Initiative focuses on accessibility issues for veterans and servicemembers under the Americans with Disabilities Act. The ADA is an important tool for ensuring that those veterans who return from service with a disability can effectively reintegrate into civilian life.

The Servicemembers and Veterans Initiative provides resources to the public and legal practitioners about Federal laws protecting servicemembers, veterans, and their families. The initiative also provides support and conducts outreach to servicemembers, veterans, and their families through the military departments.

This is a good bill to codify an existing Justice Department program, and I encourage all Members to support it.

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

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

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TAYLOR), my good friend.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the legislation that I introduced with my colleague and fellow Texan from the 16th District, VERONICA ESCOBAR, H.R. 8354, the Servicemembers and Veterans Initiative Act.

As a veteran who proudly served our country in the U.S. Marine Corps, I know how important it is to ensure that those who have served in our armed services are protected from fraud and appropriately represented by the Department of Justice.

We owe a great deal to the courageous men and women who risked their lives to keep us free. Just as they have fought to keep us safe, we must also work here in Congress to protect those servicemembers from those who wish to do them harm, and that is exactly what this bill aims to do.

H.R. 8354 would formally establish the Servicemembers and Veterans Initiative within the Civil Rights Division at the Department of Justice and codify its role and responsibilities. This office would be tasked with protecting the legal interests of the military and veterans community and advise the Attorney General on how to protect servicemembers and veterans from the fraud and predatory schemes that are out there.

Last year, the Federal Trade Commission noticed that U.S. servicemembers are increasingly becoming targets of fraud. In fact, our servicemembers and our veterans lose more on a dollar basis than the civilians who are targeted by similar schemes. This is unacceptable, and we owe it to those who serve to prevent this targeted crime.

The Servicemembers and Veterans Initiative at the Department of Justice would also play an important role in coordinating the prosecution of those who commit fraud specifically targeting our Nation's servicemembers and their families.

This bill is an important step toward protecting our Nation's heroes from fraud, and I am proud to stand with my colleague, Congresswoman ESCOBAR, in support of this bipartisan legislation, and I urge all of my colleagues to vote in support of this important bill.

□ 1715

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

Ms. ESCOBAR. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would like to thank my colleagues, specifically Mr. TAYLOR for his partnership on this very important bill and, again, Chairman NADLER and all of those, including staff and members of the Department of Justice, who made this a better bill.

Our servicemembers and veterans have worked tirelessly to protect us at home and abroad. It is only right that we work as hard as possible to protect their rights and shield them from abuses such as fraud, predatory lending, and other victimization.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support this bipartisan effort to ensure the best for our servicemembers, veterans, and their families, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Judiciary, Committee, I rise in strong support of H.R. 8354, the ''Servicemembers and Veterans Initiative Act of 2020,'' which would permanently establish the Servicemembers and Veterans Initiative (SVI) within the Department of Justice's (DOJ) Civil Rights Division.

I thank my colleague from Texas, Congresswoman ESCOBAR (TX–16), for introducing this important legislation, which I am proud to be a cosponsor.

The Servicemembers and Veterans Initiative Act details SVI's responsibilities to promote the legal interests of servicemembers, veterans, and their families within the Department of Justice.

Among the responsibilities of the SVI would be to make policy on behalf of the Attorney General on legal issues that impact servicemembers, veterans, and their families and appoint a liaison to the Assistant Attorney General for the Criminal Division to coordinate Federal prosecutions involving cases of fraud against servicemembers.

SVI currently has no formal statutory authorization so assigning a liaison in SVI to coordinate criminal fraud prosecutions is critical to protecting servicemembers.

Civil actions initiated by DOJ have not, thus far, stemmed the rising number of fraud schemes, in housing in particular, that target servicemembers.

Criminal prosecutions, available under the current fraud statutes, would provide a strong deterrent to widespread efforts to defraud servicemembers.

By giving SVI a permanent home in DOJ's Civil Rights Division, this bill would ensure that DOJ will continue to provide outreach to servicemembers, will provide the Attorney General with policy recommendations on servicemember-related matters, and will enforce the Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act, the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act of 1986, and the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act, among other laws.

Mr. Speaker, fraud schemes that target servicemembers and their families are especially pernicious.

Within just the preceding five years, the FTC received over 163,000 reports of fraud targeting military retirees and veterans, and nearly 13,000 fraud reports from active duty service members.

More shamefully, the FTC ascertained that the median loss in these cases was significantly higher for servicemembers and veterans than for their civilian counterparts.

Establishing this direct link to the Criminal Division will enable the Justice Department to be more effective in addressing civil and criminal frauds against servicemembers and their families.

A significant number of military veterans live in Houston, Texas.

They are business owners, laborers and community servants who continue to contribute to the local economy.

It is estimated that 18.5 million veterans live in the United States, of which 282,511 call Houston home.

In fact, the Houston metropolitan area is home to nearly one-fifth of Texas' veterans.

Houston-area servicemen and women have served in the Gulf wars, the Korean War and World War II.

But the largest percentage of the Houston veteran population served in the Vietnam War. Most of them are between 35 and 54 years old.

I call on my colleagues to join me in voting in favor of H.R. 8354 to provide much needed support for our nation's veterans.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. ESCOBAR) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 8354, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 965, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

OPEN COURTS ACT OF 2020

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 8235) to provide for the modernization of electronic case management systems, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 8235

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

SEC. 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Open Courts Act of 2020''.

SEC. 2. MODERNIZATION OF ELECTRONIC COURT RECORDS SYSTEMS.

(a) CONSOLIDATION.—Not later than the date specified in subsection (e), as modified by any adjustments certified pursuant to section 6(b), the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, in coordination with the Administrator of General Services, shall develop, deliver, and sustain, consistent with the requirements of

this section and section 3, one system for all public court records.

(b) REQUIREMENTS OF SYSTEM.—The system described in subsection (a) shall comply with the following requirements:

(1) The system shall provide search functions, developed in coordination with the Administrator of General Services, for use by the public and by parties before the court.

(2) The system shall make public court records automatically accessible to the public upon receipt of such records.

(3) Any information made available through a website established pursuant to section 205 of the E–Government Act of 2002 shall be included in the system.

(4) Any website for the system shall substantially comply with the requirements under subsections (b) and (c) of section 205 of the E–Government Act of 2002.

(5) To the extent practicable, external websites shall be able to link to documents on the system. Each website established pursuant to section 205 of the E–Government Act of 2002 shall contain a link to the system.

(c) DATA STANDARDS.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT OF DATA STANDARDS.—The Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, in coordination with the Administrator of General Services and the Archivist of the United States, shall establish data standards for the system described in this section and section 3.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The data standards established under paragraph (1) shall, to the extent reasonable and practicable—

(A) incorporate widely accepted common data elements;

(B) incorporate a widely accepted, nonproprietary, full text searchable, platform-independent computer-readable format; and

(C) be capable of being continually upgraded as necessary.

(3) DEADLINES.—Not later than 9 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts shall issue guidance to all Federal courts on the data standards established under this section.

(d) USE OF TECHNOLOGY.—In carrying out the duties under subsection (a), the Director shall use modern technology in order—

(1) to improve security, data accessibility, data quality, affordability, and performance; and

(2) to minimize the burden on pro se litigants.

(e) DATE SPECIFIED.—The date specified in this subsection is January 1, 2025, unless the Administrator of General Services certifies to Congress, by not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, that an additional period of time is required. If the Administrator so certifies, the date specified in this subsection shall be a date that is no later than January 1, 2026.

(f) FUNDS FOR ESTABLISHMENT, OPERATION, AND MAINTENANCE OF MODERNIZED COURT RECORDS SYSTEM.—

(1) SHORT TERM ACCESS FEES TO FUND DEVELOPMENT AND DELIVERY OF MODERNIZED COURT RECORDS SYSTEM.—Until the date specified in subsection (e), to cover the costs of carrying out this section and section 3 and pursuant to sections 1913, 1914, 1926, 1930, and 1932 of title 28, United States Code, the Judicial Conference shall prescribe a progressive schedule of reasonable additional fees for persons, other than government agencies, who accrue fees for electronic access to information under section 303 of Public Law 102–140 (28 U.S.C. 1913 note; 105 Stat. 807) in an amount of $6,000 or greater in any quarter. Any such additional fees shall be assessed on a progressive fee schedule according to the level of use so that higher volume users are assessed higher fees.

(2) PRICING FOR HIGH-VOLUME, FOR-PROFIT USE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Pursuant to sections 1913, 1914, 1926, 1930, and 1932 of title 28, United States Code, the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, in coordination with the Administrator of General Services and the Office of Technology Transformation of the General Services Administration, may prescribe a schedule of reasonable fees for high-volume, for-profit public users of the system described in this section and section 3, to facilitate service-level agreements for maximum response times, integrations, high availability, and service and support.

(B) FEE REQUIREMENTS.—The schedule of fees described in paragraph (1) shall be based on a determination of specific and substantial need, and may not impair access to justice and the public right of access to court records, restrain innovation in the provision of legal services and access to public court records, nor inhibit not for profit research of the business of the Federal courts.

(3) FEES TO FUND OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF MODERNIZED COURT RECORDS SYSTEM.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—To cover the costs of carrying out this Act, the Judicial Conference of the United States may, only to the extent necessary, prescribe schedules of reasonable user fees, pursuant to sections 1913, 1914, 1926, 1930, and 1932 of title 28, United States Code. Such fees shall be based on the extent of use of the system described under this section and section 3 as well as factors such as feasibility, fairness to other users of the system, and efficacy, and may not foreclose access to justice and the public right of access to court records.

(B) FILING FEES PROHIBITED.—The Judicial Conference of the United States may not prescribe filing fees to cover the cost of the system described in this section and section 3 unless the Judicial Conference determines that all other sources of fees will not cover the costs of such system. Only after such a determination and only to the extent necessary, the Judicial Conference may prescribe schedules of progressive filing fees under subparagraph (A). In addition to the requirements of subparagraph (A), such filing fees—

(i) shall be based on factors to ensure that such schedules are graduated and equitable, including the type of action and claim for relief, the status of a filer, the amount of damages demanded, the estimated complexity of the type of action, and the interests of justice;

(ii) may be prescribed for the filing of a counterclaim;

(iii) shall not apply in the case of a pro se litigant or litigant who certifies the litigant's financial hardship;

(iv) shall not be a basis for rejecting a filing or otherwise denying a party seeking relief access to the courts of the United States;

(v) shall be assessed according to schedules, not on a case-by-case, ad hoc basis; and

(vi) shall not be greater than 15 percent of any other fees associated with the filing.

(4) USE OF FUNDS.—

(A) DEPOSIT FEES.—All fees collected under this subsection shall be deposited as offsetting collections to the Judiciary Information Technology Fund pursuant to section 612(c)(1)(A) of title 28, United States Code, to reimburse expenses incurred in carrying out this section.

(B) AUTHORIZED USES OF FEES.—Amounts deposited to the Judiciary Information Technology Fund pursuant to this paragraph and not used to reimburse expenses incurred in carrying out this section and section 3 may be used pursuant to section 612(a) of title 28, United States Code.

(5) INTEREST OF JUSTICE.—A court may waive any fee imposed under paragraph (3) in the interest of justice upon motion.

(6) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Paragraphs (2) and (3) shall take effect on the date specified in subsection (e). Paragraph (1) and section 303 of Public Law 102–140 (28 U.S.C. 1913 note; 105 Stat. 807) shall cease to have effect on that date.

SEC. 3. PUBLIC ACCESS TO ELECTRONIC COURT RECORDS SYSTEM REQUIREMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than the date specified in section 2(e), and subject to any certification under section 6(b), the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, in coordination with the Administrator of General Services, shall make all materials in the system described in section 2 and this section publicly accessible, free of charge and without requiring registration.

(b) USE OF TECHNOLOGY.—In providing public access under subsection (a), the Director shall, in coordination with the Administrator of General Services, use modern technology in order—

(1) to improve security, data accessibility, quality, ease of public access, affordability, and performance; and

(2) to minimize the burden on pro se litigants.

(c) FUNDING FOR PUBLIC ACCESS TO MODERNIZED ELECTRONIC COURT RECORDS SYSTEM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—To cover any marginal costs of ensuring the public accessibility, free of charge, of all materials in the system in accordance with this section, the Judicial Conference of the United States shall collect an annual fee from Federal agencies equal to the Public Access to Court Electronic Records access fees paid by those agencies in 2018, as adjusted for inflation. All fees collected under this subsection shall be deposited as offsetting collections to the Judiciary Information Technology Fund pursuant to section 612(c)(1)(A) of title 28, United States Code, to reimburse expenses incurred in providing services in accordance with this section.

(2) AUTHORIZED USES OF FEES.—Amounts deposited to the Judiciary Information Technology Fund pursuant to this subsection and not used to reimburse expenses incurred in carrying out this section may be used to reimburse expenses incurred in carrying out section 2. Amounts not used to reimburse expenses incurred in carrying out section 2 may be used pursuant to section 612(a) of title 28, United States Code.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Paragraph (1) shall take effect beginning on the date specified in section 2(e).

SEC. 4. ENSURING MODERN DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS.

(a) INDUSTRY STANDARDS.—The system described in sections 2 and 3 shall be developed in accordance with industry standards for the incremental development of new information technology systems, including user-centered design, Agile software development practices and procurement, and service-oriented architecture.

(b) ANALYSES.—The Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts shall, in cooperation with the Administrator of General Services, conduct regular analyses at each stage of system development to ensure that any requirements—

(1) are consistent with this Act;

(2) meet the business needs of users of the system, the public, and the judiciary; and

(3) comply with relevant statutes and rules, including chapter 131 of title 28, United States Code (commonly known as the ''Rules Enabling Act''), the Federal Rules of Procedure, and local rules and orders of Federal courts.

(c) INITIAL PLAN.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts shall submit to Congress a report with respect to its initial plan for development of the system after consultation with the Office of Technology Transformation Services of the General Services Administration and the United States Digital Service, which may include an analysis of the state of the system as of the date of enactment of this Act, an approach for developing the system consistent with sections 2 and 3 of this Act, and a proposed timeline for development.

(d) REPORTS AND NOTICE.—

(1) REPORTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Each quarter after the issuance of the report described in subsection (c), the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts shall report quarterly to the Committees on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Senate on progress of the development of the system, improvements achieved, and risks that arise (such as lack of funding source or lack of technological solutions to meet the needs of this Act or applicable statutes and rules). Such report shall include an assessment of vendors' compliance with a quality assessment surveillance plan, code quality, and whether the system is meeting users' needs.

(B) SYSTEM STATUS.—Not later than 60 days after the end of each fiscal year, the Comptroller General of the United States shall report to Congress on the policies, goals, performance, budget, contracts, fee proposals, and user fees of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, including input from a cross-section of the nongovernmental users and stakeholders, with respect to the system described in sections 2 and 3 of this Act.

(2) NOTICE.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, and quarterly thereafter, the Comptroller General of the United States shall notify Congress that the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts has—

(A) produced additional usable functionality of the system described under sections 2 and 3 of this Act;

(B) held live, publicly accessible demonstrations of software in development; and

(C) allowed the Comptroller General or a designee to attend all sprint reviews held during such 6 month or quarterly period.

SEC. 5. REVIEW AND PUBLICATION OF USER FEES.

(a) PERIODIC REVIEW.—The Judicial Conference of the United States shall review any schedule of fees prescribed under this Act 3 years after such schedule becomes effective and every 3 years thereafter to ensure that the schedule meets the requirement of this Act. If a fee schedule does not meet such requirements, the Judicial Conference shall prescribe a new schedule of fees pursuant to this section and submit the new schedule of fees to Congress pursuant to this section.

(b) FEE PROPOSAL AND COMMENT PERIODS.—

(1) PUBLIC COMMENT.—The Judicial Conference of the United States shall publish any schedule of new fees or fee adjustments, as authorized under this Act, in the Federal Register and on the website of the United States Courts. The Judicial Conference shall accept public comment on the proposed fees for a period of not less than 60 days.

(2) PUBLICATION OF FINAL SCHEDULE OF NEW FEES OR FEE ADJUSTMENTS.—After the period specified in paragraph (2), the final schedule of new fees or fee adjustments shall be published in the Federal Register and on the website of the United States Courts along with an explanation of any changes from the proposed schedule of new fees or fee adjustments.

(3) CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW PERIOD.—A schedule of fees set or adjusted under paragraph (3) may not become effective—

(A) before the end of the 90-day period beginning on the day after the date on which the Judicial Conference publishes the schedule of new fees or fee adjustments under paragraph (3); or

(B) if a law is enacted disapproving such fee.

(c) STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Judicial Conference of the United States shall periodically study the system described in sections 2 and 3 of this Act in accordance with this section. The study shall examine—

(A) the relative extent to which specific functions and usage of the system are supported, directly or indirectly, by fees, appropriations, and other sources of revenue; and

(B) whether, and to what extent, there are additional fees of any kind that could be more appropriately imposed to support the operations and maintenance of the system and whether or not any such fees should or must be imposed by statute or by judiciary regulation;

(C) whether, and to what extent, there are additional appropriations that should be pursued that should be provided to support the system in lieu of fees; and

(D) whether, and to what extent, there are other sources of revenue that should be provided to support the system.

(2) CONSIDERATIONS.—In determining the appropriateness of any fees, the Judicial Conference of the United States shall consider the extent to which any such fees would—

(A) negatively or positively affect the administration of justice;

(B) impose inappropriate burdens on access to justice by litigants;

(C) relate to the relative impact of activities on system costs;

(D) improve fairness to users;

(E) otherwise be fair or unfair to the public;

(F) be feasible to implement effectively; and

(G) generate meaningful revenue.

(3) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Judicial Conference of the United States shall submit to the Committees on the Judiciary of the House of Representative and the Senate a report on the conclusions of the study described under this section.

(4) FEE AUTHORITY.—If the Judicial Conference of the United States determines, pursuant to subsection (a), that additional fees are reasonable and necessary to fund the system described in sections 2 and 3, it may promulgate such fees pursuant to section 2(f)(3)(A).

(5) ADDITIONAL REPORT.—Not less frequently than every 3 years, the Judicial Conference shall review the matters described in this subsection and report any new findings to Congress as described in this subsection. Any fees may be adjusted pursuant to section 2(f)(3)(A).

SEC. 6. REPORTING AND CERTIFICATION TO CONGRESS ON FINANCES.

(a) ANNUAL REPORT AND CONSULTATION CONCERNING FUNDING FOR THE FOLLOWING FISCAL YEAR.—At the beginning of each fiscal year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts shall submit to the Committees on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Senate a report on—

(1) the status of funding the system described under sections 2 and 3; and

(2) plans for any new fee proposals or adjustments and whether there is a foreseeable need to use the certification authority provided under subsection (b)(2) in the following fiscal year.

(b) CERTIFICATION REGARDING ANTICIPATED FUNDING IN THE CURRENT FISCAL YEAR.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts may treat any and all receipts, funds, expenditures and costs associated with the system established under sections 2 and 3 as constituting a separate item in its budget distinct from the remainder of its budget.

(2) CERTIFICATION.—At the beginning of a fiscal year, starting in fiscal year 2023, and only when necessary, the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts may submit a certification, including supporting documentation and analysis, to the Committees on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Senate, which—

(A) identifies any expected deficit in funds for that fiscal year; and

(B) specifies the Director's response for such deficit for the remainder of that fiscal year, including—

(i) modifying the scope and scale of the system described in sections 2 and 3;

(ii) increasing fees or other receipts within the Judicial Conference's authority; and

(iii) temporarily delaying the delivery of the system.

(3) CONSULTATION.—Not later than 30 days after receipt of the certification described in paragraph (2), the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts and the Chairs and Ranking Members of the Committees on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Senate shall meet in person concerning the certification, supporting documentation, and analysis.

(4) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts may implement its response described in paragraph (2) any time after the 30-day period following the consultation described in paragraph (3).

(5) GAO REVIEW.—In any fiscal year during which such certification is issued and implemented, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a comprehensive review of the certification not later than 120 days after its submission, including—

(A) the accuracy of the expectations of the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts with respect to any deficit in funds;

(B) the efficacy of the Director's recommended response, and

(C) the Comptroller General's recommendations for alternative or additional responses submitted as a report to the Director and Committees on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

(6) DIRECTOR RESPONSE TO REVIEW.—Not later than 60 days after the Comptroller General of the United States conducts a review under paragraph (5), the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts shall prepare and submit to the Committees on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Senate a response to such review.

SEC. 7. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act, or the amendments made by this Act, shall be construed to—

(1) affect the filing fees or other filing procedures for prisoners; or

(2) abrogate, limit, or modify the requirements described in section 1915 of title 28, United States Code.

SEC. 8. DIGITAL ACCESSIBILITY STANDARDS.

The system described under sections 2 and 3 of this Act shall comply with relevant digital accessibility standards established pursuant to section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

SEC. 9. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled ''Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation'' for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) and the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. ARMSTRONG) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 8235, as amended, the Open Courts Act, which would require the Federal judiciary to allow free public access to court records over the internet and modernize the court records system so that it will cost less to maintain and be more secure.

This act is the product of over 5 years of bipartisan effort, and I am so proud that we have gotten the bill to this moment.

I first want to thank the majority leader, STENY HOYER, for his involvement and commitment to bringing this important legislation to the floor, and I would like to thank Director Duff and his staff for their recent attention to this bill.

I also want to thank Mr. JORDAN for his support for this bill at the committee's markup.

I would be remiss if I did not recognize our partners in the Senate, Senators PORTMAN and WYDEN, for their leadership and commitment to this effort.

Finally, I extend sincere appreciation to my colleague from Georgia, DOUG COLLINS, the colead on this bill. I want to thank him for his partnership in working to make the Federal court records system freely accessible to all Americans.

I would also like to thank Perry Apelbaum with the Judiciary Committee, Jamie Simpson and Matt Robinson of my subcommittee, Jon Ferro with Congressman COLLINS' office, and I would also like to give a special thanks to Keith Abouchar with Leader HOYER's office for all of his efforts to help us be on the floor today with this bill. Without everyone's persistence, dedication, and countless hours of hard work behind the scenes, we would not be here today.

Mr. Speaker, wealth should not act as a barrier to access our courts. Whether it is a journalist reporting on the courts' activities or a citizen petitioning the court for redress, access to the courts should be free to all, not just to those who can afford it.

Forcing the public to pay for access to court records imposes an unnecessary and unconscionable burden on people who are simply engaging in a constitutionally protected activity. Transparency and accessibility should be our goal, not profits and limited access.

Court records should be as easy to access as legislation is on Congress.gov. All you have to do is put in that website, go to it, and look at all of the legislation that we produce, Mr. Speaker, and you should be able to do the same thing at the Federal courthouse.

Our courts are a vital part of America's government, and we in Congress have a responsibility to ensure that public records in public courthouses are accessible for free to the public. This bill provides such protection of our most sacred democratic ideals.

Technology has become essential to preserving our First Amendment rights by helping to ensure meaningful access to justice and to court records. It is past time that we bring our Federal court records system into the 21st century.

Convenient access to public records in public courthouses shouldn't be a privilege for the few who can afford it. It is our duty to change the system, and that is what this bill does. It finally makes it fairer for everyone else.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all of my colleagues to join us voting on this bipartisan piece of legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 8235, the Open Courts Act of 2020, will modernize the judicial branch and bring it sometimes kicking and screaming into the 21st century.

First, the bill will update and streamline the Federal judiciary's case management system, ushering in much-needed improvements to the technological capabilities of the system.

The bill will consolidate the judiciary's electronic court records system, establish certain data standards, and require the records system to follow those standards. These improvements to the case management system will increase the efficiency and improve the availability of court records to the American public.

Second, the Open Courts Act will require that Federal court records are free and accessible. By ensuring that public records are freely accessible, this bill will bring increased transparency to our judicial process.

The reforms contained in the Open Courts Act are not new ideas. Advocates of judicial transparency have long supported efforts to make court records free to the public. The Open Courts Act makes long overdue, commonsense reforms. This bipartisan legislation will expand the public's ability to not only find court records, but to access them as well.

However, before I conclude my statement, I do want to note one thing. While this bill is bipartisan, the text was updated late last night. The bill now contains an additional eight pages and includes various changes to the text, specifically regarding redaction language of sensitive info.

I understand why courts don't necessarily want this burden, and typically, under current process, filers are the ones who do the redactions, but now the text seems to be silent on the redaction of sensitive information altogether.

I honestly don't know where that places the current policy, and the reason I don't know is because we were made aware of these changes less than 24 hours ago. This is not how a bipartisan bill is supposed to proceed, and it is a really good way to get a broad bipartisan bill to not become law.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR).

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the Judicial Conference of the United States.

JUDICIAL CONFERENCE OF
THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, December 7, 2020.

Hon. STENY HOYER,
Majority Leader, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. LEADER: I write on behalf of the Judicial Conference of the United States, the policy-making body of the federal Judiciary, to express our continued strong opposition to H.R. 8235, the Open Courts Act of 2020 (''OCA''), which is scheduled for floor action on Tuesday, December 8, 2020. This legislation—which will take years to implement—rushes forward without appropriate and necessary assurances and provisions regarding the budget for such an enormous undertaking. The bill as drafted will have devastating budgetary and operational impact on the Judiciary and our ability to serve the public.

We very much appreciate that you, along with House Judiciary Courts Subcommittee Chairman Hank Johnson, intervened last week after my helpful conversation with Chairman Johnson to prompt more dialogue between the branches. The many hours of staff conversations, through the weekend, that followed your encouragement led to some significant textual changes to the bill. We are grateful for those efforts which addressed some of our concerns with the previous version of the bill. Very serious concerns remain, however, and further dialogue is much needed.

The fact is that our preliminary estimates for the cost of this bill is orders of magnitude higher than the bill's proponents have presumed—currently we are $2 billion apart—and CBO's hurried and preliminary estimates of the cost of developing and implementing a new electronic filing and public

access system, in our view, vastly underestimates the cost of the bill. Critically, some of the bill's revenue streams are also untested, difficult to administer and/or impossible to estimate reliably in advance.

In our cost estimates are correct—or even marginally closer to correct than the bill's proponents'—there is no scenario in which the revenue generated by the bill could be sufficient to cover those costs. This will force the Judiciary to slash funding for staff and other critical operations. Moreover, the Judiciary's backbone case management system, and therefore the Judiciary itself, could grind to a halt. In anticipation of a funding shortfall, the bill now provides for an emergency pause in the transition to the new system required by the bill. This might be preferable to the forced accommodation of significant unbudgeted costs, but such a pause in the middle of a massive transition of systems would result in its own substantial disruptions.

Better information on the costs of this bill and the revenues it would generate is needed to ensure that the Judiciary and public users of this system avoid devastating consequences. We believe we will have a much clearer picture of cost projections in early Spring 2021, at the conclusion of the first phase of a study for a replacement case management system to be performed by GSA.

The Judiciary has other major concerns with the bill, including issues of technological feasibility, security, and governance, but the threat of devastating budget consequences for the Third Branch simply cannot be overemphasized.

The Judiciary is committed to working collaboratively with the next Congress to improve our systems for filing, storing, managing, and making available to the public all relevant court records. We recognize and share Congress' bipartisan interest in a modern, effective, fair and successfully funded system. The current version of the Open Courts Act, however, is not the way to accomplish those goals. We look forward to working through these shared goals with you in the future.

Sincerely,

JAMES C. DUFF,
Secretary.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, let me first just acknowledge the well-intentioned goals of this legislation and my colleagues from Georgia in a bipartisan way working together. I applaud their efforts to attempt to modernize the judicial branch and make judicial records more accessible to the American people. Nevertheless, I regrettably rise with reservations, as a former practitioner in Federal court, regarding H.R. 8235, the Open Courts Act of 2020.

According to the Judicial Conference of the United States, the bill, as drafted, would have devastating budgetary and operational impacts on the judiciary's ability to serve the public. Current estimates for the cost of the bill from the Judicial Conference are currently $2 billion apart from the Congressional Budget Office's preliminary estimates of the cost to develop and implement a new electronic filing and public access system.

Should these cost estimates be correct, there is no scenario in which the revenue generated by the bill would cover costs, forcing the judiciary to slash funding for staff and other critical operations. This bill has a $2 billion price tag, and the entire budget of the Federal judiciary is only $8 billion, annually.

Additionally, despite the bill's cap on increases to filing fees, it authorizes the judiciary to raise filing fees if the other revenue sources in the bill prove insufficient to cover costs.

I know my colleagues do not want to deny access to the Federal courts. Ultimately, this bill does not resolve some of the judiciary's most fundamental concerns, and, as a result, I regrettably urge my colleagues to consider these issues and the bill's impact on the judiciary.

I know the Judicial Conference is willing to work with Congress to resolve some of these outstanding issues and to get at the sponsors' goals—which are very laudable, indeed—and that is to modernize the judicial branch and to make judicial records more accessible to the American people.

I will say that, under current law, low-income Americans can access many of these records without cost, and the vast majority of those organizations and individuals that are paying for these records and underwriting the costs are institutions that have the means to do so.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to consider these issues and the bill's potential impact on the judiciary, and I encourage my colleagues on the other side of the Capitol to work with the Judicial Conference to resolve these outstanding concerns.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments of my friend.

This has been a 5-year, bipartisan effort that only recently yielded the ability of the Judicial Conference, through the Administrative Office, to actually come to the table and talk to Congress to try to work out their concerns.

After about a week of lots of conversation, hours upon hours of conversation, dialogue, and negotiations, we came up with an amended bill. Then at the very last minute, today, the Judicial Conference issues a letter citing a preposterous figure—$2 billion—for this system, which is not attached to any realistic cost estimate whatsoever.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the CBO's, Congressional Budget Office's, estimate of the cost of the Open Courts Act to put in a new system that is more secure and more user friendly than the one that is in place right now.

CBO ESTIMATE OF THE STATUTORY PAY-AS-YOU-GO EFFECTS OF H.R. 8235, THE OPEN COURTS ACT OF 2020, AS POSTED ON THE WEBSITE OF THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE ON DECEMBER 8, 2020

Estimates relative to CBO's March 2020 baseline. Components may not sum to totals because of rounding.

H.R. 8235 would require the Administrative Office of the United States Courts (AOUSC), working in coordination with the General Services Administration, to develop and implement a modernized software system to manage the electronic records of the court. The legislation would require that public court records be accessible to the public, and would authorize the AOUSC to impose new fees—particularly on high-volume, for-profit users—to cover the costs of developing and maintaining the new system.

If enacted, CBO expects those fees would generate $47 million in additional revenue over the 2021–2030 period, mostly from high-volume users of the system. CBO believes that the new fees should be recorded in the budget as revenues, because they are new and an exercise of the government's sovereign power over the federal judiciary. Those revenues would be offset by a decline in other revenues of approximately 22 percent to account for indirect tax effects. As a result, CBO estimates that the legislation would increase net revenues by $37 million over that period.

Under the bill, the additional revenue would be deposited in the Judiciary Information Technology Fund, and the AOUSC would be authorized to spend those fees without further appropriation. As a result, CBO estimates H.R. 8235 would increase direct spending by $46 million over the 2021–2030 period. CBO expects that most of those costs would be incurred during the 2021–2025 period as major work on software development is completed and the system is deployed across the federal judiciary.

On net, CBO estimates that enacting H.R. 8235 would increase the deficit by $9 million over the 2021–2030 period.

If enacted, H.R. 8235 also would affect spending subject to appropriation by the AOUSC; CBO has not completed an estimate of that effect.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. It is a state-of-the-art, 21st century system as opposed to a 1985 system, one that will cost, in the CBO's assessment, about $46 million over 10 years.

That is a drastic difference than a $2 billion cost estimate submitted at the last minute to confuse and try to derail passage of this very commonsense, necessary legislation that brings judicial records into the 21st century.

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

□ 1730

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, with all of the concerns that exist, I think the goal of transparency and cost effectiveness are still worthy of this, and I urge support of the bill.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 8235 is a bill that will make a meaningful difference in the accessibility and transparency of an entire branch of the Federal Government. It vindicates our critical First Amendment rights and it will establish a level playing field for access to critical government documents. For those reasons, I urge my colleagues to support the bill, as amended.

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend Chairmen JERRY NADLER and HANK JOHNSON, Rep. DOUG COLLINS, Ranking Members JIM JORDAN and MARTHA ROBEY, Director of the Administrative Office of the Courts Jim Duff, and their respective staffs for their efforts

to develop and improve this important legislation. A number of improvements have been made over the last several days to the Open Courts Act as reported out of the Judiciary Committee by voice vote in September. This bill would mandate the development of a modern public records access system that would also relieve the general public, small law firms, and other modest users of having to pay fees to access public documents filed in federal courts. Among other priorities, the bill would provide for the adoption of a progressive fee schedule applying to aggregators and large law firms, which are the biggest consumers of public court records and use these materials for profit-seeking ends.

I recognize the press of other business may prevent this bill from being enacted before the end of this Congress. Whatever course awaits the Open Courts Act after today's passage, I look forward to continuing working with all the parties to react to any new information that we may receive and continue refining the bill in mutual discussions.

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD a letter from the Judicial Conference of the United States voicing their opposition and concerns to H.R. 8235, the Open Courts Act of 2020.

JUDICIAL CONFERENCE OF
THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, December 7, 2020.

Hon. STENY HOYER,
Majority Leader, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. LEADER: I write on behalf of the Judicial Conference of the United States, the policy-making body of the federal Judiciary, to express our continued strong opposition to H.R. 8235, the Open Courts Act of 2020 (''OCA''), which is scheduled for floor action on Tuesday, December 8, 2020. This legislation—which will take years to implement—rushes forward without appropriate and necessary assurances and provisions regarding the budget for such an enormous undertaking. The bill as drafted will have devastating budgetary and operational impact on the Judiciary and our ability to serve the public.

We very much appreciate that you, along with House Judiciary Courts Subcommittee Chairman Hank Johnson, intervened last week after my helpful conversation with Chairman Johnson to prompt more dialogue between the branches. The many hours of staff conversations, through the weekend, that followed your encouragement led to some significant textual changes to the bill. We are grateful for those efforts which addressed some of our concerns with the previous version of the bill. Very serious concerns remain, however, and further dialogue is much needed.

The fact is that our preliminary estimates for the cost of this bill is orders of magnitude higher than the bill's proponents have presumed—currently we are $2 billion apart—and CBO's hurried and preliminary estimates of the cost of developing and implementing a new electronic filing and public access system, in our view, vastly underestimates the cost of the bill. Critically, some of the bill's revenue streams are also untested, difficult to administer and/or impossible to estimate reliably in advance.

If our cost estimates are correct—or even marginally closer to correct than the bill's proponents'—there is no scenario in which the revenue generated by the bill could be sufficient to cover those costs. This will force the Judiciary to slash funding for staff and other critical operations. Moreover, the Judiciary's backbone case management system, and therefore the Judiciary itself, could grind to a halt. In anticipation of a funding shortfall, the bill now provides for an emergency pause in the transition to the new system required by the bill. This might be preferable to the forced accommodation of significant unbudgeted costs, but such a pause in the middle of a massive transition of systems would result in its own substantial disruptions.

Better information on the costs of this bill and the revenues it would generate is needed to ensure that the Judiciary and public users of this system avoid devastating consequences. We believe we will have a much clearer picture of cost projections in early Spring 2021, at the conclusion of the first phase of a study for a replacement case management system to be performed by GSA.

The Judiciary has other major concerns with the bill, including issues of technological feasibility, security, and governance, but the threat of devastating budget consequences for the Third Branch simply cannot be overemphasized.

The Judiciary is committed to working collaboratively with the next Congress to improve our systems for filing, storing, managing, and making available to the public all relevant court records. We recognize and share Congress' bipartisan interest in a modern, effective, fair and successfully funded system. The current version of the Open Courts Act, however, is not the way to accomplish those goals. We look forward to working through these shared goals with you in the future.

Sincerely,

JAMES C. DUFF,
Secretary.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Judiciary, Committee, I rise in strong support of H.R. 8235, the ''Open Courts Act of 2020,'' which would centralize and modernize the federal judiciary's court records systems (called CM/ECF) and would eliminate the paywall (called PACER) that currently forces the public to pay to access these records.

The new system will provide a centralized, easily searchable site to file and read court records and monitor docket activity, and equally important, make all public court records on the site available free of charge.

Every year, the public pays the federal judiciary more than $100 million in fees so they can read the motions, briefs, orders, exhibits, calendar entries, and other court filings that make up the overwhelming majority of federal litigation and bankruptcy practice.

These fees are used to maintain and operate the judiciary's electronic court records systems (called ''case management and electronic court filing systems'' or ''CM/ECF'') that judges, court employees, and the parties before the court use to file documents, issue decisions, and generally manage proceedings.

Although many parties before the court pay a fee to initiate a proceeding or otherwise file a document (generally called ''filing fees''), these fees do not support the electronic courts records systems they rely on.

Instead, those systems are subsidized by the public.

The fees the public pays to view federal court records are officially called ''electronic public access'' or ''EPA'' fees.

More commonly, they are called ''PACER'' fees, after the paywall system the public must use to pay for and access those records.

The Public Access to Court Electronic Records (PACER) system charges users 10 cents per page to view, download, or search for public court records.

The per-document fee is capped at $3.00; audio files of court hearings, if they exist, cost $2,40.

Judicial opinions are free, as are the first $30 of charges per quarter.

As several retired judges have argued, ''openness serves a structural role in our republican system of self-government'' and that ''opening up judicial records by removing the PACER paywall would be consistent with the best traditions of judicial transparency.''

PACER functions as a paywall that the public must pass through to access the judiciary's electronic court records systems.

These systems are highly decentralized—every one of the 94 district courts, 13 courts of appeals, and 90 bankruptcy courts have their own CM/ECF system.

Until recently, for example, a user was required to have a separate username and password for every CM/ECF system—today, some, but not all, courts allow a user to have the same password and username.

Seamus Hughes, the Deputy Director of George Washington University's Program on Extremism, has spent years researching terrorism cases in the United States, Europe, and in the Middle East. As he researches individuals and entities charged with providing material support to foreign and domestic terrorist organizations.

As part of those investigations, he developed expertise in searching the federal court records system and in testimony last year, described the consequences of this set up:

Quite simply, it is not easy to access public court records on PACER. PACER provides access to federal criminal records and is organized by federal districts in each state . . . To use the system you need to apply for a PACER account, get a password, and know what district in each state you want to search. Each search requires the user to know what they are looking for and where. Even then the cost is not always tied to a result.

For example, if you are a terrorism researcher and want to review every case that charges material support to a terrorist organization, you would have to go to 94 different individual court websites and conduct a new and separate search on each website.

Mr. Speaker, in addition, some public court records, including trial exhibits and unsealed documents, are routinely unavailable because they are not posted on a court's CM/ECF system, and documents are difficult to find because there are no uniform tags or naming conventions.

Mr. Speaker, the Open Courts Act of 2020 addresses these problems and helps ensure that the public and free access to the American judicial system remains available.

Section 2(a) of the bill requires the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts to, in coordination with the Administrator of General Services, consolidate all federal court records into one system within 2–3 years.

Section 3(a) requires the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts to, in coordination with the Administrator of General Services, make all court records on the system established by section 2 freely available to the public.

Section 3(b) grants authority to the Judicial Conference to designate, after notice and

comment, certain categories of records that will be subject to up to a 5-day delay before they are made publicly accessible.

Any such designation must be no broader than necessary and be based on a determination of a specific and substantial interest in restricting the public right of access to court records. Any designation expires after 3 years unless renewed via notice and comment.

Section 3(c) requires the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, in coordination with the Administrator of General Services, to ensure that the public can search for and access court records, similar to the requirements under Section 2 of this act.

Finally, section 3(d) establishes the dates when all PACER fees must be eliminated and court records are made freely available to the public within two years from enactment unless the Director of General Services certifies that an additional year is needed.

This is needed legislation and I support it.

I urge all Members to join me in voting for H.R. 8235, the "Open Courts Act of 2020."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 8235, 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.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 6395, WILLIAM M. (MAC) THORNBERRY NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2021

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on adoption of the conference report on 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, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 335, nays 78, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 238]

YEAS—335

Adams
Aguilar
Allen
Allred
Amodei
Armstrong
Axne
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Blunt Rochester
Bost
Brady
Brindisi
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Comer
Conaway
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cunningham
Curtis
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeFazio
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Emmer
Escobar
Eshoo
Estes
Evans
Ferguson
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Flores
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx (NC)
Frankel
Fudge
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (CA)
Garcia (TX)
Gianforte
Gibbs
Golden
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Haaland
Hagedorn
Hall
Harder (CA)
Hartzler
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Higgins (NY)
Hill (AR)
Himes
Holding
Hollingsworth
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hudson
Huizenga
Hurd (TX)
Jackson Lee
Jacobs
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Keller
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
Lamb
Lamborn
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (NV)
Lesko
Levin (CA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Loudermilk
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marshall
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCarthy
McCaul
McCollum
McEachin
McHenry
McKinley
McNerney
Meeks
Meuser
Mfume
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (NC)
Napolitano
Neal
Newhouse
Norcross
Nunes
O'Halleran
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Porter
Price (NC)
Quigley
Reed
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Rose (NY)
Rose, John W.
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Rutherford
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Shimkus
Simpson
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Spanberger
Spano
Speier
Stanton
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Stevens
Stewart
Stivers
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Timmons
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Trone
Turner
Underwood
Upton
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Waltz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watkins
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wexton
Wild
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Young
Zeldin

NAYS—78

Amash
Arrington
Babin
Barragán
Biggs
Bishop (NC)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Buck
Budd
Burchett
Chu, Judy
Clarke (NY)
Cline
Cloud
Davidson (OH)
DeGette
DeSaulnier
Doyle, Michael F.
Duncan
Espaillat
Fulcher
Gabbard
Gaetz
García (IL)
Gohmert
Gomez
Gooden
Gosar
Griffith
Harris
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Huffman
Jayapal
Jordan
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Lee (CA)
Levin (MI)
Long
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Massie
Mast
McClintock
McGovern
Meng
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Nadler
Neguse
Norman
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pence
Perry
Pocan
Posey
Pressley
Raskin
Rice (SC)
Rouzer
Roy
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schweikert
Serrano
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Tiffany
Tlaib
Velázquez
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Welch
Yoho

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Engel

NOT VOTING—16

Abraham
Aderholt
Bishop (UT)
Calvert
Carter (TX)
Collins (GA)
Dunn
Graves (LA)
King (IA)
LaMalfa
Lucas
Reschenthaler
Scott, Austin
Steube
Walker
Wright

□ 1825

Mr. PERRY changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mrs. DINGELL and Mr. GROTHMAN changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 965, 116TH CONGRESS

Barragán (Beyer)
Bera (Aguilar)
Bonamici (Clark (MA))
Brownley (CA) (Clark (MA))
Cárdenas (Cisneros)
Cohen (Beyer)
Costa (Cooper)
Cunningham (Murphy (FL))
Dean (Scanlon)
DeSaulnier (Matsui)
Deutch (Rice (NY))
Doggett (Raskin)
Frankel (Clark (MA))
Garamendi (Sherman)
Grijalva (García (IL))
Hastings (Wasserman Schultz)
Jayapal (Raskin)
Johnson (TX) (Jeffries)
Kim (Davids (KS))
Kind (Beyer)
Kirkpatrick (Stanton)
Kuster (NH) (Clark (MA))
Lamb (Crow)
Lawson (FL) (Demings)
Lieu, Ted (Beyer)
Lofgren (Jeffries)
Lowenthal (Beyer)
Lowey (Tonko)
McEachin (Wexton)
Meng (Clark (MA))
Mitchell (Spanberger)
Moore (Beyer)
Mucarsel-Powell (Wasserman Schultz)
Nadler (Jeffries)
Napolitano (Correa)
Pascrell (Pallone)
Payne (Wasserman Schultz)
Peters (Kildee)
Peterson (Craig)
Pingree (Cicilline)
Pocan (Raskin)
Porter (Wexton)
Price (NC) (Butterfield)
Richmond (Butterfield)
Rooney (FL) (Beyer)
Rouda (Aguilar)
Roybal-Allard (García (TX))
Ruiz (Dingell)
Rush (Underwood)
Schneider (Casten (IL))
Schrier (DelBene)
Serrano (Jeffries)
Titus (Connolly)
Tlaib (Dingell)
Trahan (McGovern)
Vargas (Correa)
Velázquez (Clarke (NY))
Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Welch (McGovern)
Wilson (FL) (Hayes)

SERVICEMEMBERS AND VETERANS INITIATIVE ACT OF 2020

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOMEZ). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule