

Moore (AL)	Roy	Tenney
Moore (NC)	Rutherford	Thompson (PA)
Moore (UT)	Salazar	Tiffany
Moore (WV)	Scalise	Timmons
Moran	Schmidt	Turner (OH)
Murphy	Schweikert	Valadao
Nehls	Scott, Austin	Van Drew
Newhouse	Self	Van Dwyne
Nunn (IA)	Sessions	Van Epps
Obernoite	Shreve	Van Orden
Ogles	Simpson	Wagner
Onder	Smith (MO)	Walberg
Owens	Smith (NE)	Weber (TX)
Palmer	Smith (NJ)	Webster (FL)
Patronis	Smucker	Westerman
Perez	Spartz	Wied
Perry	Stauber	Williams (TX)
Pfluger	Stefanik	Wilson (SC)
Reschenthaler	Steil	Wittman
Rogers (AL)	Steube	Womack
Rogers (KY)	Strong	Yakym
Rose	Stutzman	Zinke
Rouzer	Taylor	

NAYS—200

Adams	Gomez	Olszewski
Aguilar	Goodlander	Omar
Amo	Gottheimer	Pallone
Ansari	Gray	Panetta
Auchincloss	Green, Al (TX)	Pappas
Balint	Grijalva	Pelosi
Barragan	Harder (CA)	Peters
Beatty	Hayes	Pettersen
Bell	Himes	Pingree
Bera	Houlihan	Pocan
Beyer	Hoyer	Pou
Bishop	Hoyle (OR)	Pressley
Bonamici	Huffman	Quigley
Boyle (PA)	Ivey	Ramirez
Brown	Jackson (IL)	Randall
Brownley	Jacobs	Raskin
Budzinski	Jayapal	Riley (NY)
Bynum	Jeffries	Rivas
Carbajal	Johnson (GA)	Ross
Carson	Johnson (TX)	Ruiz
Carter (LA)	Kamlager-Dove	Ryan
Casas	Keating	Salinas
Case	Kelly (IL)	Scanlon
Casten	Kennedy (NY)	Schakowsky
Castor (FL)	Khanna	Schneider
Castro (TX)	Krishnamoorthi	Scholten
Chu	Landsman	Schrier
Cisneros	Larsen (WA)	Scott (VA)
Clark (MA)	Larson (CT)	Sewell
Clarke (NY)	Latimer	Sherman
Cleaver	Lee (NV)	Simon
Clyburn	Lee (PA)	Smith (WA)
Conaway	Leger Fernandez	Sorensen
Correa	Levin	Soto
Costa	Liccardo	Stansbury
Craig	Lieu	Stanton
Crockett	Lofgren	Stevens
Crow	Lynch	Strickland
Davids (KS)	Magaziner	Subramanyam
Davis (IL)	Mannion	Suozi
Dean (PA)	Matsui	Sykes
DeGette	McBath	Takano
DeLauro	McBride	Thannedar
DelBene	McClain Delaney	Thompson (CA)
Deluzio	McClellan	Thompson (MS)
DeSaulnier	McCollum	Titus
Dexter	McGarvey	Tlaib
Dingell	McGovern	Tokuda
Doggett	McIver	Tonko
Elfreth	Meeks	Torres (CA)
Escobar	Mejia	Torres (NY)
Espallat	Menefee	Trahan
Evans (PA)	Menendez	Tran
Fields	Meng	Underwood
Figures	Mfume	Vargas
Fletcher	Min	Vasquez
Foster	Moore (WI)	Veasey
Foushee	Morelle	Velazquez
Frankel, Lois	Morrison	Vindman
Friedman	Moskowitz	Walkinshaw
Frost	Mrvan	Wasserman
Garamendi	Mullin	Schultz
Garcia (CA)	Nadler	Waters
Garcia (IL)	Neal	Watson Coleman
Garcia (TX)	Neguse	Whitesides
Gillen	Norcross	Williams (GA)
Goldman (NY)	Ocasio-Cortez	Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—13

Buchanan	Kean	Norman
Carter (GA)	Luna	Rulli
Cohen	Mace	Sánchez
Courtney	McDonald Rivet	
Horsford	Moulton	

□ 1632

So the bill was passed.  
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:  
Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I was absent from the chamber during the vote on H.R. 8464. Had I recorded my vote, I would have voted "Nay" on Roll Call No. 220, passage of H.R. 8464, the Stopping Fraudulent Payments Act.

ZEROING OUT MONETARY BENEFITS IMPROPERLY EXPENDED ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SCHMIDT). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (H.R. 8467) to reform the Payment Integrity Information Act of 2019 to ensure executive agencies focus on fraud prevention, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.  
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GILL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TAXPAYER FUNDS OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (H.R. 8340) to modify the government-wide financial management plan, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.  
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GILL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?  
There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1229

Mr. DELUZIO. Mr. Speaker, I hereby remove my name as cosponsor of H.R. 1229.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's request is granted.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1741

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DESJARLAIS) at 5 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.

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 motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or votes objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

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

EXTENSION OF AUTHORITIES OF TITLE VII OF THE FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE ACT OF 1978

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 9238) to amend the FISA Amendments Act of 2008 to extend the authorities of title VII of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.  
The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 9238

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

SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITIES OF TITLE VII OF THE FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE ACT OF 1978.

(a) EXTENSION OF REPEAL DATE OF TITLE VII.—Section 403(b) of the FISA Amendments Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-261), as most recently amended by Public Law 119-87, is further amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) (50 U.S.C. 1881 note), by striking "June 12, 2026" and inserting "July 2, 2026"; and

(2) in paragraph (2) (18 U.S.C. 2511 note) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking "June 12, 2026" and inserting "July 2, 2026".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the earlier of the date of the enactment of this Act or June 11, 2026.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous material on H.R. 9238.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, FISA section 702 will expire on Friday. This bill extends the program until July 2.

The 702 program is critically important to our national security. More than 60 percent of our intelligence presented to the President, to the Commander in Chief, every single day is derived from 702.

With the World Cup about to begin this week, we cannot be left without this critical tool every day. The 702 program helps keep us safe here at home and advance our interests abroad.

This temporary extension will ensure that there is no disruption to the program while we find a path forward on reauthorization.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to support the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, when we first met on the majority's confusion and disarray over FISA at 1:30 in the morning on April 17, we pointed out that the majority's language departed so sharply from the requirements of the Fourth Amendment in the Constitution that, for the very first time, it would have authorized the government to use 702 to specifically and deliberately target and spy on the communications of American citizens.

That midnight maneuver quickly collapsed as support melted away all across the body. On unanimous consent, we agreed to a 1-week extension to give the House leadership a chance to discuss and negotiate necessary reforms with their own Members who had been ignored and bypassed in the process, as well as with us.

Speaker JOHNSON never once invited us to the table. He never got in touch with us.

One week later, congressional Republicans again failed to pass their own bill. I stood in this spot, and we agreed to a one-time 45-day extension as a gesture of legislative good faith to give the leadership a chance to meet with their own members who had been bypassed and with the Democratic side of the aisle, which had been completely bypassed, and to engage in good-faith negotiations for serious FISA legislation.

That means legislation that meets both the requirements of the Constitution for the privacy rights of the people and the needs of our foreign policy and national security. Again, we never heard from the Speaker. We never heard from his staff. They never came to talk to us.

Now, we are here to consider a bill drafted, it looks like, at 4:33 p.m., about 1 hour ago, just to kick the can down the road one more time.

For months, we have offered to work in good faith with our friends across the aisle, our colleagues in the Senate, and intelligence community to reauthorize 702 in a manner that preserves the necessary authority while protecting essential constitutional values and the privacy rights of the people.

Despite this, again, Speaker JOHNSON has never once invited Democrats to the table.

I know Speaker JOHNSON. We served together on the Committee on the Judiciary. We used to speak and interact freely, but he has completely vanished in this process.

We have an incredible shrinking Constitution under Donald Trump, and now we have an incredibly shrinking Speaker under Donald Trump.

Look, our touchstone has been a fundamental principle at the core of the Fourth Amendment. A judge must come between the Federal Government and the private communications of American citizens. That is the meaning of the Fourth Amendment. The FBI has abused this powerful surveillance authority for decades.

The FISA court has recently raised serious questions today about how section 702 is operating. Instead of implementing the modest self-administered guardrails Congress required as part of our 2024 reauthorization, the FBI appears to have been actively circumventing and violating those guardrails.

We cannot trust Kash Patel not to violate FISA when he readily admits he queried some government databases to dig up dirt on journalists who dared to report about him and the government services he has made available to his girlfriend.

Believe it or not, the administration's invitation to trust Kash Patel and Tulsi Gabbard, which the majority of this body was not interested in, has now gotten even less enticing. Today, President Trump just appointed Bill Pulte as Acting Director of National Intelligence, making it even more obvious that he intends to use FISA to investigate, harass, and persecute his political opponents.

Director Pulte has no national security experience, zero, zilch, none. He is famous in America for only three things:

One, he vowed to engage in fisticuffs with Treasury Secretary Scott Bessent when he was at Donald Trump, Jr.'s club in Georgetown, the Executive Branch.

Two, he brought Palantir into the Federal Housing Finance Agency, where he was director, to help him scour through American's personal financial data, looking for dirt on Trump's designated political enemies.

Finally, he then used this AI-enabled technology to create personal mortgage dossiers on ADAM SCHIFF, Leticia James, and Lisa Cook, who he then re-

ferred to the Department of Justice for felony criminal prosecutions. He engaged in criminal referrals. All three of these attempted prosecutions, fortunately, collapsed either at the Department of Justice or in Federal court because they were so flimsy.

That is what he spends his time doing, trying to dig up dirt through this AI-enabled technology on American citizens, including elected officials.

So if you thought our civil liberties were safe with Tulsi Gabbard as the backstop, which was the last proposal, you will love the idea of Bill Pulte being the guardian of our privacy and the protector of our civil liberties.

Bill Pulte's appointment, which has been derided not just in our party but by Senators THUNE, TILLIS, and CASSIDY, just to name a few, confirms our worst fears of the President's plans to abuse FISA section 702 for the purposes of domestic political surveillance, harassment, intimidation, and persecution.

Indeed, we know the FBI is currently abusing FISA based on the FISC opinion from March that remains inexplicably classified. Instead of implementing in good faith the modest reforms we passed 2 years ago, the FBI created a system to review Americans' data in violation of the minimal, self-administered, self-policing guardrails we required.

We can say with some confidence that the FBI has no idea how many U.S. person queries they ran last year, how many times they spied on the communications of American citizens, and we should be able to explain these serious deficiencies to our constituents.

□ 1750

Mr. Speaker, if we allow the President to turn FISA into an instrument of domestic political control, we will be ignoring everything we have already learned about the long history of abuse of this program, which my friend Mr. JORDAN has helped to bring to light: past improper searches swept in Members of Congress and staff of both parties, campaign activists and donors, and Black Lives Matter activists.

President Trump certainly believes FISA provides the technology, methodology, and opportunity to spy on political opponents. On April 10, 2024, he posted: "Kill FISA, it was illegally used against me, and many others. They spied on my campaign."

"Kill FISA," he said. These allegations may or may not be true, but the President is certainly right that this program has been badly abused in the past.

The majority, yet, still shows no evidence of seeking to impose a judicial warrant requirement for queries of U.S. citizens. They have shown no interest in building a probable cause requirement into the statute. We have seen no evidence that they want to impose any judicial oversight at all, although that

was the Framers' major commitment, that they wanted to make sure that there would be a judicial magistrate interposed between the government and the rights of the people.

That is the meaning of the Fourth Amendment. We need to stand by that, and we need a real process to make sure that we come up with real legislation that honors it.

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

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I think that might be the first time that I heard my friend and gentleman from Maryland agree with the President, as he smiles.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD), the distinguished chairman of the House Intelligence Committee and a good friend who is doing a great job.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, here is what we know: We are in an elevated threat level with FIFA World Cup games beginning this week, America's 250th birthday and related celebrations coming up this summer, Iran and its proxies are targeting U.S. military personnel daily, and the 25th commemoration of the September 11 terrorist attacks will be coming up.

We know that FISA 702 is the most important foreign intelligence authority to detect and mitigate national security threats.

This week, the World Cup kicks off, and 45 countries descend upon the United States for World Cup games, which just so happens to be the week that Democrats have actively chosen to disallow this critical national security tool from being renewed and allow it to go dark.

Democrats have chosen to compromise national security and the safety of Americans to play, essentially, political chicken with an essential national security tool. This is unserious, very dangerous behavior on the part of congressional Democrats.

Mr. Speaker, we are not talking about the policy. Instead, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are talking about personalities. They are concerned about personalities. They are not concerned about the policy.

I know, because they are really smart, that they understand that the DNI has no 702 query authority. Either they know that to be true and, yet, continue on this personality conflict issue, or they don't know that the DNI doesn't have 702 query authority. In either case, it is wrong.

We are not debating the underlying policy here. We are debating personalities, and that is a real shame.

CHUCK SCHUMER, HAKEEM JEFFRIES, and MARK WARNER are all members of the Gang of Eight. They have all been read into the threats, as I have. They know the highest levels of national security threats, above every other Member of Congress, and they are all willing to let this program go dark and

subject the American people to all manner of threats that might materialize here in the absence of this program.

That is an abdication of their constitutional responsibilities. It is shameful is what it is, for Gang of Eight members, who understand what is at stake, who have been read in at the highest levels, who understand the importance of 702, who know that 60 percent of the Presidential daily brief is derived from 702, for them to say "no" because they don't like the individual in question who doesn't even have 702 query authority. So let's go ahead and take this program hostage to make a political point because they don't like President Trump either.

That is what this has devolved into. It is an absolute shame. If this authority lapses starting on Saturday, we move into uncharted territory. It is unclear how providers will respond to statutory expiration, especially the lapse in liability protection and how uncertain this will impact foreign intelligence that is critical for policy and security decisions.

Once this authorization expires, the clock starts ticking. The implications get worse every single day.

While the 702 database would remain available to search, the data in that database will become increasingly out of date with potential provider non-compliance with orders, litigation by providers or outside groups, and even reticence by agency personnel to continue implementing an expired authority for fear of personal liability.

Enough is enough. Let's just get past the personalities, if we can, recognize the need to take care of the people in this country, and to secure our country. That is one of the things that we are supposed to do in this institution, is to protect the American people. Let's do that, take the personality potshots offline because if we want to do that, we have plenty of material to work with. Yet, let's just focus on the policy here, get this done, and move forward.

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

Mr. Speaker, I don't know what personality potshots the distinguished gentleman is referring to. Of course, that is against the rules of the House, and if you think you have an objection, you should go ahead and object based on personalities. I haven't heard a single one mentioned.

In any event, when section 702 of FISA sunsets on June 12, if that is the will of the majority, the government surveillance activities will continue unchanged. Everything that has already been authorized and certified is already in motion, and current FISA authorizations will continue unaffected, at least through March 17, 2027.

In any event, I know that the gentleman said that we are approaching the 250th anniversary of the country. Yes, that is something we have known about for 250 years, and the majority

has known for many months about this deadline and can't seem to get it together.

We don't have the opportunity to help them because they will not reach out to us and talk to us about it. I restate our commitment to try to help them get through this, but we are not going to continue to kick the can down the road with them indefinitely.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE), the very distinguished gentleman and a great champion of the Constitution and civil liberties.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this clean reauthorization of an unconstitutional program that is being used to spy on Americans without warrants. This would be the third temporary, clean extension of this unconstitutional program, and I find myself on the unfortunate opposition to the chairman of the committee of jurisdiction, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN).

I want to read some of his quotes from last year. This is an article in The Washington Post that he so eloquently wrote: "One year from now, Republicans and Democrats in Congress will have a chance to reaffirm our commitment to the Constitution and better protect Americans from warrantless government surveillance. This will be one of the most important debates we will have this Congress, and it is vital that we begin working now to protect Americans' constitutional rights."

He goes on to say: "Our fidelity must always be to the Constitution. The Fourth Amendment is one of the foundations of American civil liberties. It is part of what makes our country great and makes us the envy of the world. We must continue to protect and enhance it. Passing a warrant requirement for section 702 will do just that."

He goes on to tweet later or earlier than that: "The same people who spied on President Trump's campaign are now fighting against a warrant requirement in the new FISA bill." "Makes you wonder."

I find myself disagreeing with the chairman in this debate but agreeing vehemently with him last year and the year before when he pointed out that this program is unconstitutional and there is only one way to fix it: require warrants, judicial warrants.

We saw the President's administration tweet this week that we shouldn't trust these liberal judges in Washington, DC, to hamstring the Secretary of Defense. Well, that is not what we are talking about. Number one, we are not talking about a constraint on the Secretary of Defense or Secretary of War. We are talking about a constraint on the FBI to spy on Americans.

We are not talking about liberal judges since 8 of the 11 Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court judges were appointed by Republicans.

□ 2500

By the way, most of them aren't even in DC.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, we thank you for your trenchant remarks, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I will point out to the gentleman from Kentucky, that is not the question today. The question today is: Can we go another 3 weeks, 21 days, and try to figure out what makes sense on protecting the privacy rights of Americans?

That is a simple question. I don't think 3 weeks is too much to ask. For goodness sakes, this program has been around forever. We did 56 reforms to it just 2 years ago.

I think the question is probably just: Can we go another 3 weeks and figure it out and maybe have those discussions that the ranking member was talking about? I know he and I have talked about what makes sense. That is the question in front of us.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT), who serves on the Intelligence Committee.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I want the American citizens to know that, as was said earlier, April 17, with hundreds of people on the floor of the House of Representatives, we did, by UC, adopt a 1-week extension. That was true.

We then did a 45-day extension, and now we are asking, yes, for 21-day extension. And sometimes things take longer than we would like for them to.

I want to defend my friend Tulsi Gabbard, who was attacked by the gentleman from Maryland. Tulsi was the vice chair of the Democratic National Committee. She was the vice chair. She was elected unanimously to that position as the vice chair of the Democratic National Committee. She maintained friendships, because everybody knew she was a serious Member of Congress, up to and until she became an appointee of President Trump as DNI, and then, all of a sudden, everything I have heard from Democrats about her has been bad.

She was elected unanimously to the vice chair position of the DNC. She is a good woman. She cares about this country, and you should show her a little more respect than you do.

I want the American citizens, if you are watching this, to know, it is very simple. There is a lot going on in the world. Say what you want to about it with Iran. The bottom line is, the risks are elevated. The risks are elevated. Some of us think the President did the right thing. I realize some of you think he did the wrong thing, but the risks are elevated.

We have got the World Cup that is about to happen. Thousands and thousands of people are coming into this country, some of which actually want to do us harm. Do you know who is going to be making sure that we keep the ones out of this country that want to do us harm? It is going to be Customs and Border Protection checking statuses when they come in through

the border. I am glad that we got that funded.

I want to leave you with this. If you are watching this, we, as the Republicans in the House, are also disappointed that we have not gotten to a resolution after the 1-week extension, after the 45-day extension.

We are simply asking for another 21-day extension to make sure that this authority does not expire.

Mr. Speaker, I would just ask that we abide by commonsense and the rule that we first do no harm by taking down a valuable national security tool that the United States of America needs.

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

Mr. SPEAKER. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Let me just say, we gave the majority an extra week. We supported that unanimous consent. Everybody Member of this body supported that. They never consulted us. They never talked to us, despite all kinds of promises to do so.

I had GOP colleagues telling me, on the Judiciary Committee, they were never consulted. Nobody ever talked to them about it.

Then we gave them 45 days. They said they just needed 45 days, and they would definitely talk to us. We would be able to meet. After 1½ months, we heard nothing from them.

We have been begging them to sit down, because I believe there is a robust, bipartisan majority in this House to support the needed reforms and making sure that we interpose the voice of a judge before the personal communications of American citizens are invaded by the Government.

I think that we have got a vast majority on that side, but nobody from leadership seems to be talking to anybody who is concerned about this.

Now they say: Oh, well, just give us another week.

No, we are not interested in that. We have given you lots of time. You are not consulting us. You are not negotiating in good faith. So maybe the threat that we are not going to support you will finally get you guys serious about it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL).

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, Republicans called us up at the last minute to do yet another short-term extension of FISA.

This is just a sham. It has been months now, and we have done multiple short-term extensions. I voted against the last one because I knew that there was not actually going to be a reform proposal put on the table because, suddenly, even the bipartisan members, including my good friend, the Chairman, who has been with us for these reforms in the past, suddenly

have decided that they are just going to bow down to what Donald Trump wants. Donald Trump doesn't want any reforms.

We know what the American people want. They want a warrant requirement. That is a bipartisan position. If you put a warrant requirement on the floor right now, it would pass. Maybe the President would have to veto it, but it would pass. People would see that the Congress of the United States is standing up for the privacy rights of Americans that are guaranteed in our Constitution.

This is not about national security versus constitutional rights. This is about how we do both together.

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

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL).

Mr. JAYAPAL. This is about how we do both, and we can do that. What Americans have said over and over again is: No more secret searches of Americans' private communications. They want their basic right to privacy respected, and there is a path to get there.

The Chairman has been on our side. We got so close just a couple of years ago. We could have gotten it done. We didn't get it done then, but we can get it done now. It requires saying no to Donald Trump. It requires saying, no, you can't put Bill Pulte in as the ODNI because this guy is not to be trusted with any of our information.

Vote "no" on this extension. Let's get a real reform package passed.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise with a degree of sadness because I was present at the birth of this legislation. For 30 years, I was either a Member of the Committee, ranking member on the committee, or the Gang of Eight, for 30 years. I bring extensive intelligence experience to this discussion.

Following 9/11, it was with great care that we worked in a bipartisan fashion to put together the legislation to advance what we are talking about today, this FISA initiative.

In that legislation, we established the Office of the DNI, the Director of National Intelligence. It had certain standards. The Director of National Intelligence, to be appointed by the President, with the advice of the Senate, the individual nominated shall have extensive national security experience. He shall serve as the head of the intelligence community, act as the principal adviser to the President, under the National Security Council, Homeland Security, and the rest.

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

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I have lists, from the legislation, of the criteria establishing the position.

What do we have from the President? Somebody who has no judgment on intelligence matters. What an insult to our brave intelligence community, who serve us so well to protect the American people, to put somebody in there.

If we are expected to vote for FISA, and Patel is at FBI and—what is his name?—Pulte as DNI—Pulte and Patel equals “no” on this FISA legislation. It can be done if there is an intention to do it right.

□ 1810

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

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. HIMES), the ranking member of the Intelligence Committee.

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Maryland for yielding. I rise very sadly tonight in opposition to this legislation.

I have spent hundreds of hours negotiating this, including with the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, my friends on the Republican side, reauthorization after reauthorization. I have the scars to show for how much work has been done.

Here we are on the verge of a great deal. The Senate has a bill that reauthorizes FISA and puts in stronger safeguards than the bill that we passed here in the House. We are all ready to go, and we move on, and then the President of the United States decides that Bill Pulte, a man who has never held a security clearance, a man who I am not sure 2 days ago could have told you what the initials DNI stand for, a man who has distinguished himself in the role he currently has as an attack dog to go after the political enemies, that gets thrown in, and we are asked for yet more indulgence at that moment in time.

There is a simple way out of this conundrum. The President can follow the law and allow the Principal Deputy DNI, a Senate-confirmed appointee of the President, to assume the role of acting DNI until a suitable nominee can be confirmed by the Senate. That is all that needs to happen, and none of us needs to swallow what has just happened.

This is a funny moment because I have lots of Republican friends, and in person they have told me what a catastrophic appointment this is. We are not going to hear that on the floor or in public, but we all know that this is the path. It did not need to be this way. There is still time, though very little, to choose a new and responsible path consistent with our obligations to national security.

When this vote fails, and it will, I hope that the President sees the writing on the wall and puts national security first.

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

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, can you tell us how much time we have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland has 3 minutes remaining.

The gentleman from Ohio has 11 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I think we are ready to close if the ranking member can wind up his remarks. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, my friend, the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, flippantly says: What is another 3 weeks after we have kicked the can down the road this far?

Where is the passionate, stalwart defender of American civil liberties and right to privacy we have come to admire and esteem? The Fourth Amendment protects the rights of all Americans. It does not have a “unless it is just for another 3 weeks” exception.

Congress must act to protect the rights of Americans. We agreed to 1 week. We agreed to 45 days. Enough of this disorganization and chaos. If there is a serious proposal on the table, we are all ears. We will sit down, and we will work on this. We want to reauthorize section 702, and we want to make it safe for the constitutional rights and liberties of the people.

We also know, Mr. Speaker, that section 702 explicitly allows any current authorizations to continue until their expiration dates, even if the statute sunsets. Therefore, there is no reason we cannot protect both the Fourth Amendment rights of the people and the authorities that keep us safe.

If Speaker JOHNSON will just allow us to do so, I believe that the Judiciary and Intelligence Committees can come together and get this done.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I believe there is a robust, bipartisan majority. I think it is ridiculous that we even need to say it, but I do believe there is a robust bipartisan majority that will stand with the Constitution, that will make sure we are interposing the proper independent judicial magistrate between the government and searches of the private rights and the persons and things protected by the Fourth Amendment.

We need to protect the rights of the people and the Constitution. We can do that. We need to protect our national security with section 702. We can do that. We can harmonize them. All it takes is old-fashioned legislative deliberation and compromise.

I am certain we can do it, but we haven't had any effort by the GOP leadership to look to this body, both Republicans and Democrats. Where do they look? They look to 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

But we are an Article I for a reason. We are the legislating branch, not the President. We have got the power to declare war. The President has forgotten that. We have got the power to appropriate. We have got the power to

tax, and we have got the power to pass this legislation on section 702.

We don't have to wait on hand and foot for the White House to tell us what to do. Let's just sit down. Let's hammer out a great legislative compromise that will take us not for another 7 days or 42 days or 45 days. How about we do it for the next 5 years? If we build a search warrant requirement into it, I bet we could do it for the next 10 years.

Let's live up to our constitutional responsibilities and legislate together.

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

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time. I would just remind my friend from Maryland, the ranking member, of a couple things. I said initially, in light of the 56 reforms we did a couple years ago to this legislation, I was willing to go for a short-term reauthorization, 18 months. Remember, that was the original package. I was willing to go for that, particularly at a time when we, like it or not, are in a conflict, military operation, in Iran. I thought that made sense, in light of the reforms we have done.

Second, he said that I had said earlier what is another 3 weeks. Well, he just talked about hammering it out. I didn't say what is another 3 weeks. I said: We can take 3 weeks to continue to hammer it out and figure it out. That is all we are asking.

While we are hammering it out and figuring it out, we maybe want not to let the program go completely dark, not because—because the guys on the Intel Committee, even Mr. HIMES, understands how important this is.

Finally, I would say this. When he says: “Where is my friend from a few years ago?” if I remember right, we could have had the warrant requirement maybe 2 years ago because I remember what the vote was. It was 212–212. All it would have taken was one more “no” vote then to vote “yes,” and, shazam, we pass it.

You can criticize all you want, but those are the facts.

Now, the question again is real simple: Can we go another 3 weeks—I think we can—and hammer out a deal, which I am willing to do with the gentleman from Maryland and the folks on the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge a “yes” vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 9238.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. RASKIN. 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.

□ 1820

HONORING THE PROUD LEGACY OF  
GREENE CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL

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

Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, with great pride I recognize a truly historic moment in Greene County.

The class of 2026 is the final graduating class to walk the halls of a building that has shaped lives, strengthened our community, and carried the hopes and dreams of generations since 1962.

Greene Central High School has been far more than brick and mortar. It has been a place where friendships were formed, lessons were learned, championships were achieved, and young people prepared to make their mark on the world.

Within these classrooms and hallways are countless stories filled with Greene County pride. The building may change, but the memories and legacy of the Greene Central Rams will live forever.

We honor every educator, parent, class, and the community who helped build the proud legacy of Greene Central High School.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 11, 2026, at 9 a.m.

OATH OF OFFICE MEMBERS, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER, AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members, Resident Commissioner, and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in 5 U.S.C. 3331:

"I, AB, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Member of the 119th Congress, pursuant to the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 25:

James Gallagher, First District of California.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,  
ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

EC-3787. A letter from the Chairman, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Agency's 2025 "Recommended Best Practices Report for Environmental Reviews and Authorizations", pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 4370m-7(a)(1); Public Law 114-94, Sec. 41008(a)(1) (as amended by Public Law 117-58, div. G, title VIII, Sec. 70801(f)); (135 Stat. 1293); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-3788. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Department Notification Number: DDTC 25-068 pursuant to Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-3789. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Department Notification Number: DDTC 25-035 pursuant to Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-3790. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Department Notification Number: DDTC 25-149 pursuant to Sections 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-3791. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Department Notification Number: DDTC 26-014 pursuant to Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-3792. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Department Notification Number: DDTC 25-104 pursuant to Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-3793. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of War for Legislative Affairs, Department of War, transmitting the Department's legislative proposals and a section-by-section analysis; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services, Transportation and Infrastructure, and the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON  
PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GUEST: Committee on Ethics. Contempt Report Related to the Conduct of Michael Joseph (Rept. 119-693). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GUEST: Committee on Ethics. Contempt Report Related to the Conduct of Hector Roos (Rept. 119-694). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. YAKYM:

H.R. 9236. A bill to amend the PROTECT Act to include minimum standards for

issuing an alert for a high-risk missing person, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOST (for himself, Mr. BLIRAKIS, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. LAWLER, Mr. VAN ORDEN, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MCGUIRE, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. MEUSER, Ms. KING-HINDS, Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia, Mr. HAMADEH of Arizona, Mr. HILL of Arkansas, Mr. OBERNOLTE, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. TAYLOR, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 9237. A bill to amend titles 10 and 38, United States Code, and other Federal laws, to improve benefits for veterans and the administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:  
H.R. 9238. A bill to amend the FISA Amendments Act of 2008 to extend the authorities of title VII of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978, and for other purposes; to the Committees on the Judiciary and Intelligence (Permanent Select).

By Mr. CROW (for himself, Mr. DELUZZIO, Ms. GOODLANDER, and Ms. HOULAHAN):

H.R. 9239. A bill to provide for limitations on judgments, awards, and compromise settlements under section 1304 of title 31, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONALDS:  
H.R. 9240. A bill to provide the Comptroller General of the United States access to State records and documents for the purposes of certain audits, investigations, and evaluations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. HAMADEH of Arizona (for himself and Mr. MILLS):

H.R. 9241. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to improve the oversight of the disposition of accountable property in certain theaters of operation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HAMADEH of Arizona (for himself, Mr. MESSMER, and Mr. MILLS):

H.R. 9242. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to submit to Congress a report on the recovery of certain United States nationals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HARDER of California:  
H.R. 9243. A bill to authorize the President to declare a smoke emergency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Small Business, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HARRIGAN:  
H.R. 9244. A bill to regulate certain State taxation of interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. HAYES:  
H.R. 9245. A bill to establish a grant program supporting teacher and school leader induction programs in public schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

By Mr. HERNÁNDEZ (for himself, Mr. BELL, Ms. HOYLE of Oregon, Mr. TRAN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Ms. ROSS):