisory Committee shall be composed of 18 members of whom—

(A) nine shall be appointed by the leader of the Republican caucus in the Senate (in consultation with the minority leader of the House of Representatives), one of which shall be appointed as a Co-Chairperson of the Advisory Committee; and

(B) nine shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives (in consultation with the leader of the Democratic caucus in the Senate), one of which shall be appointed as a Co-Chairperson of the Advisory Committee.

(2) REPRESENTATION.—Individuals appointed to the Advisory Committee under paragraph (1) shall be geographically balanced and shall include representatives of Federal, State, and local governments and of the legal, cybersecurity, and election administration and technology communities.

(3) DATE.—The appointments of the members of the Advisory Committee shall be made not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) PERIOD OF APPOINTMENT; VACANCIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), a member of the Advisory Committee shall be appointed for the duration of the Advisory Committee.