The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. TAKANO).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC, March 7, 2019.
I hereby appoint the Honorable Mark Takano to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2019, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties. All time shall be equally allocated between the parties, and in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

REASONS TO OPPOSE H.R. 1
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUDD. Mr. Speaker, later today, we are going to be voting on H.R. 1, and I would like to make a few points for the RECORD.

To my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, before you vote this afternoon, I would like you to remember one thing. This bill is nearly 600 pages, and it has been referred to 10 different committees, yet it has been subject to only one markup.

I want the supporters of this bill to think about how that really looks. You are bringing up the bill that is intended to expand the ability of Americans to participate in the political process by using a process that restricted the participation of their elected officials.

The second thing I want to point out is the section of this bill that creates a voucher program to allow people to use public funds for campaign donations. Mr. Speaker, instead of using taxpayer dollars for critical needs like border security or fixing our roads, we would be sending these dollars to political campaigns. That would be a complete disaster.

One last thing that I am going to point out about this bill is the fact that it would weaponize the FEC to favor the ruling political party.

Under current law, the Federal Election Commission is made up of six members, consisting of three Republicans and three Democrats. Four votes are needed to move forward with any kind of prosecution. The bill says that the new commission must consist of two Republicans, two Democrats, and one independent. By this logic, BERNIE SANDERS is technically an independent and would count, even though we all know he is a socialist and caucuses, though, with the Democrats.

I would say much more about this bill, Mr. Speaker, and in the coming weeks I plan to. But for now, I want my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to know that we have a real chance to put politics aside and pass some serious reform that would make our system work even better, but the more time we focus on partisan games like this, the less time we actually focus on draining the swamp.

MOTHERS RUNNING FOR ELECTED OFFICE FACE CHILDCARE OBSTACLES
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PORTER) for 5 minutes.

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I am a single mom. When I ran for Congress last year, I spent thousands and thousands of dollars on childcare.

Running for Federal office requires 60- to 90-hour workweeks, and I worked every single day, including every single weekend. I also worked challenging hours, normally starting my day at 6:45 a.m. and ending with campaign events stretching late into the evenings.

I juggled dozens and dozens of childcare providers for nearly 2 years, without whom I would never have made it to Congress.

I have three children, Betsy, who is 7; Paul, who is 10; and Luke, who is 13. Leaving them alone while I was on the campaign trail was not an option. Bringing them along on the campaign trail was often impossible or inappropriate and sometimes could even have been dangerous for them.

For the past two centuries, Congress has written many, many laws about what women may and may not do. But until this year, women's representation in Congress was less than 20 percent. With the election of my historic class, we hit 23.4 percent—102 women.

But, Mr. Speaker, that number is still very low. There are even fewer moms in Congress and even fewer single moms, as in nobody but me. A major barrier to women running for elected office is their inability to afford the amount or type of childcare needed in a campaign.

That is why I worked to include language in H.R. 1, the For the People Act, and introduced an identical standalone bill, the Help America Run Act. It explicitly allows candidates for Federal office to use campaign contributions to pay for childcare.
Right now, candidates can use campaign funds for a whole range of expenses, from pizza for exhausted staff to cybersecurity for digital devices, but the law does not make it clear that childcare is among those allowed expenses.

Like so many laws, there is an assumption of a female caregiver behind every male elected official. In part because of that, moms who continue to shoulder the majority of childcare responsibilities also struggle to run for Congress.

Until women are fully and equally present in Congress, women’s perspectives will continue to be underrepresented. The result is a weaker democracy for the people.

Mr. Speaker, I very much look forward to the enactment of H.R. 1 and the Help America Run Act.

WOMEN’S HISTORY MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize March as Women’s History Month.

Throughout history, countless women have contributed to the character and success of the United States of America. During Women’s History Month, we celebrate the scores of women who have worked to improve our society and who have fought inequality and discrimination in every form.

These women have created a legacy that lives on and continues to inspire generations of Americans, from Harriet Tubman to Elizabeth Cady Stanton, and Susan B. Anthony to Helen Keller.

Women’s History Month is a time to honor the lives and legacy of all women, living and dead. Through sharing their stories, we are able to acknowledge how their contributions have enriched our lives.

In the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, legendary journalist Ida Tarbell was born at the onset of the oil boom. She is best known for her 1904 book, "The History of the Standard Oil Company." Ida Tarbell was known for her ability to take complex subjects and break them down into articles that could be easily consumed by the general public.

She had a successful career as an investigative journalist, and the Oil Region Alliance in northwestern Pennsylvania recently completed a full restoration of Ms. Tarbell’s childhood home in Titusville so that it would be preserved for generations to come.

Mr. Speaker, by honoring women and their achievements, we can honor the past, inform the present, and inspire the future.

Many women have served as part of our Armed Forces throughout history and proudly continue to today, women like Mary Ludwig Hays McCauley, who fought in battles during the Revolutionary War and was among the first women to receive a military pension, and modern-day women like Lisa Jaster, a major in the United States Army Reserve who completed Army Ranger School, which is one of the toughest courses in the military.

Major Jaster is the Ranger class that allowed women, and she is the first female Army Reserve officer to become a Ranger School graduate.

Mr. Speaker, many women have left their imprint on the pages of history, and the American leaders who will continue to guide this Nation into the future. May we celebrate and honor them, not only during Women’s History Month, but all year long, and thank them for their incredible contributions.

HEALTH AND NUTRITIONAL CHALLENGES FACING AFRICAN AMERICAN POPULATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics, which prepared this statement for me in acknowledgement of Black History Month.

Minority populations, especially the African American population, continue to remain in relatively poor health when compared to the majority population and also continue to be underserved by the healthcare delivery system.

One of the biggest health challenges facing our country today is obesity, and the African American community is especially at risk. In a 2015-2016 study by the CDC, the report found non-Hispanic Black adults, at 48.6 percent, had a higher prevalence of obesity than non-Hispanic White adults, which was 37.9 percent.

Compared to other States, Illinois’ obesity rate is a significant area of concern, with 31 percent of adults having obesity. This statistic is higher than the U.S. median.

Illinois has the 27th highest adult obesity rate in the Nation and the 7th highest obesity rate for youth ages 10 to 17. Chicago’s African American community is the demographic with the highest obesity rate at 39.8 percent.

We talk a lot about the African American community falling in the obese category, this demographic runs a higher risk for obesity-related conditions, including heart disease, stroke, type 2 diabetes, and certain types of cancer that are some of the leading causes of preventable, premature death.

Compared to the general population, African Americans are disproportionately affected by diabetes. African Americans constitute more than 35 percent of all patients receiving dialysis treatment for kidney failure but only represent 13.2 percent of the overall U.S. population.

High blood pressure is the second leading cause of kidney failure among African Americans and remains the leading cause of death due to its link with heart attacks and strokes.

With these troubling statistics, where do we go from here? Awareness, empowerment, and hope to changing our Nation’s health, and food and nutrition practitioners play a very important role in leading the health revolution.

Obesity is partially attributed to poor nutritional intake and has been implicated as a contributor to cancer, heart disease, stroke, and diabetes.

Food and nutrition practitioners have an opportunity and an ethical obligation to positively influence the healthcare experience of individuals. These experts have the power to influence factors affecting health disparities at the individual and the population levels, including programs such as SNAP, WIC, adult care food programs, and other nutrition programs.

By connecting with individuals who are most at risk, food and nutrition practitioners can make a huge change when it comes to the health of African Americans, as well as the health of all Americans.

I thank the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics for preparing this information for me.

STATE OF AMERICAN WORKFORCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SMUCKER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about our economy and the state of the American workforce.

With reforms enacted by the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, as well as needed regulatory relief, the economic indicator is pointing up. The latest U.S. jobs report shows our economy is at its strongest rate in 13 years. Unemployment is at a record low across the board. Wages are growing at the fastest level in over a decade. Business investment is strong. Best of all, American families are keeping more money in their pockets. But new success brings a new set of challenges.

The number of job openings in the U.S. hit a record high last month of 7.3 million. We have gone from, “Where are the jobs?” to, “Where are the workers?” While it may seem positive that there are more jobs open than workers to fill them, I fear that, without addressing the needs of our workforce, we will stifle our incredible economic growth.

According to a study conducted by the National Federation of Independent Business, 22 percent of business owners cite the difficulty in finding workers as their single most important business threat. I hear this from every employer I meet with in my district. The number of job openings is staggering and must be addressed.
Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address perhaps the most important reform legislation to protect and strengthen our democracy in a generation: H.R. 1, the For the People Act.

We have a responsibility, an obligation, to make sure that our government always remains one of the people, by the people, and for the people. But the truth is Congress has not done enough to protect the voices of everyday Americans and to make sure that our government institutions are working for them.

The American people know it, and, Mr. Speaker, I believe that is exactly why they voted for new leadership in our people’s House. They know what is happening to our political system. The dark money, the attack ads from secret, fly-by-night groups, the incredible influence special interests seem to have over too many political leaders. They see it every day when the system is so rigged that used to work for the middle class is now rigged against them.

So much of it is the result of the Supreme Court’s Citizens United decision. Consider the facts: From 2008 to 2016, the amount of outside spending to influence our elections has increased tenfold, reaching an astonishing $1.4 billion during our last presidential election.

These billions being spent to influence elections and politicians, they aren’t coming from everyday Americans, but are more likely coming from Wall Street, Big Pharma, and other high-powered interests working against the rest of us. We can do better and, with H.R. 1, we will do better.

This transformative set of reforms will shine a light on dark money and return power to the people. It puts disclosure front and center by requiring political groups to disclose their large donors, bringing dark money out of the shadows for good.

H.R. 1 recognizes a simple principle: The American people ought to know who is writing big checks to their elected officials and candidates for office.

By curbing the influence of special interests, we can lift the voices of everyday Americans and we can better focus on the issues that matter most, like quality jobs, affordable healthcare, clean air and water, and strong infrastructure.

Mr. Speaker, history has its eyes on us today. Let us, once again, resolve to make sure that our government remains one of the people, by the people and, of course, for the people.

UNNECESSARY TINKERING WITH THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH) for 5 minutes.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in memory and in celebration of the life and legacy of my friend, Suzanne Kling Post, a tremendous force in the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

Suzanne was an environmental visionary and a fierce advocate for the Commonwealth and the planet. She was a tireless champion of environmental protection and a committed community leader. She was a mentor, a confidant, and a dear friend to many, and her legacy will live on for generations to come.

Mr. Speaker, the Higher Education Act is one of the most significant pieces of legislation to come before Congress. It provides necessary support to students and families across the country, and it is clear that this legislation is needed more than ever.

But mandating voter registration efforts on campus doesn’t show good intentions for student engagement.

Instead, it reveals the true motive behind this unnecessary tinkering with the Higher Education Act. Colleges and universities have not, and must not ever exist to serve the Federal Government.

The provisions in H.R. 1 take institutions of higher learning and put them in the same category as your local DMV. It is bad enough that colleges and universities barely resemble the free marketplace of ideas they once were. This bill turns them into full-fledged government offices, with all of the customer service and freedom of thought for which government offices are known.

The provisions to oppose H.R. 1 are many, but we could not allow the provisions that impact educational institutions to go unnoticed as House Democrats clearly hoped.

H.R. 1 is one of the most cynical political stunts we have seen and, for that reason, Mr. Speaker, we should oppose it and oppose it with all our might.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF SUZANNE KLING POST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise as leader of the Republicans on the Education and Labor Committee, which had a referral on H.R. 1 that did not even have a hearing, much less a markup on the provisions that fall within our jurisdiction.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, a referral means a bill should be debated by a committee of jurisdiction, but that did not happen.

It appears that every corner of American life would be touched by this overreaching, politically-motivated bill. Even colleges and universities did not manage to escape its reach.

We fully recognize the opportunity colleges and universities can provide for traditional 18- to 24-year-old students to register to vote. That is why we have always been supportive of voter registration efforts on campuses. But mandating voter registration efforts on campus doesn’t show good intentions for student engagement.

As reliable as the sun rising and setting each day, if there was injustice, prejudice, or discrimination, Suzy was there, organizing and empowering the people to lift the voices of those wronged, and demanded more from our city and our Commonwealth on behalf of those in need.

GOVERNMENT BY THE PEOPLE, FOR THE PEOPLE, AND OF THE PEOPLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STANTON) for 5 minutes.
Born into a white, middle-class, Jewish family in the Highlands of Louisville in 1933, Suzy was quick to put others first. She joined the NAACP as a student at Indiana University. She returned home and helped organize sit-ins and sit-downs of civil rights violations in protest of housing discrimination; and she helped lead efforts for civil rights and against the Vietnam War.

She led the ACLU of Kentucky, founded by her uncle, Arthur Kling, and eventually became the founding director of the Metropolitan Housing Commission. After decades of service, she was inducted into the Kentucky Human Rights Commission Hall of Fame in 2007.

Though small in stature, she was larger than life. She had a fire in her belly and a passion for her work that was contagious. Her low voice had the power to move you, and she never missed an opportunity to use it and move us forward as a city.

In the Louisville Courier-Journal's thoughtful obituary recounting her life, they noted that, once asked why she became an activist, Suzy replied: I guess I just don’t like injustice. It ticks me off; it really does. Although she didn’t use the word “ticks.”

She was as uncomplicated as she was powerful; straightforward, straight to the heart and an invaluable source of strength for me, our city, and our Commonwealth. To say we are better off because of her decades of service is an understatement. She expected more, gave more, and got more from all of us because she demanded it of her community and of herself.

I will always value her friendship, her leadership, and for never shying away from a fight.

To her children and grandchildren, I hope you can take some solace in knowing that your mother and grandmother was the conscience of the city that loved her dearly, and we will all work to carry her legacy forward.

May her memory be a blessing.

Differences between this Congress and last Congress

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. LaMalfa) for 5 minutes.

Mr. LaMalfa. Mr. Speaker, let me point out an important difference between this Congress and this one.

Last Congress, under Republican leadership, our number one priority was tax reform and jobs, putting more money into the pockets of the American people who have earned it. That is why I blocked the Tax Cut and Jobs Act, was that first priority.

Even back in 1995, the first bill under Republican leadership was the Congressional Accountability Act, to make sure Congress and its staff had to abide by the same rules as the rest of Americans.

This Congress, under Democrat leadership, it appears their priorities are much different. Their H.R. 1, supposedly, their most-prized bill, hence, they give it the number 1 bill, is not a generational policy reform to benefit Americans, but, rather, politics and rigging elections; that is the Democrat priority: sweeping Federal mandates that institute a 6-to-1 government match for small donor political contributions.

That means 6 to 1 of your tax dollars going to match contributions made for campaigns; $200 would yield $1,200 from the Federal Government into a campaign.

In what world is it defensible for the Federal Government to be forced to use your taxpayer funds, you to be forced for your taxpayer dollars to support a candidate for office, regardless of whether you support that candidate.

The bad news is it doesn’t end there. Democrats want to take some of the corrupt policies already implemented in my own State of California and institute them on a national level.

For example: Ballot harvesting. Since its implementation in California, this practice has opened up our State to endless potential for election fraud. Just a couple of months ago, this exact practice sent one North Carolina election into chaos, with every Democrat in the State demanding a re-election. In the North Carolina one they were using similar practices.

Ironically, this bill is completely silent on ballot harvesting. In fact, Democrats' amendment I worked on that would make ballot harvesting illegal in all States, not just where it is convenient for their elections.

In Orange County, California, 250,000 provisional ballots were counted after election night, with people delivering hundreds of them at a time.

Now, I am a staunch supporter of ensuring every voter has access to the polls, but this bill isn’t about that. This legislation only undermines the security of our election system and limits the already-lacking safeguards that are in place to ensure the integrity of our electoral process.

How are the voters, the people, the citizens of America supposed to have confidence in their election system when they see these games being played?

To make matters worse, this bill will actually weaken voter ID laws. It automatically registers everyone in the DMV database, no questions asked, alive or dead.

When this issue has come up in California, we have seen numerous problems in the DMV process. California voter rolls have little integrity. We have tens of thousands of so-called votes, or so-called voters that are registered that may not even be eligible, may not even be citizens.

This has also, in that process, made the REAL ID process in California questionable as well, where the people are going to have to go get their ID redone in order to be able to use the airports.

While some of my other colleagues on the other side of the aisle like to peg voter ID laws as prohibitive, the National Bureau of Economic Research published a study proving that is not the case.

We all support easy and fair voter registration, but it has to come with sensible voter protection prevention safeguards. As we saw in California this past election cycle, thousands of ballots continued to be harvested even after election day. That is a huge problem.

This bill needed another nail in the coffin, even the ACLU has condemned the legislation as unconstitutional. That is because it hurts free speech and attempts to silence those who would dare disagree with, in this case, Democrat priorities.

Just a few years ago, a California theater director was forced to resign over harassment due to a political donation, just for advocating for his own beliefs.

Democrats boldly dubbed this legislation the For the People Act, but a more appropriate title would be “Democrat Politicians Protection Act.”

Once again, H.R. 1 under Republican leadership was the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act and, years ago, an accountability act. H.R. 1 under Democrat leadership is an unconstitutional bill to force Americans to help reelect more Democrats. That should paint a substantially contrasting picture for the American people what the priorities are of the two parties.

Mr. Speaker, I urge opposition to this terrible bill.

Honoring Constituent of the Month Shelby Jacobs

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. Levien) for 5 minutes.

Mr. Levin of California. Mr. Speaker, as the Congress Member for California’s 49th District, it is my distinct honor to represent over 700,000 Californians from North County San Diego and South Orange County.

I have met countless constituents across the district who do incredible work to make our community stronger, and I am proud to serve them in Congress.

With so many outstanding constituents, I thought it would be appropriate to start a new Constituent of the Month program to recognize individuals who have gone above and beyond to help their neighbors, give back to their community, and make our country stronger.

For our first constituent of the month, I am thrilled to recognize Mr. Shelby Jacobs of Oceanside, a retired aerospace engineer who worked for 40 years on NASA’s Apollo and Space Shuttle programs.

Mr. Jacobs served in a number of roles, including project manager of the
Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, when Speaker PELOSI took the gavel on January 3, she was surrounded by children, and as she brought down the gavel to commence the 116th Congress, these were her words: “I now call the House to order on behalf of all of America’s children.”

The importance of Speaker PELOSI’s words cannot be overstated. Last year was horrendous for children in our country.

If we look at gun violence or immigration or healthcare or poverty relief, children suffered last year under the Trump administration and a Republican Congress.

On February 14, 2018, a gunman walked into Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland, Florida, to commit mass murder; 17 people were killed, another 17 were injured, and most of them were children.

The Parkland shooting wasn’t the first school shooting in our Nation’s history and it wasn’t the last. But the Parkland students, standing on the shoulders of student leaders before them, stood up and marched. They bound together in an intersectional, nationwide movement to demand that Congress act. This nation must do something to make our country safer.

Unfortunately, their pleas fell on deaf ears. The President and his administration were too inept or too cowardly to confront the NRA. And because our colleagues across the aisle were too inept or too cowardly to confront the NRA, we witnessed preventable shooting after preventable shooting.

Then, when the Trump administration finally did release its School Safety Commission report, it completely ignored evidence-based violence and prevention strategies. Instead, the report suggested rolling back civil rights protections for students and making guns more easily accessible in schools.

Look, there is a commonality among the mass shootings in America’s schools: easy access to firearms. But rather than address the root cause of school shootings, the Trump administration suggested that we gut guns in classrooms, as if teachers are security guards and schools are prisons. Nobody thinks that is a good idea except for the NRA.

Meanwhile, educators across the country are clamoring for funding to install new locks on classroom doors, harden school entryways, and secure school facilities.

The 116th Congress was called into order on behalf of all children because Democrats will listen to teachers and students—not the NRA. That is why I introduced the Safer Neighborhoods Gun Buyback Act: to save children’s lives.

We were called into order on behalf of all children, including those who are at our borders.

Under the Trump administration and Secretary Kirstjen Nielsen, both of whom were empowered by my colleagues across the aisle, the United States of America ripped children away from their parents and put them in cages, many have not been reunited.

Ripping children away from their parents and lying about it to the American people was evil, plain and simple, and it should have ended Secretary Nielsen’s career. I feel Secretary Nielsen is incompetent, inept, and is not up to the task of securing the homeland’s safety. Anyone who would put children in cages, fenced cages, taken from their parents can just not be trusted.

President Trump’s deplorable, inhuman attempt to change our immigration system has killed people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

DEMOCRATS ARE LIVING UP TO OUR COMMITMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. LUJAN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to stand before you today in strong support of H.R. 1.

Mr. Speaker, I want to start by thanking Congressman SARBANES, Speaker PELOSI, Chairwoman ZOE LOFGREN, and my colleagues for their work on this issue.

H.R. 1 is historic legislation. It will restore transparency in our government and put the power back in the hands of the people.

It will reduce the role of dark money in politics and make it easier to vote. Perhaps most importantly, it will re-affirm that this is the people’s House and our work here is for them. There could be nothing more fundamentally important than that.

Too many have lost faith in the process; too many have lost faith in their government. They look around and wonder who is on their side, who is fighting for them. They see rules rigged against them, and every day it gets harder and harder for their neighbor to buy insulin or for their daughter to shake off the incredible burdens of student loan debt.

This legislation, H.R. 1, is an important step in how we stand up for our communities and for the people. It is a tool that allows us to act on the many issues impacting working men and women, the family that I was raised in.

It will also give Americans a greater voice in their government. This legislation will allow automatic voter registration and create a national holiday for election day.

I am also proud to submit an amendment to H.R. 1 that will expand election infrastructure grants to promote voter participation in our elections, and increase funding for these efforts to engage all parts of our society in our democracy.
Looking ahead to next week, I am looking forward to reintroducing with my colleagues the Native American Voting Rights Act. This legislation will make sure that communities are not left behind as we strengthen our democracy. House Democrats committed to the American people that we would fundamentally change Washington if elected to the majority; we committed that our work would be for the people. This week, we are living up to that commitment.

ANTI-SEMITISM IS THE CANARY IN THE COAL MINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Deutch) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, today should not be about politics. I didn’t rise to be political. This is personal.

A few years ago, I was invited to speak at a General Assembly special session on anti-Semitism. I told the representatives from the assembled countries that anti-Semitism is the canary in the coal mine, that if there is anti-Semitism in your country, there is hatred that will ultimately permeate throughout society if it is not checked. I never thought I would need to explain that to my colleagues.

This is not political. No one should make it political.

The use of anti-Semitic language and images can never be tolerated. When a Presidential campaign runs a commercial alleging a Jewish global conspiracy in an ad featuring George Soros, Janet Yellen, and Lloyd Blankfein, it is invoking classic anti-Semitic tropes and it must be condemned. When the same campaign tweets their opponent featuring a Jewish star and piles of money, it does the same thing and it must be condemned. When one of our colleagues accuses Soros, Steyer, and Bloomberg of buying the election, it also invokes classic anti-Semitism that must be condemned. And when one of our colleagues invokes the classic anti-Semitic tropes that Jews control the world, that Jews care only about money, and that Jews cannot be loyal Americans if they also support Israel, this, too, must be condemned.

We have the opportunity to condemn all of that, by all of them, intolerable as it all is, by passing a strong condemnation of anti-Semitism. Mr. Speaker, because of anti-Semitism over millennia, millions of Jews have been hated, targeted, and expelled from their countries, violently attacked, killed, and exterminated. Words lead to action and to death.

There is too much hatred, too many other people who are targeted, and we need to stand with all of them. But we are having this debate because of the language of one of our colleagues, language that suggests that Jews like me, who serve in the United States in Congress and whose father earned a Purple Heart fighting the Nazis in the Battle of the Bulge, that we are not loyal Americans.

Why are we unable to singularly condemn anti-Semitism? Why can’t we call out anti-Semitism and show that we have learned the lessons of history? It feels like we are only able to call the use of anti-Semitic language by a colleague of ours—any colleague of ours—if we are addressing all forms of hatred, and we feel like we can’t say it is anti-Semitism unless everyone agrees that it is anti-Semitism.

Who gets to define what counts as stereotypes or discrimination? Isn’t it the people who experience the bias? The people who have experienced that hatred for thousands of years?

If Jews whose families were persecuted or attacked or killed are talking about how anti-Semitic words can lead at their most hateful and violent extremes, then it is anti-Semitism. And take my word for it. If you don’t do that, then please understand that an anti-Semite will hear those words as a dog whistle.

What has been so difficult for so many people in my community is that people who are fearful when anti-Semitic tropes are used are being told that they are wrong. Jewish elected officials are saying that this history that we know well is invoked by referencing dual loyalty, and some of my colleagues are saying that it doesn’t matter what that history means to me. It is intensely personal because it is ongoing: in Europe, in Asia, in the Middle East, in South America, and in the United States.

Eleven people were killed less than 6 months ago in a synagogue because they were Jews. What is happening in our country should alarm us all. The attacks on our colleagues because they are Muslim or African American or Hispanic or members of the LGBT community, any attack must be condemned when it is based on hatred.

But when a colleague invokes classic anti-Semitic lies three times, then this body must condemn that anti-Semitism. Anti-Semitism is worthy of being taken seriously on its own. It is worthy of being singularly called out.

Jews control the world? Jews care only about money? Jews have dual loyalty and can’t be patriotic members of the country in which they live? Words matter. For generations, they have had dangerous consequences for me, for my family, and for my people. This shouldn’t be so hard.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o’clock and 48 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Merciful God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

As the days grow longer and many impatiently wait for more springlike warmth, we give You thanks for all the blessings we enjoy in our favored land. We ask Your blessing on the Members of this people’s House in the work they do. Though sometimes contentious, we ask Your blessing of Spirit upon all that, as colleagues in the important work of the House, they might seek to find agreement on issues that will redound to the benefit of our Nation.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day’s proceedings and announces to the House her approval thereof. Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. Crawford) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. Crawford led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

COMMEMORATING TRIPLE NEGATIVE BREAST CANCER AWARENESS DAY

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

Mr. MORELLE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commemorate Triple Negative Breast Cancer Awareness Day, which took place earlier this week on March 3.

My daughter, Lauren, battled triple negative breast cancer for 2 years, with incredible strength, courage, humor,
and tenacity. She shared her story publicly with tens of thousands of people on a Facebook page called Lauren vs. Cancer, underscoring the importance of this serious health issue and encouraging everyone to get tested.

Sadly, Lauren died at the age of 31 from this horrible disease in August of 2017. In Lauren’s memory, I have dedicated myself to eradicating the scourge of breast cancer.

As we recognize Triple Negative Breast Cancer Awareness Day, I want to extend my support to the thousands of women affected by it, whether living with it, battling it, or supporting survivors, and, at times, deadly disease. We must take this opportunity to highlight the need for continued education, research, and action to finally find a cure for breast cancer.

COMMENDING ARKANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY FOR HOSTING 25TH ANNUAL COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AGRIBUSINESS CONFERENCE

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commend my alma mater, Arkansas State University, for hosting the 25th Annual College of Agriculture Agribusiness Conference. This conference focuses on farm management, commodity and credit markets, and the economics and politics of trade and farm policy.

During this conference, Chancellor Damphousse announced a $1 million gift for the College of Agriculture from the Judd Hill Foundation.

Farmers and those involved in the agriculture industry throughout Arkansas attend this meeting each year to learn about important deadlines and challenges that producers will encounter this growing season from a diverse group. This year, speakers included Tyne Morgan, host of U.S. Farm Report, as well as two of my past interns, Hunter Biram and Grant Wilson.

Instrumental to this conference's continued success has been Dr. Greenwalt, professor of agricultural economics at Arkansas State, also serves as a director of the Arkansas Agricultural Council. I had the pleasure of being one of Dr. Greenwalt’s students while pursuing my degree in agricultural business at Arkansas State University.

Many others come to support this annual event. As the event grows, so does the attendance.

I would like to extend my congratulations and gratitude to Dr. Greenwalt, Dean Burcham, and everyone who contributed to the success of the ASU Agribusiness Conference for the last 25 years.

RECOGNIZING RUTH WEAKLEY ON HER 100TH BIRTHDAY

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

Mr. CARBAJAL. Madam Speaker, this Women’s History Month, I rise to recognize Ruth Weakley of Arroyo Grande on her 100th birthday today.

During World War II, with many of America’s young men serving overseas, U.S. jobs traditionally held by men began to open their doors to women. While Ruth’s husband, Harry, was away serving in the Army Air Force, Ruth stepped up to serve, and became one of a handful of women driving rural postal routes. She drove a route in Los Angeles County for nearly 2 years during the war, resigning when her husband returned from his military service in December 1945.

Contributions like hers were both critical to our Nation’s war effort and to reshaping the role of women in our workforce and society.

Today, over 70 years after Ruth’s time with the Postal Service and on her 100th birthday, I recognize and thank her for her service to our Nation and to women everywhere.

HONORING THE LIFE OF CHIEF ROBERT RICHARDSON

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

Mr. DUNN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of former Panama City Fire Chief and United States Navy veteran Robert Richardson. Chief Richardson passed away at the age of 79 on January 5.

Chief Richardson proudly served our Nation as a submariner in the Navy, and he went on to serve his community in Bay County for 33 years—first as a firefighter and then as the Panama City Fire Chief.

He was honored by the State of Florida for his work, earning the distinction of Florida’s Firefighter of the Year and Florida’s Fire Chief of the Year.

Chief Richardson was appointed by Governor Bob Graham to serve on the Florida State Fire Board and used that position to fight for stricter building codes. He dedicated his entire life to protecting others.

Madam Speaker, I can attest that Panama City is a better place because of the lifelong service of Chief Richardson. Please join me in honoring the life of Chief Richardson.

COMMEMORATING THE SOCIETY FOR NEUROSCIENCE DURING BRAIN AWARENESS WEEK

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

Mr. McNERNEY. Madam Speaker, the Society for Neuroscience, SFN, is the world’s largest organization of scientists and clinicians focused on studying the brain and the nervous system. This week, we welcomed them to Capitol Hill to give us an update on their progress and their impact.

Federal funding from agencies like the National Institutes of Health and the National Science Foundation is absolutely critical to their work. Sustained, reliable funding is critical to continuing advancements in neuroscience and to scientific advancement in general.

This week is Brain Awareness Week, and I want to commend the BRAIN Initiative partners. The 2018 total for the BRAIN Initiative program at NIH is more than $400 million.

I have long supported research investments in neuroscience research. It is opening up a vast understanding of our brains, and it is vitally important to the over 100 million Americans impacted by neurodevelopmental, neurodegenerative, and neuropsychiatric brain disorders.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting robust funding for the National Institutes of Health so that the BRAIN Initiative can continue its outstanding achievements.

ENDING SAUDI INCITEMENT IN SCHOOL TEXTBOOKS

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

Mr. WILSON. Madam Speaker, Saudi Arabia has a vital role in the global war on terrorism. Riyadh is a crucial counterterroist ally. Yet, current textbooks in the Middle East are steeped in incitement and promote anti-Semitism.

One current textbook is inflammatory against Christianity, Judaism, and even other Muslims who do not subscribe to the Saudi interpretation of Islam, which they describe as “evil.”

Saudi Arabia has committed to reforming its curriculum for over a decade. That is why Congresswoman soft KEATING and I have introduced H.R. 554, the Saudi Educational and Transparency and Reform Act. It will hold the Saudis accountable by requiring an annual report on any intolerant content of their textbooks. It will also send a clear, bipartisan message to end incitement now.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

CONGRESS HAS THE MORAL RESPONSIBILITY TO STEP UP AND ACT

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

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, this week the House is considering H.R. 1,
the For the People Act. This bill takes on one of the biggest issues facing our democracy: campaign finance reform.

The Supreme Court’s decision, in Citizens United, was one of the most disastrous decisions of our time. It opened the floodgates to the unlimited amounts of unregulated dark money that is now corrupting our democracy.

And Congress not only has the authority to regulate the way our political campaigns are financed, but, I believe, we have the moral responsibility to step up.

This bill would shed light on the billionaires and special interest groups who are really behind some of the candidates running for office, and it would level the playing field by giving the power back to the traditional grass roots donors.

This, without a doubt, is one of the most important issues that we as a Congress will take on this year, and that is why I urge all of my colleagues to get in this fight to get unlimited dark money out of the political system once and for all.

FOR THE POLITICIANS ACT

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

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1, ironically titled the For the People Act. A more accurate name would be the “For the Politicians Act.”

This bill would, essentially, ban the interstate crosstown system which 27 States, including Tennessee, use to prevent voter fraud by ensuring voters are not registered in multiple States.

Is that for the people or for the politicians?

Another provision would mandate that States use unaccountable, unelected commissions to draw their districts, further isolating Americans from their elected officials.

Is that for the people or for the politicians?

Still, another section would create a 6-to-1 taxpayer-funded match for political donations, giving politicians a massive boost for their campaign coffers from taxpayer dollars.

Is that for the people or for the politicians?

H.R. 1 is not for the people; it is for the politicians. I urge my colleagues to vote “no.”

RECOGNIZING MARCH AS NATIONAL NUTRITION MONTH

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker. I rise today to recognize March as National Nutrition Month.

In 1973, the American Dietetic Association, now called the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics, started National Nutrition Week as a way to deliver nutrition education messages to the public.

Fast-forward 7 years, and the week became a month-long celebration thanks to the growing public interest in nutrition.

Madam Speaker, during the last Congress, I had the honor of being chairwoman of the Agriculture Subcommittee on Nutrition. From women and children who use the WIC program to adults and families who utilize the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or what we refer to as SNAP, formerly called food stamps, I know that good nutrition is important at every stage of life.

National Nutrition Month focuses on the importance of making informed food choices and developing sound eating and physical activity habits.

Next Wednesday is Registered Dietitian Nutritionist Day, and this occasion increases awareness of registered dietitian nutritionists as the indispensable providers of food and nutrition services, while recognizing their commitment to helping people enjoy healthy lives.

Happy National Nutrition Month.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF JAMES PATTERSON

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

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize an outstanding patriot and advocate for Tennessee veterans, James Patterson of Columbia, Tennessee, who recently passed away.

James was a Vietnam veteran who earned medals for his service. He had a 35-year career at Union Carbide, but locals know him best for his many volunteer efforts in life. He was the true embodiment of what makes America great.

James was an American Legion commander and Legionnaire of the Year, also a member of the Disabled American Veterans and Veterans of Foreign Wars.

He was Maury County’s veterans services director, and every week, as sergeant at arms, he led the Pledge of Allegiance at Columbia’s Rotary Club. James loved his country and loved, most of all, the men and women who fight for it. My staff and I have worked with him often to help Tennessee veterans receive the benefits and honors they deserve.

We were saddened to learn of his passing. The entire community lost a friend.

My condolences to the Patterson family. Here in the Capitol and in my home State of Tennessee, I will do my best to carry on James’ work on behalf of the men and women who risk their lives to defend the United States of America. He set an example for all of us.

Thank you for your service, James.

HONORING JOAN ESPENSHADE

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

Mr. SMUCKER. Madam Speaker, March is Women’s History Month, and I am proud to honor some remarkable women in my district.

Today, I would like to recognize Ms. Joan Espenshade, a woman from Lancaster, Pennsylvania, who gave back to our community by creating an extraordinary program to feed those in need.

In 2005, Joan learned that some local children were food insecure on weekends when the school program was not available to them, so she decided to step in and help parents make better use of their limited food dollars.

She founded the Power Packs Project to provide food and nutritional information to low-income families. Not only did she help those families, but the Power Packs project now extends to 45 schools in 13 districts with 350 volunteers.

Joan stepped down as president of Power Packs after 8 years in 2014, but her vision and impact can still be seen as the program continues today.

We are thankful for people like Joan who remind us of the importance of caring for those in need. It is an honor to recognize her today.

HONORING SHERIFF MIKE BROWN

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

Mr. CLINE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the career of retiring Bedford County, Virginia, Sheriff Mike Brown. The county’s top law enforcement officer since 1996, Sheriff Brown has devoted nearly 50 years to protecting the citizens of his home county and the Commonwealth of Virginia.

In his time as sheriff, Mike has led efforts to modernize the department and expand cooperation with surrounding departments. These efforts led to the 1998 creation of the Southern Virginia Internet Crimes Against Children Task Force, an organization whose purpose is locating and prosecuting individuals who prey on our children.

In the most recent reporting year, the task force arrested 227 individuals accused of crimes against children and identified 127 child victims. Over 20 years, an untold number of children have been protected and hundreds of predators have been put behind bars because of Sheriff Brown’s efforts to establish the task force.

In 2017, Sheriff Brown was appropriately named National Sheriffs’ Association Sheriff of the Year.

Madam Speaker, I thank Sheriff Brown for his service to the citizens of...
Bedford County and all of Virginia, and I wish him and his family all the best during a well-earned retirement. His service leaves a legacy we can all be proud of.

HONORING BOB HUDZIK
(Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Bob Hudzik, a constituent in my district who has made a profound difference in his community.

Bob, a world champion dart player and custodian at Mt. Olive High School, began Darts for Kids, a non-profit organization that hosts an annual dart tournament. The proceeds go to families of children with life-threatening illnesses, usually to contribute to the cost of unforeseen medical expenses.

Their first tournament in 2013 raised about $10,000. To date, Darts for Kids has raised almost $175,000 and helped about $10,000. To date, Darts for Kids has raised over 90 families with medical costs for children.

I recently cosponsored legislation that shines a light on individuals like Bob. H.R. 276, the RISE Act, would establish the Recognizing Inspirational Bob. H.R. 276, the RISE Act, would establish the Recognizing Inspirational
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Page 539, insert after line 16 the following (and redesignate the succeeding subtitle accordingly):

(Subtitle E—Clearinghouse on Lobbying Information

SEC. 7401. ESTABLISHMENT OF CLEARINGHOUSE.

(a) Establishment.—The Attorney General shall establish and operate within the Department of Justice a clearinghouse through which members of the public may obtain copies (including in electronic form) of registration statements filed under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995, 2 U.S.C. 1301 et seq. and the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended 22 U.S.C. 611 et seq., and copies (including in electronic form) of registration statements filed under the Senate Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 for inclusion in the clearinghouse.

(b) Clerk and Secretary.—The Attorney General shall ensure that the information in the clearinghouse established under this Act is maintained in a searchable and sortable format.

(c) Agreements with Clerk of House and Secretary of the Senate.—The Attorney General shall enter into such agreements with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate as may be necessary for the Attorney General to obtain registration statements filed with the Clerk and the Secretary under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 for inclusion in the clearinghouse.

AMENDMENT NO. 40 OFFERED BY MR. RUIZ OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of subtitle A of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 8006. LIMITATION ON USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS AND CONTRACTING AT BUSINESSES OWNED BY CERTAIN GOVERNMENT OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES.

(a) Limitation on Federal Funds.—Beginning in fiscal year 2020, and in each fiscal year thereafter, no Federal funds may be obligated or expended for purposes of procuring goods or services at any business owned or controlled by a covered individual or any family member of such an individual, unless such obligation or expenditure of funds is necessary for the security of a covered individual or family member.

(b) Prohibition on Contracts.—No federal agency may enter into a contract with a business owned or controlled by a covered individual or any family member of such an individual.

(c) Determination of Ownership.—For purposes of this section, a business shall be deemed to be owned or controlled by a covered individual or any family member of such an individual if:

(1) a member of the board of directors or similar governing body of the business;

(2) directly or indirectly owns or controls 51 percent or more of the voting shares of the business;

(d) Definitions.—In this section:

(1) Covered individual.—The term ‘‘covered individual’’ means—

(A) the President;

(B) the Vice President;

(C) the head of any Executive department (as that term is defined in section 101 of title 5, United States Code); and

(D) any individual occupying a position designated by the President as a Cabinet-level position.

(2) Family member.—The term ‘‘family member’’ means an individual with any of the following relationships to a covered individual:

(A) Spouse, and parents thereof.

(B) Sons and daughters, and spouses thereof.

(C) Parents, and spouses thereof.

(D) Brothers and sisters, and spouses thereof.

(E) Grandparents and grandchildren, and spouses thereof.

(F) Domestic partner and parents thereof, including domestic partners of any individual in paragraph (5).

(3) Federal agency.—The term ‘‘Federal agency’’ has the meaning given that term in section 102 of title 40, United States Code.

AMENDMENT NO. 41 OFFERED BY MR. TAKANO OF CALIFORNIA

In title VI of the bill—

(1) redesignate subtitle C as subtitle D (and conform the succeeding subtitle accordingly); and

(2) insert after subtitle B the following:

Subtitle C—Disposal of Contributions or Donations

SEC. 6201. TIMEFRAME AND PRIORITY FOR DISPOSAL OF CONTRIBUTIONS OR DONATIONS.

Section 313 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30314), as amended by section 5113 and section 5302, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (c), (d), and (e) as subsections (d), (e), and (f), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

‘‘(c) Disposal.—

‘‘(1) Timeframe.—Contributions or donations described in subsection (a) may only be used—

‘‘(A) in the case of an individual who is not a candidate with respect to an election for any Federal office for a 6-year period beginning on the date on which the individual was a candidate for any such office, during such 6-year period; or

‘‘(B) in the case of an individual who becomes a registered lobbyist under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995, before the date on which such individual becomes such a registered lobbyist.

‘‘(2) Means of disposal; prioritization.—Beginning on the date the 6-year period described in paragraph (1) of this section ends (or, in the case of an individual described in such paragraph, not later than 30 days after such date), the amounts described in subparagraph (B) of such paragraph, the date on which the individual becomes a registered lobbyist under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995, the date on which such individual becomes such a registered lobbyist, or the date on which such individual becomes a candidate with respect to an election for Federal office of the individual.

‘‘(A) First, to pay any debts or obligations owed in connection with the campaign for election for any Federal office for a period of not less than 6 years beginning on the date on which the individual was a candidate for any such office, during such 6-year period; or

‘‘(B) in the case of an individual who becomes a registered lobbyist under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995, before the date on which such individual becomes such a registered lobbyist.

AMENDMENT NO. 42 OFFERED BY MS. MNGO OF NEW YORK

Page 538, insert after line 19 the following (and redesignate the succeeding subtitle accordingly):

Subtitle C—Recommendations to Ensure Filing of Reports Before Date of Election

SEC. 6201. RECOMMENDATIONS TO ENSURE FILING OF REPORTS BEFORE DATE OF ELECTION.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal Election Commission shall submit to Congress a report describing recommendations for changes to existing law, on how to ensure that each political committee under the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, including a committee which accepts contributions or donations that do not comply with the limitations, prohibitions, and reporting requirements of such Act, will file a report under section 304 of such Act prior to the date of the election for which the committee receives contributions or makes disbursements, without regard to the date on which the committee first registered under such Act, and shall include specific recommendations to ensure that such committees will not delay until after the date of the election the reporting of identification of persons making contributions that will be used to repay debt incurred by the committee.

AMENDMENT NO. 46 OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF MARYLAND

Page 71, strike lines 6 through 13 and insert the following:

(b) Breakdown of Information.—In preparing the report under this section, the State shall, for each category of information described in subsection (a), include a breakdown by race, ethnicity, age, and gender of the individuals whose information is included in the category, to the extent that information on the race, ethnicity, age, and gender of such individuals is available to the State.
AMENDMENT NO. 50 OFFERED BY MR. ESPAILLAT OF NEW YORK

At the end of part 2 of subtitle E of title II of division A (page 246, after line 8), add the following new section:

SEC. 4115. REPORTS ON MEMBERSHIPS OF INDEPENDENT REDISTRICTING COMMISSIONS.

Not later than May 15 of a year ending in a zero or in the 60th calendar day thereafter, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report on the extent to which the memberships of independent redistricting commissions established under this section with respect to the immediately preceding year ending in the numeral zero meet the diversity requirements as provided for in sections 6002 to 6004, inclusive.

AMENDMENT NO. 51 OFFERED BY MR. O’HALLERAN OF ARIZONA

Insert after section 8035 the following:

SEC. 8035. PROHIBIT ON USE OF FUNDS FOR CERTAIN FEDERAL EMPLOYEE TRAVEL IN CONTRAVENTION OF CERTAIN REGULATIONS.

(a) In General.—Beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, no Federal funds appropriated or otherwise made available in any fiscal year may be used for the travel expenses of any senior Federal official in contravention of any Department of Defense travel or official duties regulations, as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act, and includes any senior executive branch official employed at the applicable agency.

(b) Quarterly Report on Travel.—(1) Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act and every 90 days thereafter, the head of each Federal agency shall submit to the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives a report detailing the direct and indirect costs to the Department of Defense in support of travel by senior executive officials on military aircraft. Each such report shall include whether spousal travel furnished by the Department was reimbursed to the Federal Government.

(2) Exception.—Required use travel, as outlined in Department of Defense Directive 5000.56, shall not be included in reports under subsection (a).

(c) Senior Executive Official Defined.—In this section, the term `senior executive official' has the meaning given the term (as that term is defined in such section).

AMENDMENT NO. 52 OFFERED BY MR. MCADAMS OF UTAH

Page 537, insert after line 7 the following (and redesignate the succeeding subsection accordingly):

(b) REDUCTION OF PERCENTAGE EXEMPTION FOR DETERMINATION OF THRESHOLD OF LOBBYING CONTACTS REQUIRED FOR INDIVIDUALS TO REGISTER AS LOBBYISTS.—Section 3(10) of the Lobbying Disclose Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1602(10)) is amended by striking “less than 20 percent” and inserting “less than 10 percent”.

AMENDMENT NO. 59 OFFERED BY MR. PHILLIPS OF MINNESOTA

Page 552, strike lines 1 and 2 and insert the following:

(2) in paragraph (1)—
(A) by striking `by 3 years’ in each instance and inserting `by 2 years’; and
(B) by inserting `, or conducts any lobbying activity to facilitate any communication to or appearance before,’’ after “any communication to or appearance before;” and

AMENDMENT NO. 60 OFFERED BY MR. PHILLIPS OF MINNESOTA

Page 499, line 4, strike ‘‘; consisting and insert ‘‘; or representing’’.

AMENDMENT NO. 65 OFFERED BY MR. HARDER OF MINNESOTA

Add at the end of subtitle C of title VII the following new section:

SEC. 7202. REQUIRING LOBBYISTS TO DISCLOSE IN THE FEDERAL REGISTER ANY LOBBYING CONTACTS.

(a) Mandatory Disclosure at Time of Contract.—Section 14 of the Lobbying Disclose Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1609) is amended by—
(1) by striking subsections (a) and (b) and inserting the following:

(‘‘(a) Identifying Requirement at Time of Lobbying Contract.—Any person or entity that makes a lobbying contact with a covered legislative branch official or a covered executive branch official shall, at the time of the lobbying contact—
(1) indicate whether the person or entity is registered under this chapter and identify the client on whose behalf the lobbying contact is made; and

(2) indicate whether such client is a foreign entity and identify any foreign entity required to be disclosed under section 30(b)(4) that has a direct interest in the outcome of the lobbying activity.’’;

(2) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d).

(b) Effective Date.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to lobbying contacts made on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 66 OFFERED BY MR. HORSFORD OF NEVADA

In subtitle A of title VI of the bill, insert after section 6006 the following new section (and redesignate the succeeding provision accordingly):

SEC. 6007. REQUIRING FORMS TO PERMIT USE OF ACCENT MARK ON NAMES OF FOREIGN PERSONS.

(a) Requirement.—Section 311a(1) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 311a(1)) is amended by striking the section on the date and inserting the following:

‘‘The President of the United States shall submit to Congress a report on the Office’s public website. So submitted, the Director shall publish such report on the Office’s public website.

AMENDMENT NO. 55 OFFERED BY MR. O’HALLERAN OF ARIZONA

Insert after section 8035 the following:

SEC. 8036. REPORTS ON COST OF SENIOR EXECUTIVE TRAVEL.

(a) REPORTS ON SENIOR EXECUTIVE TRAVEL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 90 days thereafter, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives a report detailing the direct and indirect costs to the Department of Defense in support of travel by senior executive officials on military aircraft. Each such report shall include whether spousal travel furnished by the Department was reimbursed to the Federal Government.

(b) Exception.—Required use travel, as outlined in Department of Defense Directive 5000.56, shall not be included in reports under subsection (a).

(c) SENIOR EXECUTIVE OFFICIAL DEFINED.—In this section, the term `senior executive official' has the meaning given the term (as that term is defined in such section).

AMENDMENT NO. 57 OFFERED BY CO. DAVIS

Page 15, line 7, strike “subsection (c)” and insert “subsection (c) and subsection (d)”.

Page 201, insert after line 10 the following:

(c) DURATION OF STATE OF IOWA.—Subsection (a) does not apply to the State of Iowa, so long as congressional redistricting in such State is carried out in accordance with a plan developed by the Iowa Legislative Services Agency with the assistance of a Temporary Redistricting Advisory Commission, under law which was in effect for the most recent congressional redistricting carried out in the State prior to the enactment of this Act and which remains in effect continuously on and after the date of the enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 58 OFFERED BY MR. FINKENAUER OF IOWA

Page 499, line 4, strike ‘‘; consisting and insert ‘‘; or representing’’.

AMENDMENT NO. 67 OFFERED BY MS. LOFGREN

From California (Ms. LOFGREN) each will control 10 minutes.

Page 240, line 15, strike “section 2401(c)” and insert “sections 2401(c) or section 2401(d)”.

Page 252, line 4, strike “paragraph (2)” and insert “paragraph (2) and paragraph (3)”.

Page 252, insert after line 19 the following:

(3) EXCEPTION FOR STATE OF IOWA.—In the case of the State of Iowa, the apportionment notice in accordance with a plan developed by the Iowa Legislative Services Agency with the assistance of a Temporary Redistricting Advisory Commission, as provided under the law described in section 2401(d).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 172, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentle- woman from California.
One amendment would stop campaign contributions providing an endless piggybank to candidates long after they have left office, or their campaign.

Another amendment gives citizens an important and accessible window into lobbying information. It would require the Attorney General to establish within the Department of Justice a single lobbying information disclosure portal through which members of the public can obtain hard copies and electronic copies of registration statements filed under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 and the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938. The effect of this amendment would be to combine and make easily accessible information that is currently available from disparate sources, including the House, the Senate, and the Department of Justice. Efforts like these increase information flow, transparency, and confidence in our government.

Madam Chair, I think these amendments are worthy of our support. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank my friend and chairperson of our committee, Ms. LOFGREN. It is great to be able to work together and show some bipartisanship.

As many who may have been paying attention yesterday to our long debate on this bill, now, that has been one of my chief complaints about H.R. 1. We have not seen the bipartisanship that the new majority, the new Democratic majority, promised.

Every one of these amendments were offered by members of the Democratic conference. While our amendments in the only markup process that we had for this 622-page bill were all shot down on a partisan roll call, I want the Record to show here that public and Congress.

This problem is real and it has got to be a chance to talk about the issues that I hear from families in my community: the cost of healthcare, education, maybe jobs. But imagine my surprise when the only thing these lobbyists wanted to talk about was what would benefit their clients.

This happens in the city every day. Thousands of lobbyists here, in one city, creating an ecosystem of easy access where they can push their client’s agenda in front of elected representatives.

Mr. HARDER of California. Madam Chair, I thank Chair LOFGREN for her leadership on this issue.

Mr. HARDER of California. Madam Chair, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support my amendment to limit the influence of lobbyists on elected officials.

Here is a stat that blows me away. D.C. is home to 11,000 registered lobbyists. That is 25 lobbyists per Member of Congress.

During one of my first nights in D.C., I got invited to dinner with some of my freshman colleagues. I thought it was going to be a chance to talk about the issues that I hear from families in my community: the cost of healthcare, education, maybe jobs. But imagine my surprise when the only thing these lobbyists wanted to talk about was what would benefit their clients.

This happens in the city every day. Thousands of lobbyists here, in one city, creating an ecosystem of easy access where they can push their client’s agenda in front of elected representatives.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. O’HALLERAN), who has several amendments.

Mr. O’HALLERAN. Madam Chair, as I travel throughout my district, I hear Arizona’s concerns about the integrity of our elections, our elected leaders, and those who serve them in the highest positions of our government. At a time when millions of Americans feel uncertain about the state of our democracy, Congress must act.
I am proud to support H.R. 1, which will strengthen our democracy and close ethics loopholes.

I want to thank the chairwoman and the ranking member for agreeing to adopt my three amendments to the underlying bill. These amendments, which include my Taxpayers DIME Act and my Protecting Defense Dollars Act, will do right by our taxpayers by increasing transparency and accountability when it comes to travel, including on government and military aircraft.

These amendments will crack down on bureaucrats abusing ethics rules in place of lavish travel on private jets, first-class flights, and more. Several of these amendments have previously received bipartisan support.

Regardless of party, those who serve the American public must be held to the highest ethical standards. Our ability to hold government officials accountable to taxpayers is a hallmark of our democracy, and we must work to uphold that right.

Again, I thank my colleagues for including my commonsense amendments in this package.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Madam Chair, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER), who has an amendment here.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Madam Chair, I want to thank my colleague for yielding.

Madam Chair, the American people elected a new Congress to clean up corruption and make Washington work for them.

To that end, this week we will pass H.R. 1 to elevate the people’s voice in our politics, restrict the influence of dark money in our campaigns, expand voting rights protections, and limit corporate influence.

At the foundation of this effort is a commitment to increasing transparency, so the American people know who is behind the money funding the political ads they see and how much these individuals are spending.

Currently, too many political action committees, including so-called super PACs, have an easy way around the important disclosure requirements. By officially organizing a PAC or super-PAC just before an election, these committees can spend on ads to influence an election, without disclosing anything until after the voting has already occurred.

In another scheme, PACs borrow money to pay for advertising and operations and incur debts that are not paid off by donors until long after the election.

Both of these practices are extremely troubling and obfuscate who is donating to PACs. Voters are left in the dark until it is too late.

This amendment is a simple first step to address these abuses by requiring the Federal Election Commission to report recommendations to Congress for how we can crack down on these practices by PACs.

I call on my colleagues to join us to increase transparency and support this amendment.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment on bloc offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 21 OFFERED BY MR. RICE OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 23 printed in part B of House Report 116–16.

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 665, strike line 12 and all that follows through “court.”’’ on line 20.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 172, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. HICE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Madam Chair, the Office of Government Ethics is a prevention and education agency. OGE is responsible for ensuring compliance with ethics requirements, such as financial disclosure and conflict of interest rules.

These are the folks that the executive branch employees call when they have an ethics question. Their mission is to advise Federal employees on ethics matters.

OGE is not an investigative office, but that is exactly what H.R. 1 wants to turn OGE into, by granting the director the authority to subpoena information and records.

Here is the thing. OGE does not even need to have subpoena authority. It already has the power to request any information needed from Federal agencies, and the Federal agencies are required to comply under the Ethics in Government Act.

The only reason to give subpoena authority is to empower OGE to harass executive branch employees. This is not far fetched, Madam Chair.

The former director of OGE, Shaub, was openly hostile to the Trump administration and to Mr. Trump personally, even before he took office. Under Shaub, OGE went so far as using its official Twitter account in an attempt to coerce President-Elect Trump to divert his business interests. That is not what OGE’s role is supposed to be.

We don’t want to allow an office that has become partisan to have subpoena authority and thereby open the door to overt harassment to executive branch employees.

I would just remind my Democrat friends that if this bill does become law—and it won’t—but if it does, a future Democratic administration will eventually also have to deal with the same type of issues with the Office of Government Ethics.

Let me further remind everyone that the inspector general of the agency already has authority to subpoena information and documents, so we don’t need to expand this and extend it to the director.

At the end of the day, this bill has much bigger problems than this small OGE subpoena authority provision. It is a bad bill. I will not be supporting it, obviously, but I know that many of my friends on the other side of the aisle will be supporting this bill.

Frankly, there is no amendment that is made in order by the Rules Committee that can fix this legislation. And then, the Democratic majority, including this one, can at least make it marginally better, but it is a bad bill through and through.

I believe the American people, frankly, are going to see this as they find out what is in this piece of legislation, such as public financing for congressional candidates. The American people don’t want that. They don’t want tax dollars, particularly, six times going to Federal candidates.

And then there is the automatic voter registration requirement. I think the American people will be irate when they find out about this. This particular provision forces States to turn over individual information from government agencies and services and then transfer those over to election officials for voter registration.

Obviously, that is a violation of the 10th Amendment, but it is even worse than that. The Democrats crafting this legislation will not tell the American people that this provision will lead to huge numbers of illegal aliens and noncitizens being registered to vote.

And here is the problem. Illegal aliens and noncitizens use government agencies and services. Their information, according to H.R. 1, would then be sent to election officials, along with everyone else’s, and they will be registered to vote.

The only safeguard that H.R. 1 has to prevent an illegal alien from being automatically registered to vote is if the alien proactively declines, which is not likely to happen because they don’t want to draw attention to themselves to begin with because they are here illegally. So for us to expect that they would go publicly and draw attention to themselves, it just simply is not ever going to happen. That just flies in the face of logic.

Not only does H.R. 1 make it significantly more likely for ineligible voters to be registered, it also makes it next to impossible for States to remove ineligible voters from the registration list once they are on there. I doubt that anyone could have devised a better way, or a worse way, as it really is,
to ensure illegal aliens get registered to vote. I urge my colleagues to vote against H.R. 1, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, I must oppose the gentleman’s amendment. It strips the subpoena power from the Director of the Office of Government Ethics.

Recent years have made it clear that the OGE needs to be strengthened. The subpoena power is a key enforcement tool, and a necessary one, for the Office of Government Ethics.

The former head of OGE said, in working with the current administration it has become clear we need to strengthen the ethics program. That individual resigned as head of the agency in July of last year, after almost 5 years as its head.

The OGE was set up in the aftermath of the 1976 Watergate scandal to clean up government. Some of that cleanup has relied on norms of behavior that are no longer in effect. We need to make sure that we have the ability with the OGE head to actually obtain information so they can do their job.

I would note, also, that there has been a lot of discussion over and over that the small donor program is funded by taxpayers. That is incorrect. You can just read the bill and see that is incorrect.

The freedom from influence fund is entirely funded by a nominal, additional assessment on criminal tax fraud cases, at the upper end, and corporate malfeasance fines and forfeitures. That is the entire source of funding. If there is not enough funding from those sources to fully fund the program, then the program is not fully funded.

That is in the bill itself; so I think it is important that we all understand that.

In terms of the automatic voter registration system, this has worked very successfully in a number of States, and six more are in the process of implementing it.

There are quite a few—we think, ample—safeguards to make sure that only those eligible to vote are, in fact, registered to vote. AVR agencies have reliable data about citizenship status and age, and there are separate rules for those agencies that don’t collect that information.

I would note, also, that there has been discussion about how this is an unfair Federal imposition on States. This is only for Federal elections. This whole bill, H.R. 1, is about Federal elections. And why is that? Article I, Section 4 gives the authority to Congress to pass laws about the conduct of Federal elections.

We have seen over and over, throughout the United States, efforts to suppress the vote in ways we think are improper by purging eligible voters from the rolls, by preventing people from registering through bogus and arcane ID rolls, by making sure that voters can’t get to the polls because they have moved the polls, by eliminating early voting that is so helpful to people who work so hard that they might not be able to get to the polls before the poll closes. So this is for Federal elections.

And why is that important? Each one of us here in the House of Representatives has one vote. That is as it should be, as the Founders established it.

The people who send us here should have the equivalent right to vote for their Representative. There shouldn’t be a way that one person in one State has an equal right to vote but the vote is suppressed in some other State. That is not democracy; that is not fair; and that is what H.R. 1 will fix.

Madam Chair, I urge that we oppose the gentleman from Georgia’s amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. HICE).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 24 Offered by MS. PRESSLEY
The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 24 printed in part B of House Report 116-16.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 72, insert after line 2 the following:

SEC. 1052. LOWERING VOTING AGE IN FEDERAL ELECTIONS.

(a) LOWERING VOTING AGE TO 16 YEARS OF AGE.—A State may not refuse to permit an individual to register to vote or vote in an election for Federal office held in the State on the grounds of the individual’s age if the individual will be at least 16 years of age on the date of the election.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall apply with respect to elections held in 2020 or any succeeding year.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 172, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Madam Chair, I rise today in support of my amendment, H.R. 1, the For the People Act. H.R. 1 is based on transformative legislation which seeks to restore the people’s faith that government works for the public interest, not special interests.

We were sent to Washington with a sacred task to do everything in our power to reinstate Americans’ hope and faith in our democracy.

My amendment to H.R. 1 strikes at one of the fundamental goals of this legislation by ensuring that those who have a stake in our democracy will also have a say in our democracy. By lowering the voting age from 18 to 16 years of age, my amendment will allow young people to have a say in our Federal elections, to help shape and inform the policies that will set the course for the future.

From gun violence to climate change, our young people are organizing, mobilizing, and calling us to action. They are at the forefront of social and legislative movements and have earned inclusion in our democracy.

Beginning at the age of 16, young people are contributing to both the labor force and their local economies by paying income taxes, and yet they are deprived of the opportunity to exercise their right to vote.

In this country, we affirm that when a person walks into the voting booth and pulls that lever, there is no question about our hierarchy. The booth is the equalizer.

Despite many reasons in our lives growing up—in my family—to feel invisible and small, my mother reminded me, as a super voter each election day throughout my childhood, that I believed that then, and I still do. When we step into that voting booth, we bring the totality of our lived experiences. The vote we cast absorbs and honors it all.

I have questioned the maturity of our youth. I don’t.

A 16-year-old in 2019 possesses a wisdom and maturity that comes from 2019 challenges, hardships, and threats. An 18-year-old will bring with them the 2019 fears that their father’s insulin will run out before the next paycheck. A 17-year-old will bring with them the 2019 hopes to be the first in their family to earn a college degree.

A 16-year-old will bring with them the 2019 lessons they learned picking up shifts, waiting tables to support their family while their mother was deployed.

A 17-year-old will bring with them the 2019 solemn vow to honor the lives of their classmates stolen by a gunman.

And now is the time for us to demonstrate the 2019 courage that matches the challenges of the modern-day 16- and 17-year-old.

I would like to thank my colleagues, Representatives Meng and Schakowsky, for their leadership on this issue and for cosponsoring my amendment. They are at the forefront of social and legislative movements and have brought my amendment to the House floor for consideration; and I also wish to thank my staff, Aissa and Lynsey, specifically.

Madam Chair, I respectfully request my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. Meng). Ms. MENG. Madam Chair, I thank the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) for yielding her time.

I strongly agree with my friend from Massachusetts. I thank her for sponsoring this important amendment, and
I am proud to cosponsor it with her. It addresses a crucial and often ignored issue that I have been fighting to raise awareness of during my time in Congress. I have met with students across the State of New York and across the country and am incredibly impressed with their drive and passion directed at the democratic process.

Across the country, these students are getting involved. They are marching. They are advocating for their generation’s future, and they are asserting their position in our society.

This is why I am proud to have introduced a constitutional amendment in the 115th and the 116th Congress to lower the voting age to 16 for Federal, State, and local elections.

The amendment in front of us today gives 16-year-olds the right to vote in Federal elections. In localities that have already granted 16-year-olds the right to vote, we have seen an increase in voter participation and better debate.

Madam Chair, 16-year-olds participate in the democracy already. They are legally permitted to work. They pay Federal taxes on their income and can even be tried as adults in court. It is only just that they are given the right to vote.

Madam Chair, I thank the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) for championing this cause. I know this fight will continue. I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I thank the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY), my new colleague, for participating in the legislative process. This is why we are here. We are here to debate the issues, whether we agree or disagree. That is what this institution is all about. And it is great to see new Members be active on very important issues.

I have to say, I think there might be a constitutional issue with this amendment. The last time we lowered the voting age, in 1971, I believe we had 18-year-olds fighting for our country in Vietnam.

It seemed wrong back then. The kids that were eligible for the draft. Through no fault of their own, through no choice of their own, they were asked to go fight for our freedoms in a foreign country. Being 1 year old at the time, I don’t really remember that debate, but I can tell you, it was the right thing to do.

However, for constitutional reasons—and also, I am of the opinion that we shouldn’t arbitrarily lower the voting age just because, right now, I believe Democrats think they will gain more votes.

H.R. 1 is bad enough because I believe it will institutionalize a Democrat majority here in this House of Representatives, but to be so brash and, possibly, unconstitutional to decide and lower the voting age only for political reasons is something that I don’t think this institution should be doing.

I have always believed that if you got to cast their first vote this year. There was some thought before election day. I didn’t know if I would get their votes, but since then, they told me they have voted for me. And a close race like mine, it makes a difference.

But this policy is not well thought out. It is not constitutional, and it should not be part of this bill. I am going to urge a ‘no’ vote.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Madam Chair, I respectfully disagree with the gentleman from Illinois, and I, too, appreciate the opportunity to engage in a civil discourse with him.

The data supports the fact that by extending the table of democracy, given what we have learned in Maryland, that, in fact, we have seen more robust voter participation by both 16- and 17-year-olds and those over the age of 18. I think that we should be cultivating that relationship with the young people and their government and their participation as early as possible.

Although a constitutional amendment is one approach, I do think that we have a mandate from this electorate, as a Congress, to be bold; and this is the opportunity to do exactly that, and we should be acting.

There is nothing spontaneous about this. There have been advocates who have been organizing in communities for decades on this very issue and, of course, colleagues in this very House. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, how much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Madam Chair, I just want to share a thought on this. It is interesting that recently we just raised the alcohol purchasing age to 21. We don’t allow a 16-year-old to buy a beer, and the decisionmaking is because of their ability to reason at that age. That is why we moved their ability to buy a simple beer to age 21. And now the other side wants to grant a 16-year-old the ability to decide the future of the country. I think this is foolish.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, it is a great debate to have.

The problem we have here in this country, all 16-year-olds are still legally minors. They can’t be tried as adults in the court of law unless, under special circumstances, of heinous crimes. They can’t join the military. They won’t even be eligible for the draft that took so many of our young men to Southeast Asia, where many never came home, the last time the voting age was lowered.

States, 16-year-olds can’t even drive their car alone. They can’t take out a loan. They can’t take out a mortgage. They can’t open a credit card. And they can’t even run for the offices that we would be asking them to be allowed to vote for.

This is an amendment that has political reasons behind it. It is the reason that I believe the Democrats are pushing it. It is because they believe they will be able to increase the number of Democrat votes that are put forth in the next election.

This institution should not be used for that. This bill is political enough. This bill, as a whole, is nothing more than a charade to make permanent the Democratic majority that just came into existence just a few months ago.

That is why I believe H.R. 1 is a bill that should be voted against. Please vote 'no' on H.R. 1 and please vote ‘no’ on this amendment for the reasons that I put forth.

Again, I thank my colleagues from Massachusetts and my colleague from New York for being here and participating in this process.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY).

The question was taken; and the Acting CHAIR announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 25 OFFERED BY MR. GREEN OF TENNESSEE

The Acting CHAIR. The Acting CHAIR. The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 315, line 1, strike “Relating to Illicit Money Undermining Our Democracy”.

Page 317, insert after line 6 the following:

SEC. 4002. FINDINGS RELATING TO FREEDOM OF SPEECH AS A FUNDAMENTAL RIGHT.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The First Amendment to the United States Constitution guarantees the most fundamental right of our democratic society: “Congress shall make no law . . . abridging the freedom of speech.”

(2) The right to free speech guarantees that the American people can freely speak about their political beliefs.
(3) The Federal government should not concern itself with the political ideology or affiliation of any of its citizens, when applying the law, offering services, or evaluating applications for federal benefits or awards.

(4) The protection of free speech is broad and covers expressive and political speech.

(5) Political speech, including the financial contributions of political or issue advocacy campaigns, is a vital part of our Nation’s free exchange of ideas and avenues of free expression must be preserved and protected.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Rule 43, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GREEN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Madam Chairwoman, I rise today to offer my amendment expressing the sense of Congress that free speech should be protected.

H.R. 1 is a misguided bill with many problems. One problem, in particular, has united everyone from the Heritage Foundation to the ACLU. It is the bill’s assault on free speech.

“The ACLU itself says H.R. 1 will “chill speech essential to our public discourse.” When the ACLU admonishes a Democrat bill, everyone should take notice.

My amendment is simple. It reaffirms the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States. The First Amendment, after all, guarantees the most fundamental right of our Democratic society: “Congress shall make no law . . . abridging the freedom of speech.”

Our Founding Fathers knew that in order for the American experiment to work, the people must be free: free to participate in the democratic process, free to vote in elections, free to help candidates and causes they believe in, and free to speak up when their elected officials are no longer representing them.

The freedom of speech enshrined in the First Amendment has helped make America the most exceptional country in the history of the world. Unfortunately, H.R. 1 tramples on that very freedom.

Madam Chair, I offer this amendment to express the sense of Congress that the freedom of speech must be preserved and protected because, without it, the American experiment won’t ever be the same again.

A vote against this amendment is a vote against free speech. If you don’t believe me, ask the ACLU. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chairwoman, I claim my time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment, reluctantly, because it is only the last paragraph in the amendment that causes concern.

The amendment expresses a sense of Congress that free speech should be protected. Who can disagree with that? Our Founding Fathers envisioned a robust and open discourse. They did not fathom speech that was unacceptable to anonymous corporations that would drown out the voices of individual Americans.

The concern we have on this amendment is the last paragraph, really, is an attempt to protect the Citizens United decision and the flow of unlimited dark money into our politics and elections.

It is important to note that, under the guise of free speech, some are suggesting that we need to protect anonymous special interests. Nothing stops people or entities from donating to political campaigns or politicians, but they must be transparent about it.

Justice Brandeis indicated, and I think has been very widely, that sunshine is the best disinfectant, and the American people cannot fully exercise their First Amendment rights if they do not have all of the information necessary to react in an informed manner.

We all have the right to know who is trying to influence elections, and it may well change our minds if we know who is saying what. Ultimately, this amendment is flawed because disclosure does not limit speech.

In Citizens United, the Court affirmed holdings in other cases, that disclaimer and disclosure requirements impose no ceiling on campaign-related activities and do not prevent anyone from speaking. The Court held the disclosure is “a less restrictive alternative to more comprehensive regulations.”

Lauded conservatives have long espoused this principle, and the Supreme Court has upheld disclosure because it helps voters hold elected leaders accountable. In fact, eight of the nine Supreme Court Justices upheld disclosure in the Citizens United case as necessary for voters to hold leaders accountable.

Perhaps no one said it better than Justice Antonin Scalia in Doe v. Reed. Justice Scalia said: “Requiring people to stand up in public for their political acts fosters civic courage, without which democracy is doomed.”

Much has been said about the ACLU, and I appreciate what the ACLU does on many scores, but they have a storied history of litigating constitutional issues that we cannot disagree. However, we have differed on our approach to campaign finance laws. They have upheld and supported the Citizens United decision and they oppose McCain-Feingold.

While I support so much of the good work they do, I think they are mistaken on this. In an open letter to the ACLU, I include in the RECORD a letter from Democracy 21, which is a very thought-provoking rebuttal to the ACLU’s position.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: Democracy 21 strongly supports H.R. 1, the “For the People Act of 2019,” and urges you to vote for the legislation, which is the most comprehensive effort to repair our democracy since the post-Watergate reforms of the 1970’s.

In particular, the bill contains a series of important reforms to address serious problems with our campaign finance system. The legislation provides a small donor, matching fund system that will encourage small donations and remove candidate dependence on wealthy contributors and special interest money. It also contains federal improvements to the disclosure laws to address the growing problem of undisclosed “dark money” that is being spent to influence federal elections. And it establishes objective standards to ensure that supposedly “independent” spending is not done in cooperation or coordination with candidates or their agents, in order to help citizens “make informed choices in the political marketplace.”

As Justice Kennedy wrote for an 8-1 majority in Citizens United, disclosure provisions “impose no ceiling on campaign-related activities” and “do not prevent anyone from speaking.” Id. In Citizens United the Supreme Court upheld disclosure provisions because they establish those important governmental interests of “providing the electorate with information about the sources of election-related spending.”

As Justice Kennedy wrote for an 8-1 majority in Citizens United, disclosure provisions “impose no ceiling on campaign-related activities” and “do not prevent anyone from speaking.” Id. In Citizens United the Supreme Court upheld disclosure provisions because they establish those important governmental interests of “providing the electorate with information about the sources of election-related spending.”

The ACLU’s principal objection is that H.R. 1 requires disclosure that “reaches beyond the bounds” of express advocacy. ACLU Ltr. at 12. Yet the Court in Citizens United addressed precisely this issue and upheld a disclosure requirement for a broadcast ad that referred to a candidate in the pre-election period, but that did not contain express advocacy.

The Court explicitly stated that “we reject Citizens United’s contention that the disclosure requirement must be limited to speech that is the functional equivalent of express advocacy.” Id. at 918.

Thus, the principal constitutional argument raised by the ACLU with regard to the democracy 2019
DISCLOSE Act—that disclosure requirements cannot extend beyond express advocacy—has already been squarely and overwhelmingly rejected by an 8 to 1 vote in the Supreme Court. The ACLU states that it particularly objects to disclosure requirements for "electioneering communications," i.e., non-explicit advocacy ads that refer to a candidate and solicits a vote for or against a specific election position. At 13, this is the very issue that the Court addressed in upholding such disclosure requirements in *Citizens United*, 130 S.Ct. at 916. Absent such a showing, campaign finance disclosure requirements are constitutional.

The Court did state in *Citizens United* that, with respect to the *Citizens United* disclosure requirements, "a reasonable probability'' that disclosing the names of a specific threat, the disclosure requirements would be held unconstitutional only for the specific group involved based on the information known by that group. The proposed disclosure laws would otherwise remain constitutional.

The ACLU states a concern that the bill fails to acknowledge or to give proper weight to specific showing that the definition of coordination could encompass "communications with the candidate about the public policy issues of the day without a sufficient nexus to the potential corrupting influence of very large expenditures." Absent such a showing, the ACLU "agrees that a 'message' or 'policy' is integral to discussion indicating the speaker acted pursuant to legislative or policy discussion 'so long as there is no communication between the person and the candidate or committee . . . regarding the candidate's campaign advertising, message, strategy or policy,'" id. (emphasis added).

This is at best, a half-hearted objection because the ACLU also then "agrees that the coordination provisions of H.R. 1 create a new category of 'coordinated spenders,' based on certain specified relationships, activities or statements by an agent of an outside group, but not by an agent of a candidate or committee," id., and the ACLU concerns about coordination provisions are not effective rules against coordination, but instead will strengthen existing coordination rules to make the existing enforcement more rigorous.

The ACLU also objects to disclosure requirements for money spent on ads that promote, support, attack or oppose (PASO) the election of a candidate, complaining about "extraordinary intelligence activities, or to protect a reasonable opportunity to know what is subject to serious threats, harassment or reprisals as a result of the compelled disclosure." Id. at 198. But the Court has never limited the definition of coordinated spending only to spending pursuant to an explicit discussion about, from either Government officials or private parties." *Citizens United*, 130 S.Ct. at 916. Absent such a showing, campaign finance disclosure requirements are constitutional.

The Court did state in *Citizens United* that, with respect to the *Citizens United* disclosure requirements, "a reasonable probability'' that disclosing the names of a specific threat, the disclosure requirements would be held unconstitutional only for the specific group involved based on the information known by that group. The proposed disclosure laws would otherwise remain constitutional.

The ACLU states a concern that the bill fails to acknowledge or to give proper weight to specific showing that the definition of coordination could encompass "communications with the candidate about the public policy issues of the day without a sufficient nexus to the potential corrupting influence of very large expenditures." Absent such a showing, the ACLU "agrees that a 'message' or 'policy' is integral to discussion indicating the speaker acted pursuant to legislative or policy discussion 'so long as there is no communication between the person and the candidate or committee . . . regarding the candidate's campaign advertising, message, strategy or policy,'" id. (emphasis added).

This is at best, a half-hearted objection because the ACLU also then "agrees that the coordination provisions of H.R. 1 create a new category of 'coordinated spenders,' based on certain specified relationships, activities or statements by an agent of an outside group, but not by an agent of a candidate or committee," id., and the ACLU concerns about coordination provisions are not effective rules against coordination, but instead will strengthen existing coordination rules to make the existing enforcement more rigorous.

The ACLU also objects to disclosure requirements for money spent on ads that promote, support, attack or oppose (PASO) the election of a candidate, complaining about "extraordinary intelligence activities, or to protect a reasonable opportunity to know what is subject to serious threats, harassment or reprisals as a result of the compelled disclosure." Id. at 198. But the Court has never limited the definition of coordinated spending only to spending pursuant to an explicit discussion about, from either Government officials or private parties." *Citizens United*, 130 S.Ct. at 916. Absent such a showing, campaign finance disclosure requirements are constitutional.

The Court did state in *Citizens United* that, with respect to the *Citizens United* disclosure requirements, "a reasonable probability'' that disclosing the names of a specific threat, the disclosure requirements would be held unconstitutional only for the specific group involved based on the information known by that group. The proposed disclosure laws would otherwise remain constitutional.

The ACLU states a concern that the bill fails to acknowledge or to give proper weight to specific showing that the definition of coordination could encompass "communications with the candidate about the public policy issues of the day without a sufficient nexus to the potential corrupting influence of very large expenditures." Absent such a showing, the ACLU "agrees that a 'message' or 'policy' is integral to discussion indicating the speaker acted pursuant to legislative or policy discussion 'so long as there is no communication between the person and the candidate or committee . . . regarding the candidate's campaign advertising, message, strategy or policy,'" id. (emphasis added).

This is at best, a half-hearted objection because the ACLU also then "agrees that the coordination provisions of H.R. 1 create a new category of 'coordinated spenders,' based on certain specified relationships, activities or statements by an agent of an outside group, but not by an agent of a candidate or committee," id., and the ACLU concerns about coordination provisions are not effective rules against coordination, but instead will strengthen existing coordination rules to make the existing enforcement more rigorous.

The ACLU also objects to disclosure requirements for money spent on ads that promote, support, attack or oppose (PASO) the election of a candidate, complaining about "extraordinary intelligence activities, or to protect a reasonable opportunity to know what is subject to serious threats, harassment or reprisals as a result of the compelled disclosure." Id. at 198. But the Court has never limited the definition of coordinated spending only to spending pursuant to an explicit discussion about, from either Government officials or private parties." *Citizens United*, 130 S.Ct. at 916. Absent such a showing, campaign finance disclosure requirements are constitutional.
or a “common plan” for, a particular expenditure. The Court has instead cast a wide net in demanding that independent spending be “totally independent,” Buckley, 424 U.S. at 29, and “not pursuant to any general or particular understanding with a candidate,” Colorado Republican Federal Campaign Committee v. FEC, 518 U.S. 604, 614 (1996), and “truly independent.” FEC v. Colorado Republican Federal Campaign Committee, 535 U.S. 431, 442 (2001). The framework enunciated by the Court in H.R. 1 look both to certain relationships between the outside spender and the candidate, and certain activities between the outside spender and the candidate. Whether or not a person’s expenditure meets the standard set by the Court of being “totally” and “truly” independent. If the relationship between the candidate and spender, or the activities of the candidate on behalf of the spender (such as helping to raise funds for the spender), indicate that they do not meet this high standard for true independence, then the proposed rule would appropriately deem spending by that person to be coordinated.

Conclusion

The reforms contained in H.R. 1 will make essential improvements in the transparency of the money spent to influence federal elections and in shutting down avenues that are currently being exploited to evade and evade the contribution limits. The bill is carefully drafted to conform to the Supreme Court’s campaign finance rulings, and to appropriately balance constitutionally protected privacy and speech interests with the government’s compelling interests in deterring corruption and the appearance of corruption through disclosure and the restoration of effective contribution limits.

Democracy 21 urges you to vote for H.R. 1. Sincerely,

FRED WERTHEIMER,
President,
DONALD J. SIMON,
Counsel.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, I would note, also, that we have just received a letter from The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights expressing their strong support for H.R. 1. This is an organization that no one can fault for their firm leadership on behalf of civil and constitutional rights for many decades.

I include in the RECORD a letter from The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights.

THE LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE ON CIVIL AND HUMAN RIGHTS,
Washington, DC, March 1, 2019.

Support H.R. 1, the For The People Act.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, a coalition of more than 200 national organizations committed to promoting and protecting the civil and human rights of all persons in the United States, and the 50 underrepresented organizations, we write in strong support of H.R. 1, the For The People Act.

H.R. 1 represents a transformative vision for American democracy. It would create a democracy that welcomes every eligible voter’s chance to participate in civic life, and a democracy that demands integrity, fairness, and transparency in our nation’s elections.

For far too long, voter suppression has been a shameful reality in our country—undercutting the power and representation of African Americans, Native Americans, Hispanic Americans, Asian Americans, Pacific Islanders, Native Americans, and other groups historically excluded from our political process. The ability to meaningfully participate in our democracy is a racial justice issue. It is a civil rights issue. And the need for legislative action is urgent. We commend the House co-sponsors of this critical legislation.

Our nation will soon mark the 54th anniversary of the March on Washington, where John Lewis and 600 voting rights activists were viciously beaten and attacked on March 7, 1965 on the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma, Alabama. In August 1965 with the passage of the landmark Voting Rights Act (“VRA”), which sought to end racial discrimination at the ballot box. Nearly five decades later, five justices of the Supreme Court gutted the VRA’s most powerful tool—the preclearance system. That system had enabled the Justice Department and federal courts to block proposed discriminatory voting restrictions in states with well-documented histories of discrimination.

In the aftermath of the Shelby County v. Holder decision, North Carolina, Texas, and other jurisdictions previously covered in whole or part by the VRA preclearance requirement began to implement voter suppression laws. In striking down the North Carolina law in 2018, the Fourth Circuit determined that “voter suppression is not election officials, unless the challenge is based on a factual basis to believe the person is ineligible to vote or register to vote. Creating a federal holiday and ensuring early and online voter registration: H.R. 1 would make Election Day a federal holiday. It would also require at least 15 consecutive days of early voting, including weekends, in federal elections and ensure that early voting polling places are accessible by public transportation.

Reforming redistricting: H.R. 1 would be a milestone in the battle against the extreme partisan gerrymandering our country has witnessed in recent years. By requiring states to draw congressional districts using independent redistricting commissions that are bipartisan and reflect the demographic diversity of the region, H.R. 1 would establish fair redistricting criteria and ensure compliance with the VRA to safeguard voter interests for communities of color.

Modernizing election administration: H.R. 1 would reauthorize the Election Assistance Commission—an independent, bipartisan commission that plays a vital role in ensuring election reliability and voting equipment used in our nation’s elections. It would also promote election reliability and
security by requiring voter-verified permanent paper ballots and enhanced poll worker recruitment and training. And H.R. 1 would prohibit state election administrators from taking any political part in a political campaign over which they have supervisory authority.

H.R. 1 would also make significant advances to safeguard freedom of speech and ethics reform. It would correct the rampant corruption flowing from the corrosive power of money in our elections. It would replace the corrupt campaign finance system that empowers the super-rich and big corporations with one that relies on small donors and public matching funds. It would end secret expenditures and force disclosure of all election-related spending. And it would call for a constitutional amendment to overturn the disturbing Citizens United decision that made it impossible to restrict outside spending by corporations or billionaires.

In addition, H.R. 1 addresses our government ethics crisis by, among other things, requiring the development of a code of conduct for Supreme Court Justices to enhance accountability on ethics and recusal issues; overhauling the Office of Government Ethics to strengthen financial oversight, establish more robust conflict of interest requirements for government officials; prohibiting members of Congress from using taxpayer dollars to settle allegations of employment discrimination; and requiring recipients to disclose their tax returns.

H.R. 1—the For the People Act—provides a North Star for the democracy reform agenda. It is a bold, comprehensive reform package that offers solutions to a broken democracy. Repairing and modernizing our voting system and in hand with reforms that address the rampant corruption flowing from the corrosive power of money in our elections, and reforms that address the myriad ethical problems that plague all the branches of the federal government. The reforms in H.R. 1 are necessary to advance racial justice and ensure that our government works for all people, not just a powerful few.

The civil and human rights coalition is strongly committed to expanding the franchise and fixing our democracy, and we urge Congress to pass this historic legislation.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GREEN).

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Tennessee will be recognized.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee will be recognized.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. In conclusion, Madam Chairwoman, again, as I look at that point five, that paragraph five, supporting the free exchange of ideas and avenues of free expression, I struggle to see where disclosure issues are raised in that paragraph.

But as my colleagues, I have no one else to comment on the bill. I am ready to have the amendment considered, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GREEN). The question was taken, and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XIX, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 26 OFFERED BY MR. GREEN OF TEXAS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 26 printed in part B of House Report 116–16. Mr. GREEN of Texas, Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end of subtitle A of title I the following:

PART 8—PROVIDING VOTER REGISTRATION INFORMATION TO SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS

S. 1501. PILOT PROGRAM FOR PROVIDING VOTER REGISTRATION INFORMATION TO SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS PRIOR TO GRADUATION

(a) PILOT PROGRAM.—The Election Assistance Commission (hereafter in this part referred to as the “Commission”) shall carry out a pilot program under which the Commission shall provide funds during the one-year period beginning after the date of the enactment of this part to eligible local educational agencies for initiatives to provide information on registering to vote in elections for public office to secondary school students in the 12th grade.

(b) ELIGIBILITY.—A local educational agency is eligible to receive funds under the pilot program under this part if the agency submits to the Commission a request for such funds and the agency is responsible for administering elections for public office in the area served by the agency in developing the initiatives the agency will carry out with the funds.

(c) CONSULTATION WITH ELECTION OFFICIALS.—A local educational agency receiving funds under the pilot program shall consult with the State and local election officials who are responsible for administering elections for public office in the area served by the agency in developing the initiatives the agency will carry out with the funds.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this part, the terms “local educational agency” and “secondary school” mean—
school" have the meanings given such terms in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).

SEC. 1082. REPORTS.

(a) REPORTS BY RECEIPTENTS OF FUNDS.—Not later than the expiration of the 90-day period which begins on the date of the receipt of the funds, each local educational agency receiving funds under the pilot program under this part shall submit a report to the Commission describing the initiatives carried out with the funds and analyzing their effectiveness.

(b) COMMISSION.—Not later than the expiration of the 60-day period which begins on the date the Commission receives the final report submitted by a local educational agency participating in the pilot program under this part, the Commission shall submit a report to Congress on the pilot program under this part.

SEC. 1083. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this part.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 172, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the basis of the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chairman, I am not opposed to what this amendment does, although I would point out, once again, this is another amendment. This is an ever other cost that the CBO has already said, from what they can score, this bill is going to cost taxpayers $2.8 billion with a potential for billions more for what they couldn't even offer a congressional budget score for. So I have some issues with that, although I appreciate the direction my colleague is going with this.

I think providing voter registration materials at schools is something that is probably being done now. I would hope that local county clerks—I know mine are—are already doing that. But I am not opposed to that language.

However, I disagree with my colleague from Texas that H.R. 1 is a bill by the people and for the people. Frankly, I believe every single American who is eligible to vote should have their vote counted and they should have their vote protected.

We all know Republicans and Democrats—want every vote to count. We want to make sure everyone can get registered to vote. At a time in our country when registration turnout is exceedingly high compared to previous congressional budget scores, we should safeguard that.

Make no mistake about it. This bill is not by the people. H.R. 1 is not for the people. H.R. 1 is for the Members of Congress who sit in this institution who are going to eventually get tax dollars to pay for this legislation. That is why this bill is a bad bill. I appreciate the amendment that my colleague is offering, but by no means is H.R. 1 going to ensure that we have the protection to ensure that every eligible American voter has their vote counted and protected.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Chair, I yield such time as she may consider appropriate.

Ms. LOFGREN. This is a splendid amendment. It will do a lot to allow young people to channel their excitement and to understand they are important and they are going to be participating as voters when they turn 18. It works well with the amendment that will be offered by Mr. NEGUSS later that allows for preregistration of 16- and 17-year-olds so that when they turn 18 they can automatically be registered to vote.

I know that there is some concern on both sides of the aisle about the idea of a 16-year-old preregistering, that change in the voting eligibility. We don't know how that amendment will turn out, but certainly these amendments would do much to make sure that young people are thoroughly connected to our government and understand that the government belongs to them and their families.

Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Chair, I close with these words. This is a participatory democracy. It is a function efficaciously, then the right to vote must be protected.

I join my colleague on the other side in his position that all votes should be counted and that every person who has the right to vote should be in a position to vote. This amendment helps to assure that young people will start to participate in the participatory democracy.

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I would like to thank my colleague and friend from Texas (Mr. GREEN). Again, I agree with what Chairperson LOFGREN said about the excitement of students in high schools being able to understand what it means to be able to register to vote and participate in the political process. That is why I visit high schools throughout my district on a regular basis each time we are back from Washington, off the floor, and in my districts for our district work period.

I am going to, again, extend the olive branch of bipartisanship to ensure that I am not going to oppose this amendment. I want this amendment to pass through, but I will vote to many of my colleagues on the floor. Madam Chair, we just had two Republican amendments offered, and not one passed. The olive branch of bipartisanship has to work both ways. I am, again, reaching out, and I will continue to do so throughout the day, it is not without frustration that that olive branch has not yet been returned.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN). The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 27 OFFERED BY MR. GRJALVA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 27 printed in part B of House Report 116–16.

Mr. GRJALVA. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 142, insert after line 3 the following (and redesignate the succeeding provisions accordingly):

"(c) PERMITTING VOTERS TO RETURN BALLOT TO POLLING PLACE ON DATE OF ELECTION.

The State shall permit an individual to whom a ballot in an election was provided under this section to cast the ballot on the
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date of election by delivering the ballot on that date to a polling place.".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 172, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chairman, I urge support for the underlying legislation, H.R. 1, which in my mind reaffirms the right to vote and empowers the individual citizens in our democracy and empowers their role in our democracy over the wealthy special interests that has been the trend of late.

My amendment asks that in the spirit of this bill, which is to protect voting rights, that we protect Americans who opt to vote by mail from unnecessary impediments to voting. Specifically, this amendment requires States to provide voters with an opportunity to return ballots at a polling place on election day.

At its face value, this might not seem like a drastic ask, but it merits consideration, granted efforts by States to switch eligible voters from cast their ballots by denying them the right to return the ballot on election day. In Arizona, about 228,000 people dropped off their ballots at the polling places on election day in November of this general election, a majority of whom, I should add, were Republican voters.

The reason why I believe that my amendment should be supported is to protect the vote-by-mail process. In 2016, 16 States showed a combined percentage of greater than 50 percent of votes cast early, by mail, or via absentee ballots, including my State of Arizona. As more Americans chose to vote by mail, lawmakers in this Chamber should facilitate rather than hinder the right to vote by mail.

Voting by mail allows voters to take their time examining and researching the candidates and issues that align with their values, thus making that very important informed decision on election day. That only strengthens our democracy and empowers that individual voter.

Voting by mail also allows voters not to be constrained by work, school, family, or other sensitive matters that would otherwise prevent a voter from casting their ballot on election day. For many constituents, voting by mail is the most practical and convenient method to exercise that right. Voting by mail can help reduce the issue of forcing voters to wait hours to cast their ballots, which is unacceptable. Voting by mail can help reduce these incidents and provide more opportunities that are consistent of a person’s lifestyle or their particular needs.

Vote by mail helps alleviate under-resourced, consolidated, or distant polling places from having an influx of voters on election day. By ensuring that all polling sites accept vote-by-mail ballots on election day, voters’ confidence in the electoral process, I believe, is upheld. Vote by mail is intended to increase voter participation during non-Presidential election years which tend to have overall lower voter turnout rates.

The scope of this legislation is to promote and protect the right to vote that every American citizen is entitled to. For many constituents, voting by mail is the most practical and convenient method to exercise that right. With ongoing efforts at all levels of governance to restrict voting, now more than ever it is important to ensure that regardless of voting in person or by mail that that vote is cast, processed, tabulated, and accepted as valid.

Madam Chair, I would hope that you would join me in ensuring States are not able to place harmful restrictions on voters. States should continue to do their due diligence and protect voters by allowing them to return their ballots on election day. Anything less would be a direct attack on voters’ rights and a growing percentage of nontraditional voters across this Nation.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chairman, I have a couple of questions in particular. First, is: If the gentleman from Arizona, Chairman GRIJALVA, has this information, I would like to know. This is already the process that we follow in my home State of Illinois.

Are there any States that don’t allow this already that the gentleman is aware of?

Mr. GRIJALVA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I think there have been efforts in my home State to begin to restrict the use of election day dropping off of vote-by-mail forms and other discussions, and this is both a preventive and encouraging amendment that prevents any of those actions, and more importantly, to encourage States to apply that fairly.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I will reclaim my time. Of course, as the process, it is illegal in the State, my colleague’s home State.

I am not against this process happening because it happens in my home State right now. The problem we have is we don’t want somebody who is eligible to cast their ballot, who got that vote-by-mail ballot, and they decided on election day to fill it out. We want them to be able to go to their polling place and not have to wait in line, and we want them to be able to turn it in. In the process, we have on our side of the aisle is it is ballot harvesting. It is the process in North Carolina where a Republican is likely going to jail, if convicted. But that same process that will likely send that person to jail, if convicted, is legal in California. We have a problem with somebody besides that voter taking absentee ballots unwatched, not a bipartisan effort, not any control mechanisms, bringing it to this floor. So there’s going to be a county clerk on election day or after election day. Those are issues that we are concerned about in the bill.

I don’t oppose this amendment because, again, it is already the process we have in my home State.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES), who is the author and leader of the legislation, H.R. 1.

Mr. SARBANES. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I just want to support this amendment. Again, what we are talking about here with increasing confidence, engagement, and participation on behalf of the voters. This opportunity to be able to return mail-in ballots at polling places is a way to further that.

I just want to say that with respect to this idea we have to distinguish between election fraud and voter fraud; what we saw in North Carolina was election fraud by a political operative taking advantage of voters, not voters engaging in the process. So there is a very important distinction there.

I also really wanted to quickly correct the RECORD for my colleague from the other side of the aisle who mentioned a moment ago that somehow under H.R. 1 taxpayer money would be used to fund candidates’ campaigns. Nothing could be further from the truth. The bill provides explicitly that there will be no taxpayer funds going to any kind of candidate committees or candidate campaigns. I just wanted to correct the RECORD. I am happy to continue doing that over the course of the debate.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield myself the remainder of my time, Madam Chair.

I would remind everybody that this amendment provides the States with flexibility. It is providing convenience, as my colleague mentioned, and as a preventive tool, and no prohibition on voters returning mail ballots would actually slow down the process. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Chairman, again, I don’t oppose this process. It is already in existence in my home State to ensure that every eligible American voter has their vote counted and protected.

There are legitimate concerns about the ballot harvesting process; otherwise, somebody might not have to face a trial in North Carolina.

I certainly appreciate the author coming to the floor to, once again, talk
about the bill and some of the changes that were made since it was introduced on January 3, the first day of Congress, cosponsored by every Member of the other side of the aisle, a 571-page bill. I certainly hope everybody had a chance to take a look at that bill before signing their names on the dotted line, because the provision that the author put in place, if he would have reached out to any of the three Republicans on the House Administration Committee, we would have gladly discussed some of our priorities, but there was no olive branch of bipartisanship whatsoever.

The Sheer fact that somehow the bill has been changed to now create this fine that is going to be corporate malfeasance dollars, it is never going to be able to get the amount of money in that candidates are going to expect when running for Congress. Candidates, even like the neo-Nazi who ran against my good friend Dan Lipinski in the last race, are going to get the amount of money in campaign to run a race, and they are going to ask the taxpayers to bail it out. Everybody on that side of the aisle knows that candidates for Congress, including Members of Congress on the other side of the aisle, aren’t going to get what they expect into their campaigns from this corporate malfeasance fund—which is corporate dollars that we weren’t supposed to be able to take as Members of Congress in our campaigns anyway but now somehow it is a good idea to do—know what is going to happen? They are going to say, “I don’t have the money in my campaign to run a race,” and they are going to ask the taxpayers to bail it out.

Everybody on that side of the aisle knows that is going to happen, and the shell game they are playing right now is very frustrating.

The CBO couldn’t even score this new provision. We don’t even know how much this is going to cost beyond the possible $3-plus billion.

This is a bill designed to keep a Democratic Congress in this Congress so that we don’t have a chance to pass over these hearings anymore.

That is not the way to run elections. That is not what our Constitution wants. That is not what anybody should support.

Madam Chair, again, I am not opposed to this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. Grijalva).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 28 OFFERED BY MR. RODNEY DAVIS OF ILLINOIS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 28 printed in part B of House Report 116–16.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, as the designee of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Yoho), I have an amendment at the desk, amendment No. 28.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 529, line 12, strike “Not later than” and insert “(a) In General—Not later than”.

Page 530, after line 3, insert the following: “(b) Conduct—Conduct issued under subsection (a) shall contain requirements that are at least as stringent as the requirements placed on Members of Congress under Rule XIX of the Rules of the House of Representatives (known as the Code of Official Conduct).”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 172, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, it is great to have many conversations with you today. This is what is great about the institution: Our forefathers set up a legislative branch to debate, to cast votes, and then to legislate.

We won’t always agree on every issue. There are times we will vehemently disagree with each other. But, Madam Chair, after the debate is over, we all move on and look forward to working with each other.

Madam Chair, today, I rise in support of amendment 28 because Members of Congress, all of us in the legislative branch, are, appropriately, held to stringent ethical standards that are designed to prevent financial or material gain for actions taken while we are legislating in that role. We should ensure all branches of government are held to high ethical standards, too.

This commonsense amendment would require the Judicial Conference of the United States to implement a judicial code that is at least as stringent as the requirements placed on Members of Congress. This amendment would be a step in the right direction for providing transparency in government, which the American people expect and deserve.

Again, I gave the olive branch to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle on the last two amendments, and I certainly hope that that olive branch can be returned on this Republican amendment, and I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Madam Chair, this amendment is well intended but biddled with inconsistencies that render it ineffective and unnecessary.

Although judges should be held to high ethical standards, it is a false equivalence to claim that Members of Congress and judges face the same dilemmas. Judges do not accept campaign funds, do not represent constituents, and have no term limits. Everyone has the privilege to serve in our government should be held to a code of conduct, yet it is a misstep to assume that all branches of government have the same prerequisites and ethical pitfalls.

H.R. 1 already contains a reasonable approach to expanding ethics for the United States Supreme Court, and this amendment would confuse the clarity and enforcement of these standards.

This amendment is asking the Judicial Conference of the United States is best suited to issue a code of conduct for the courts of the United States. Judges know best what predicaments judges face and how best to protect the integrity of our courts from corruption and improper conduct.

We should pass H.R. 1 without this amendment so that we can create effective, enforceable ethical standards for our courts.

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I thank my colleague from Georgia for debating this amendment with me.

There are a lot of what I believe are constitutional issues with H.R. 1, legislative overreach that defies the equal branches of government. This one does not. All we are simply doing with this amendment is asking the Judicial Conference of the United States to implement a judicial code up and down the judicial spectrum.

Maybe it will actually help ensure that, as judges go through the confirmation process in the Senate for whatever level of Federal judgeship he or she may be nominated, it might help us understand who these judges are.

This is a very commonsense amendment. We are not saying Congress is going to legislate judicial conduct. We are just saying that we are the lawmakers. Why don’t we ask the Judicial Conference to do it for the judges, just like our standards are set by Congress and the executive branch standards should be set by the executive branch.

These are small things that make a big difference in a big bill. Again, I have extended the olive branch of bipartisanship this entire day, yesterday, and I would certainly hope that that would be extended back to us because we have yet, in this entire process of H.R. 1—being a 622-page bill yesterday and added pages upon pages yesterday and today—not one single Republican amendment has been accepted. Not one. Maybe this is it.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 29 OFFERED BY MS. MOORE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 29 printed in part B of House Report 116–16.

Ms. MOORE. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:
Page 111, line 21, after "such election", insert the following: "and provide such individual with any materials that are necessary to register to vote in any such election".

Page 112, after "such election", insert the following: "and provide such individual with any materials that are necessary to register to vote in any such election".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Rule 2, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Ms. Moore) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wisconsin.

Ms. Moore. Madam Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment to H.R. 1, the For the People Act, which would, among other provisions, require Federal and State governments to physically provide voting registration materials at the same time they provide notification of a restoration of voting rights under the bill. Voting is the most powerful voice that we have in our democracy.

As a Wisconsinite, I am proud to stand today to fight for everyone's right to vote. Wisconsin has been the petri dish for some of the most pernicious voting suppression efforts, including partisan gerrymandering, all designed to marginalize some votes. When votes are counted, our voices are heard. I am here to say no more—no more—to suppression.

Anyone who works to suppress the vote does not support democracy. Madam Chair. Anyone who limits the ability of people to express their voice through the ballot does not support democracy.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Rodney Davis of Illinois. Madam Chair, I rise this time in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. Rodney Davis of Illinois. Madam Chair, I was a strong supporter of the First Step Act, and I continue to support criminal justice reform efforts.

As a matter of fact, just last week, a former czar in the Obama administration, Van Jones, said that, "The conservative movement in this country, unfortunately," from his point of view, "... is now the leader on this issue of reform," talking about criminal justice reform.

We need to make sure that we don't have nonviolent offenders spending more time in Federal prison than Jared the Subway guy who was a pedophile, but we have to review this amendment very carefully.

We still haven't figured out the processes and procedures of an amendment that passed, part of H.R. 1, that is in the underlying bill that would allow felons to vote without any determination of whether that felon may be like Jared the Subway guy.

Who is to say he doesn't live near a polling place where his polling place is a school? How in the world can we deny that a school? How in the world can we do that? How in the world can we do that?

We need to make sure that we don't stop our efforts to get nonviolent offenders out of our prisons, petty drug users who have been put away because maybe they didn't have the information that the assistant U.S. attorney wanted and then, all of a sudden, they are ratched into a long jail sentence because of mandatory minimums. These are the issues that have bipartisan support. By your own vote does the First Step Act, or any act of criminal justice reform that I support or that anybody else I know would support, want murderers out of prison. That is not the case.

If that is the case, we have some more questions about this amendment and we have some more questions about this bill. We want to make sure those jail cells are reserved for the people who are the most hardened criminals.

We have got to work together on criminal justice reform to take the next step in the First Step Act. We need to make it better, but it is all for nonviolent offenders.
I have some serious concerns when sex offenders get out of prison or maybe they don’t even go to prison for that long, like Jared, the Subway guy, because he may have had a lot of money, may have had the ability to hire a good lawyer; but so many polling place workers who are going to be the beneficiary of the First Step Act didn’t.

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

Ms. MOORE. Madam Chair, just in closing, I hope that my colleague will support this amendment. It doesn’t deal with murderers or pedophiles. It deals with people who are coming out of prison and being notified of their rights and responsibilities with regard to voting.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 30 OFFERED BY MS. MOORE

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the resolution of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana (Mr. GIANFORTE).

Mr. GIANFORTE. Madam Chair, we all agree that Americans should vote and participate in our Republic. We all agree that every American’s vote deserves to be counted and protected. But this bill, the underlying bill we consider today, is riddled with problems.

My friends across the aisle call this bill the For the People Act, but it should really be called the “Protect Professional Politicians Act.”

One of the most egregious parts of this bill is the creation of Federal funding for elections. Taxpayers will pay for politicians’ campaigns whether they agree with them or not. Under this bill, if someone gives a politician $1,200 of money to that politician, the Federal Government will send $1,200 of money to that politician.

Those mailers that fill your mailbox, well, under the “Protect the Professional Politicians Act,” you will pay for them.

Those attack ads that flood your TV, well, you will pay for them.

Those high-priced political consultants in Washington, D.C., well, you will pay for them, too.

Since when is it a good idea to have taxpayers’ hard-earned money shoveled into a trough for a politician’s campaign?

Montanans don’t want that. At a recent townhall, 97 percent of Montanans told me they oppose taxpayer funding for political campaigns.

Imagine Republicans and Democrats working together on a bipartisan bill that addresses voting and election reforms. We could have done that. We did that with election security in the last Congress.

But that is not what happened with H.R. 1, the “Protect Professional Politicians Act.” Maybe that is one of the reasons why diverse groups like the
And until this day, until this week, I had no idea that the Democratic majority is okay with putting more corporate money into their own campaign coffers. Corporate dollars are not allowed in our campaigns now, as you know. Madam Chair, but we are going to use this to lift up small donors out there and give a matching fund that we want to see, to help people with disabilities, to support candidates' campaigns. We have come to support candidates' campaigns. We have explicit that that would not happen. There will be no taxpayer funds used to support candidates' campaigns. We have provided for that. We have come up with another way to support the matching fund that we want to see, to lift up small donors out there and give them a voice in their own democracy.

I know the gentleman who spoke a few minutes ago, was suggesting that, under H.R. 1, taxpayer money would go to fund political campaigns, candidates' campaigns, and I just want to reiterate that the bill is explicit that that would not happen. There will be no taxpayer funds used to support candidates' campaigns. We have provided for that. We have come up with another way to support the matching fund that we want to see, to lift up small donors out there and give them a voice in their own democracy.

I know the gentleman who spoke a moment ago might not have been here previously, so I just wanted to make sure I got that on the record.

Mr. SARBANES. Madam Chair, I just want to support the amendment. Obviously, we want to make voting as accessible as we can to everybody, and this is a very, very important step in terms of respecting people with disabilities. I want to thank my colleague for introducing the amendment.

I did, also, just want to correct the Record. The last speaker, who may not have been here a few minutes ago, was suggesting that, under H.R. 1, taxpayer money would go to fund political campaigns, candidates' campaigns, and I just want to reiterate that the bill is explicit that that would not happen.

There will be no taxpayer funds used to support candidates' campaigns. We have provided for that. We have come up with another way to support the matching fund that we want to see, to lift up small donors out there and give them a voice in their own democracy.

I know the gentleman who spoke a moment ago might not have been here previously, so I just wanted to make sure I got that on the record.

Ms. MOORE. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time. Ms. MOORE. Madam Chair, I just want to thank the gentleman, again, for his support of this amendment.

I think that America's motto, E Pluribus Unum—out of many, one—will really be honored by this reporting requirement which I believe will provide information that will move us closer to an election process that is truly inclusive and accessible for all Americans. That is what makes democracy work.

The Acting CHAIR. Madam Chair, I urge a "yes" vote on my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 31 OFFERED BY MR. DAVIDSON OF OHIO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 31 printed in part B of House Report 116-16.

Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 63, strike line 19 and all that follows through page 64, line 7 and insert the following:

(3) The term "exempt State" means any of the following:

(A) A State which, under law which is in effect continuously on and after the date of the enactment of this Act, operates an automatic voter registration program under which an individual is automatically registered to vote in elections for Federal office held in the State in November 2014 and who voted in such elections was more than 5 percentage points greater than the percentage of the aggregate number of individuals who were eligible to vote in the regularly scheduled general elections for Federal office held in the State in November 2018 and who voted in such elections.

B

Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio. Madam Chair, all too often in Washington, we mistake activity for progress, and in many cases we apply that misguided framework onto the States.

There are few better examples of this than Washington's dabbling in our election laws over the last 2 or 3 decades. The National Voter Registration Act, our last big partisan bill, aimed at increasing turnout, did not actually achieve that aim. It increased voter registration, but according to the Congressional Research Service has said:

Its effect on turnout remains unclear. Its cost and mandates on the States, however, were very clear.

That is exactly what I am talking about in terms of mistaking activity for progress.

The centerpiece of division A's voting section is automatic registration. According to my colleagues on the other side, it covers all sorts of problems: updating the voter rolls, lack of participation, etcetera.

No excuse vote by mail, same-day registration can be important, but is the automatic voter registration section that is hoped for the driver of participation?

This is an aggressive mandate in a bill full of aggressive mandates. Fifteen States and Washington, D.C., have automatic registration. Only five States do it at every welfare and government office.

The outcome that this bill looks for is turnout. It would amount to, at the very least, a top three most aggressive automatic registration program all across the country, but the bill says that if you are in a State where you have already got an automatic registration program on the books, you don't have to comply with all the mandates in the bill.

My amendment would do the same thing, but for outcomes instead of for registration.

The outcome that this bill looks for is turnout.

States that have seen massive increases in turnout should get rewarded, and that is what this amendment does.

CBO has already said $2 billion-plus for some $1 billion to the taxpayers under this fund, but how much is going to be raised from this corporate malfeasance?
It lets States who have achieved increased turnout be rewarded by exemption from the mandates in this bill to continue the success that they have been able to achieve with their own programs.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. HAA LAND). The gentlewoman from California is recognized.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This amendment aims to exempt States that have taken measures to increase voter turnout that are not subject to additional Federal voter registration mandates, and I think what it really does is undermine the progress that would be made under H.R. 1.

In November of 2016, the general election, nearly one in five people who were eligible to vote but who did not vote cited registration issues as their main reason for not casting a ballot.

H.R. 1 sets a national standard for voter registration and access to the ballot in Federal elections.

Now, an improvement in participation rates is fine, but it doesn’t mean that proven programs, such as the automatic voter registration program, aren’t necessary.

You know, automatic voter registration obviously increases turnout. It serves a more fundamental purpose: to protect the right to vote by removing bureaucracy and obstacles from the process of registering to vote.

Now, nearly every State that has implemented automatic voter registration has seen dramatically increased registration rates. High rates of voter registration are inherently healthy for a democracy.

Madam Chair, I include in the RECORD a letter that I received just yesterday from Governor Brown, the Governor of Oregon.

STATE OF OREGON.
March 6, 2019.

DEAR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS: I write in strong support of H.R. 1, the For the People Act of 2019, which includes bold and necessary reforms to strengthen our democracy, protect and expand voting rights for all Americans, and improve campaign finance laws. As the Governor of Oregon and former Secretary of State, this is an issue that I—like many Americans—care deeply about, and I urge you to vote in support of this legislation.

Voting is our country’s greatest collective responsibility, and we must work continuously to safeguard the sanctity of our elections. Across the country, the fundamental right of voting itself is increasingly at risk. More states are moving to restrict voting rights than are increasing access to the ballot. It’s imperative that Congress take action to bolster our democracy and fight every time it undermines it by ensuring that, as a country, we are making it easier, not harder, for people to have their voices heard.

Several key provisions in H.R. 1 reflect the work that Oregon has done to lead the way on expanding voter access, including creating a national automatic voter registration system, allowing citizens to register to vote online, and expanding vote-by-mail.

As you know, Oregon was the first state to pass an automatic voter registration (AVR) in 2015. This law, combined with our vote-by-mail election system, makes Oregon the most modern, efficient, and secure state to vote in the country. Oregon’s AVR program has added nearly 400,000 voters to the state rolls, already significantly increased voter turnout, and has ensured 80 percent of eligible voters in our state are registered.

Across the country, this success is being recognized and replicated. Seventeen states and the District of Columbia have since adopted some form of automatic voter registration. These reforms have been successful in creating a stronger and more inclusive democracy. And here in Oregon, it’s supported by both Democrats and Republicans.

Every eligible voter in the U.S. should have equal, easy access to the ballot box, and I commend Congress for their focus on this critical issue. This week, I urge you to pass this important legislation.

Sincerely,

GOVERNOR KATE BROWN.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, Governor Brown notes that Oregon was the first State to have automatic voter registration. It went into effect in 2015 and has added nearly 400,000 voters to the State rolls. Nearly 90 percent of eligible voters were registered to vote. What that means is they can participate in our elections, which I think is very important.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio. Madam Chairwoman, the amendment that I have offered is in keeping with the spirit of the bill. States are balancing the right of everyone to have access to the polls.

Automatic voter registration has allowed so much access to the polls, that it has created challenges for States to be able to comply, even with people who are only supposed to vote legally. They have access to voter registration through different means. More than one voter may be registered to vote when they are not even residents of the United States, and it puts burdens on States to comply with that.

This would be a one-size-fits-all mandate that may be needed in some States where access has been challenging and where voter turnout has been low, but in States that have high voter turnout, that do have effective regimes where they have not just access, but participation at levels that have increased by 5 percent or more, to continue on the path of success that they have had without disruption from Federal mandates that would potentially do that.

The Brennan Center says: Automatic voter registration is gaining momentum across the country.

Currently, 15 States and D.C. have approved the policy, meaning that over a third of Americans live in a jurisdiction that has either passed or implemented automatic voter registration. This policy is winning at the State level and overall push for turnout is also winning.

My amendment is complementary to this bill’s enterprise and it would do nothing to undermine the pushes that are already going on at the State level. It was Madison who said that States are:

"best acquainted with the situation of their people."

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, I appreciate the spirit with which this amendment is offered, but I disagree. This is about Federal elections. The Constitution says that the Congress has the ability to promulgate laws about Federal elections.

The reason we are looking at it is there have been States who have gone into AVR, they are grandfathered into the bill, but the problematic States are those States that are trying to suppress the vote, trying to keep people from voting, and we need to do something about that.

Madam Chair, while we are here, I do want to say something about, not the gentleman’s comments, but the prior comments of the ranking member about the costs of the bill.

We have a score from CBO, and almost all the money that CBO has scored goes to grants to the States to upgrade their computer systems: $1.5 billion from 2019 to 2024; 750 for other computer assistance; and the other big amount is for making polling places accessible to disabled voters. So it is about the other provisions in the bill.

I would also like to note, and I put this into the RECORD yesterday, the Joint Committee on Taxation has estimated that the fine and forfeiture fund that will go into the Freedom From Influence Fund is estimated to raise $1.948 billion between 2019 and 2029. They also estimate that it will reduce the deficit by $83 million, which is important, because that means people from cheating on their taxes. So the comments made about the money were simply incorrect.

I know that the Joint Committee on Taxation material is in the RECORD under general leave, I will make sure that the CBO report is also included.

Madam Chair, I would just end with this: I appreciate the tone of the gentleman’s arguments and the intent of his amendment, but I think it severely undercuts the advances that H.R. 1 would make.

Madam Chair, I urge a “no” vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.
Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Madam Chairwoman, companies are already going ahead and disclosing political donations. 196 of the Fortune 500 companies have disclosure policies in place, up from 174 in 2015. More companies are deciding this is the right way to approach their political giving.

But I don’t have anything to say against their voluntary decision. I do think it is a mistake to force compliance through disclosure laws at a time when public markets are less attractive than ever for going public.

Capital formation in the United States of America could easily be improved and has, in fact, suffered by a heavy-handed regulatory approach.

Corporations are not treated differently than individuals are. There is nothing that compels an individual to disclose every single dollar they donate and to whom. This would go in the other way.

If you decide to go public in the United States, you are treated differently under the law than a private corporation or a private individual. The reality is, under the law, you should be treated the same way. In some cases, you are allowed to give a donation privately, and in other cases, you are not.

Corporations have to comply with that law. The Federal Election Commission administers that law, not the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Madam Chairwoman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 2 1/4 minutes remaining.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Madam Chairwoman, I am glad to hear that some corporations are good citizens. However, we cannot leave our basic functioning of our democracy to the whims of individuals.

Corporations protected the safety of their workers before we had the OSHA laws. Some corporations didn’t use child labor before we had our child labor laws. We need fundamental rules to make sure there is sunshine in this area.

Now, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES), my friend.

Mr. SARBANES. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I just really wanted to echo what was just said, a couple of things that were said.

First of all to note that, clearly, best practices have emerged with respect to public companies making this kind of information available, but if that best practice has merit, then it ought to be applied across the board, which is the argument that we are making. I thank you for your work and interest in this issue.

The SEC is there to protect shareholders. It is there to protect the public. That is the purpose of that agency. Within the basket of things and measures that it can do to protect the public is to promote this kind of disclosure.
The rider that we are trying to get rid of in this bill that you would strike, that rider is preventing that kind of inquiry and disclosure and protection of the public to occur, and that is why it is so important that that rider be struck. I agree with the gentleman in his opposition to this amendment.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Madam Chair, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, I think there has been a lot of talk about transparency today. We have had a transparent process in the committees, 15 hours of hearings, but this repeals a rider that was privately put on an appropriations bill by Republicans to prevent the SEC from doing something that they want to do.

Let’s get real. I mean, this actually just undoes a secret rider on an appropriations bill. This is the way bad law gets made.

We are here in the middle of the day, in public, debating amendments, not secretly putting little riders on appropriations bills that hamstring the SEC for making sure that there is sunlight on what corporations are doing. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio. Madam Chair, may I ask how much time I have remaining.

We are here in the middle of the day, in public, debating amendments, not secretly putting little riders on appropriations bills that hamstring the SEC for making sure that there is sunlight on what corporations are doing.

Chair, may I ask how much time I have remaining.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Madam Chair, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, I think there has been a lot of talk about transparency today. We have had a transparent process in the committees, 15 hours of hearings, but this repeals a rider that was privately put on an appropriations bill by Republicans to prevent the SEC from doing something that they want to do.

Let’s get real. I mean, this actually just undoes a secret rider on an appropriations bill. This is the way bad law gets made.

We are here in the middle of the day, in public, debating amendments, not secretly putting little riders on appropriations bills that hamstring the SEC for making sure that there is sunlight on what corporations are doing. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on consideration of amendment No. 33 printed in part B of House Report 116-16.

Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio. Madam Chairwoman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike subtitle E of title IV.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 172, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio. Madam Chairwoman, my amendment would uphold an appropriations policy rider included in the FY 2019 appropriations package that this body, on a bipartisan basis, just voted on last month. That provision prevents the IRS from the collection of donor information for 501(c)(4) social welfare organizations.

In 2013, when the IRS attempted to issue rules that would clamp down on these organizations, there was bipartisan pushback from groups as disparate as the ACLU and Tea Party Patriots.

The IRS has a poor track record on the handling of donor information of these organizations. The 2013 IRS scandal of targeting conservative groups is the perfect example of this. The IRS asked groups excruciatingly detailed questions, even as far as the details of the prayer meetings of pro-life organizations. Government agencies investigating the intimate details of an organization’s political activity, yet they are allowed to give tax-exempt status and don’t have to disclose their donors. And the IRS can’t do anything about it.

We must allow the IRS to move forward on the 2013 rule to define acceptable levels of political activity by these organizations. This will create a clear standard. If a group violates this standard, and it falls to adhere to its social welfare mission, then it should lose its tax-exempt status, and it should register as a PAC.

If you are going to spend millions of dollars to influence someone’s vote, then you better have the courage to stand behind your words. Instead, mega-donors have taken advantage of a loophole that allows them to donate to a tax-exempt welfare organization while hiding their identity.

All Americans should care about the abuse of social welfare organizations. It undermines the sanctity of so many other valuable and necessary organizations.

We must be clear about what is happening here. This amendment serves one purpose: to hide mega-donor support for campaigns. Let’s pull back the
501(c), for social welfare organizations to just be conduits for dark campaign spending.

In exchange for nonprofit status and tax exemption status, the law requires them to engage exclusively in the promotion of social welfare.

Now, how is that defined? The IRS was trying to get a bright line on that, but they were stopped by a secret rider put in an appropriations bill.

Obviously, the appropriation at large got votes from both sides of the aisle because you need to keep the government down. But that is not the way you legislate. That is a sneaky way to change the law.

To repeal this provision of H.R. 1 would be a huge mistake, because what we are doing is setting things right so that people know what they can do and what they can’t do. Yes, you can speak, but don’t expect to get a tax break because you are speaking about politics. You get a tax break because you are doing charitable work.

Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. CROW. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES).

Mr. SARBANES. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for his work in introducing the bill that would repeal that rider that prevents the IRS from the kind of inquiry that should be done.

This is about figuring out who is leaning into the big money game. So it goes with a number of other riders that we have seen that have been put in place over the last few years. We want to know if Federal contractors are leaning into the big money game. That is why we want the executive branch to have rules of disclosure with respect to what is happening with money and Federal contractors. That is why we want to get rid of the rider that would stop that from happening.

We want to know if public companies are leaning into the big money game. That is why we want to get rid of that rider that would stop that from happening.

And in this instance, we want to make sure that these entities that are supposed to be tax exempt aren’t leaning into the big money game, and the IRS is there as the agency to do that.

Madam Chair, we need to make sure we protect that ability.

Mr. CROW. Madam Chair, how much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Colorado has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. CROW. Madam Chair, this is much simpler than it is at the core of the objection for groups that don’t agree on much.

Between the ACLU and the NRA they don’t often agree, but they agree that H.R. 1 is bad, and this goes to the heart of the Federalist Papers.

Madam Chair, I ask unanimous support for my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CROW. Madam Chair. I yield 1 minute to the Chairwoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, just to note, Congress never intended for

This is about rule of law and making sure we are enforcing what is already on the books, and we are prohibiting the abuse of social welfare organizations and we are bringing to light dark money.

The voters of this country deserve to know who is spending money, millions of dollars, to influence their vote. It should not be hidden. The people of our communities deserve to know who is spending that money to influence our vote, and that is why I ask folks in this Chamber, my colleagues, to pass this amendment and let’s restore our democracy and return power back to our communities.

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

Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio. Madam Chairwoman, in Alabama v. the NAACP, the courts upheld the right to protect the privacy of donor information.

The right to privacy is fundamental to our Bill of Rights, and it is threatened. It has a chilling effect, as has been enumerated from any number of groups. My colleagues know this.

Just recently, social welfare groups, as defined by 501(c)(4), engaged in a social welfare support to support infanticide, a bill that could not get a vote to cloture in the Senate.

It would require the IRS, instead of the body of jurisdiction, the Election Commission, to deal with donors.

The IRS should be narrowly focused on collecting tax revenue, not on elections law, and we have seen abuses of their already-limited jurisdiction.

This is the right thing to do. I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment, and I ask for everyone who can find a way to see through the distortion of information that is being presented here to support our Bill of Rights, protect the right to privacy, and vote for this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 34 OFFERED BY MR. LUJÁN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 34 printed in part B of House Report 116–16.

Mr. LUJÁN. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 285, line 1, insert “and the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology” after “National Science Foundation”.

Mr. CROW. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).
Page 285, line 7, insert ":, and increase voter participation" after "infrastructure":
Page 285, line 17, insert ":, and on voter participation" after "infrastructure":
Page 285, line 25, strike "$6,250,000" and insert "$20,000,000"

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 172, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. LUJAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. LUJAN. Madam Chair, our democracy is at its best when all voices are heard. Unfortunately, whether due to an antiquated voting system or restrictive voter laws, too many Americans face too many obstacles to participating in our elections.

There is also an immediate need to protect election security. Russia attacked our democracy in 2016 and could do so again. That is why, last Congress, I introduced a Voting Innovation Prize Act, to tap into America’s innovative spirit to strengthen our democracy. These are competitive grants.

Today, I am proud to offer an amendment based on that legislation. My amendment would expand the existing election infrastructure grants to promote voter participation, secure our elections, and increase funding.

Madam Chair, I thank Chairman BENNIE THOMPSON for working with me on this amendment, and I urge adoption of this amendment and the For the People Act.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BAIRD. Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of my time.

Mr. BAIRD. Madam Chair, although I strongly oppose H.R. 1, I appreciate the intent of Mr. LUJAN’s amendment.

This amendment would improve the election infrastructure innovation grant program established in H.R. 1 by requiring consultation with the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology.

Ms. LOFGREN, the chair of the Committee on Science and Technology, NSF, and the NIST, all of which are implicated by section 321.

Although I do not expect H.R. 1 to ever become law, I hope election security is something that we can do on a bipartisan basis in the future. This process was rushed, and appropriate due diligence to create strong and effective bipartisan election and security reforms has not been done.

Once again, I support the intent of this amendment, but I oppose H.R. 1.

Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LUJAN. Madam Chair, I yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), the chair of the Committee on House Administration.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, I think this amendment is really the premier agency to help us on technical issues. So I think it is a very good amendment.

And before we leave the floor, I would like to note that I will include in the RECORD a letter from the AFL-CIO and a letter from the American Federation of Teachers urging support of H.R. 1.

AFL-CIO, Washington, DC, March 5, 2019.

UNITED STATES HOUSE,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the AFL-CIO, we express our strong support for H.R. 1, the “For the People Act of 2019.” By expanding access to the ballot box, reducing the influence of big money in politics and strengthening ethics rules for public servants, this legislation includes many of the most important reforms necessary to restore the promise of our democracy.

For years, right-wing groups backed by wealthy donors have been working aggressively to suppress the right of every American citizen to cast a ballot. They have supported laws to make it harder to register and to vote and they have used the corrosive power of money to drown out the voices of working people.

H.R. 1 would expand the franchise by promoting early voting, same day and online registration. It would create a system of public financing powered by small donations and require super PACS and dark money political organizations to make their donors public. It would restore voting rights for formerly incarcerated individuals and commit Congress to restore the Voting Rights Act to end racial discrimination in voting.

Record wealth inequality, mass incarceration and low voter turnout are all symptoms of a broken political system. AFL-CIO proudly supports H.R. 1 as we continue the fight to fix our democracy and restore the balance of power to working people.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM SAMUEL,
Director, Government Affairs Department.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF TEACHERS,
Washington, DC, March 6, 2019.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 1.7 million members of the American Federation of Teachers, I urge you to vote YES on H.R. 1, the For the People Act of 2019.

There is no question that we have seen an erosion of voting rights, a loosening or ignoring of ethics rules and conduct, and an ever-increasing presence of big money in elections. All of this undermines America’s democracy.

That is why H.R. 1 is so important. It represents a historic effort to restore both the rights of working people and the promise of our nation’s democracy. It will give power back to the people by limiting the influence of the corrupt and by expanding voting rights for all Americans.

The For the People Act will strengthen the government’s ethics laws while imposing much-needed restrictions on campaign finance regulations. For far too long, the influence of money in politics—especially unaccountable “dark money” funneled into our system by wealthy individuals and large companies—has been a negative force in elections across our nation. The bill will put an end to anonymous election spending and force disclosure of all election-related spending.

The AFT also strongly supports H.R. 1’s call for a constitutional amendment to overturn the disturbing Citizens United decision. This case has had a corrosive effect on our democracy, giving powerful corporations a disproportionate amount of influence in our elections. Since this case was decided, big corporations have been using their record profits to try to silence the voices of hard-working Americans. Now it is time to hide its identity as it floods the system with hundreds of millions of dollars in an effort to pass an extreme agenda that will gut the salary, healthcare and pensions of workers.

It’s time to restore balance and guarantee that a teacher in Cleveland has the same elected official as a democracy issue. It commits to restoring the Voting Rights Act; restoring voting rights for formerly incarcerated people; reforming voter registration; combating voter suppression; prohibiting corporate and labor unions from using union dues to fund political activities; and as a democracy issue. It commits to restoring the Voting Rights Act; restoring voting rights for formerly incarcerated people; reforming voter registration; combating voter suppression; prohibiting corporate and labor unions from using union dues to fund political activities; and as a democracy issue.

The bill’s promise to focus on voting is absolutely essential as a civil rights matter and as a democracy issue. It commits to restoring the Voting Rights Act; restoring voting rights for formerly incarcerated people; reforming voter registration; combating voter suppression; prohibiting corporate and labor unions from using union dues to fund political activities; and as a democracy issue.

Expanding voting rights in 2019 is vital to our democracy. It’s hard to understand how any member of the House of Representatives would vote against it, yet we have seen all too frequently an allegiance to partisan politics rather than to the basic values of civic participation.

Passage of H.R. 1 will help confront the many real threats facing our democracy today. I hope you will vote YES when it comes up for a vote this week in the House.

Sincerely,

RANDI WEINGARTEN,
President.

Mr. LUJAN. Madam Chair, I urge adoption of this amendment, I urge adoption of H.R. 1, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. LUJAN).

The amendment was agreed to.
AMENDMENT NO. 37 OFFERED BY MR. POCAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 37 printed in part B of House Report 116–16.

Mr. POCAN. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

After subtitle G of title II, insert the following (and redesignate subtitle H as subtitle I):

Subtitle H—Residence of Incarcerated Individuals

Section 2701. Residence of Incarcerated Individuals

SEC. 2701. RESIDENCE OF INCARCERATED INDIVIDUALS

Section 141 of title 13, United States Code, is amended

(1) by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (h); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (f) the following:

"(g)(1) Effective beginning with the 2020 decennial census of population, in taking any tabulation of total population by States under subsection (a) for purposes of the apportionment of Representatives in Congress among several States, the Secretary shall, with respect to an individual incarcerated in a State, Federal, county, or municipal correctional center as of the date on which such census is taken, attribute such individual to such individual's last place of residence before incarceration.

"(2) In carrying out this subsection, the Secretary shall consult with each State Department of Corrections to collect the information necessary to make the determination required under paragraph (1)."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House amendment 172, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. POCAN. Madam Chair, first off, let me thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARNAES) for this bill and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) for all her work on this bill.

This is an important promise that we made to the American people that we would clean up Washington, and I think H.R. 1 is going to go very far in doing that.

This amendment specifically addresses an important aspect of continuing to make the process for democracy stronger in this country. This amendment would end the practice of prison gerrymandering.

Starting this decennial Census, this amendment would require persons who are incarcerated in correctional facilities to be counted as a resident of their last place of residence before incarceration.

There is only one constitutional mandate as it pertains to the Census: The Federal Government must count all persons present in the country at the time of the Census.

We know we will get an accurate count of incarcerated individuals. The only question, then, is: Where do we count them?

If we count incarcerated persons as being present at their last known residence, we know that the right community will receive the appropriate amount of population-based funding it needs to take care of all of their citizens, because the odds are that an incarcerated person will return home after release to the community in which they most recently lived.

If we count incarcerated persons as residents of correctional facilities, more often than not we are simply swelling the population count of communities in which incarcerated individuals do not actually live, participate in civil society, or utilize government services outside prison walls.

Let's stop this charade. Let's stop the dramatic distortion of representation at State and local levels, and let's end the inaccurate creation of community populations that mislead research and planning efforts.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, which is also supported by the Brennan Center for Justice, Commission on Civil and Human Rights.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I appreciate the gentleman from Wisconsin's interest in redistricting and gerrymandering.

Coming from the State of Illinois, I like the independent redistricting provisions of H.R. 1.

I have some concerns as to why one State's redistricting plan is now part of the bill when it was supposed to be a nationwide approach, but we will get to that later.

Mr. POCAN. Madam Chairwoman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentleman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chairwoman, I appreciate the thoughtful comments made by the ranking member, but I do think this is a special situation, and it is why the NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund is in support of this amendment.

As the NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund has noticed, the practice of counting prison inmates as part of the district where the prison is located has a disproportionate impact on African American and Latino communities. That is because members of those communities, for a variety of other bad reasons, are incarcerated at higher rates and housed at prisons far from their homes than other communities.

The gentleman from Illinois is correct. You may be counted in the census at your university dorm, but you can also vote from your university dorm. The inmates can't vote. Actually, they are properly allocated to the communities where they are from. Doing otherwise has the impact of disenfranchising communities of color around the United States, and that is why this amendment is an important one and why the Brennan Center for Justice and the NAACP support it.

I thank the gentleman for offering the amendment.
Mr. POCAN. Madam Chair, I would just like to add, in 2016 when the census in the Federal Register asked for comment on this, 77,000 people did comment. Only four wanted to keep this provision. Everyone else wanted to change this, out of 77,000. That is probably about the percent of people who think Nickelback is their favorite band in this country. It is pretty low.

I think if you look—at if Nickelback is your favorite band, I apologize to the gentleman.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POCAN. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Why would the gentleman criticize one of the greatest bands of the nineties?

Mr. POCAN. Wow. One more reason why there is a difference between Democrats and Republicans, clearly found on the floor of Congress today.

I would argue, when I look at the small communities in Wisconsin and I would probably argue in Illinois, where there are correctional facilities, those populations really do bloom because of the people who are incarcerated there, but almost no one goes back to that community. So this is a much better and more accurate way to have a census. I hope that it will be supported, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chairwoman, I stand here to say that my colleague from Wisconsin, I know he did not mean to offend the many thousands, upon thousands of Nickelback fans in his district in Wisconsin. I will stand here to save you from doing that and have to face the political consequences at the ballot box.

Madam Chair, I enjoyed debating back and forth and it is always good to have some good humor on the floor of the House. And, yes, I actually do have a Nickelback song on my running playlist that I listen to on a regular basis.

I was ridiculed for that when I posted my playlist one time, and I know some in this Chamber—even up at the dais—are still laughing about that.

But this amendment is a bad amendment. I wish we could have worked together on it. I hope we can work together on any gerrymandering in this Nation together as we know it, and I look forward to working with the gentleman in the future.

I do not recommend a “no” vote on this amendment because it does not address the underlying issues with gerrymandering, and the underlying issues that I have with this bill. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POCAN. Madam Chairwoman, I will just wrap up by saying I appreciate that very brave admission of your fandom for Nickelback. That is very brave and I do recognize that. I didn’t think we were going to talk about Nickelback on the floor today. Somehow it came up.

Madam Chair, I urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. POCAN. Madam Chairwoman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

In title III of the bill—

(1) redesignate subtitle G as subtitle H (and conform the succeeding subtitle accordingly); and

(2) insert after subtitle F the following new subtitle:

Subtitle G—Use of Voting Machines Manufactured in the United States

SEC. 3601. USE OF VOTING MACHINES MANUFACTURED IN THE UNITED STATES.

Section 301(a) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21081(a)), as amended by section 1504, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(8) VOTING MACHINE REQUIREMENTS.—By not later than the date of the regularly scheduled general election for Federal office occurring in November 2022, each State shall seek to ensure that any voting machine used in such election and in any subsequent election for Federal office is manufactured in the United States."

Mr. POCAN. Madam Chairwoman, I rise today to offer an amendment that I think everyone in this Chamber can support. Whenever possible, voting machines used in America should be made in America.

Aside from the obvious that it just makes sense to have the infrastructure of American democracy made in America, this amendment seeks to help safeguard our elections. Manufacturing voting machines in America will ensure that production lines are secure, and that we know without a doubt whether or not our voting machines have been compromised.

Today’s amendment simply requires States to seek to ensure that any voting machine used in any election for Federal office is a machine that is made in this country. The deadline for this requirement would be the 2022 election.

Madam Chair, I believe that the intent of this amendment is clear. I anticipate strong support from my colleagues, and for that reason I will stop here, urge the Chamber to vote in favor of this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chairwoman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I thank my good friend from Wisconsin. I didn’t know if he wanted to mention Creed this time or not, but we can have a great debate on nineties music, if you like. But I do have a good amendment to offer my colleagues after this is done. We will have some fun.

I am opposed to this amendment because American manufacturing employs more than 12 million men and women, contributes $2.25 trillion to the U.S. economy annually, has the largest economic impact of any major sector, and accounts for more than three-quarters of all private-sector research and development in the Nation. I support American manufacturing wholeheartedly.

However, my good friend’s amendment is not about American manufacturing. It is about the many complaints that I have had regarding H.R. 1—and I have already stated—about Federal overreach in mandating States to comply with a requirement that is within their jurisdiction.

This bill continues to burden the American taxpayer by adding programs that would be footed by everyday Americans and would have to be paid for by county governments, by local governments, and municipalities that already have budgets that are stretched too thin. It is another unfunded mandate. It is another unfunded mandate from the Federal Government.

Unnecessary regulations of election equipment also present an undue burden on the States who administer these elections. This requirement gives State and local officials less options. This is ultimately a federalism issue. We believe that our State and local governments can maintain safe, secure elections that allow every one of their constituents, our constituents, to vote, and also ensure that every single American who is eligible to vote has their vote counted and has their vote protected. That is our goal.

H.R. 1 doesn’t accomplish this goal, and much to my chagrin, I say to my friend from Wisconsin, I am opposed to this amendment, although I am not opposed to him.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POCAN. Madam Chairwoman, I yield such time as she may consume to my good friend from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chairwoman, I support this amendment, given the level of foreign interference in the elections in 2016 and 2018 and efforts to penetrate our voting systems. I think it makes sense that we use American-manufactured systems as well as software. But I would note this: this amendment is not prescriptive. It says that “States shall seek to ensure.” That is not a mandate to do it. Really, this is saying this is a good thing to do. I think it is a good thing to do.

While I have the microphone, I would like to note that we have just received
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People of faith know that Washington is not representing their best interests when millions of Americans who are eligible to vote cannot do so because they are not registered and their engagement in the civic body. The faith community offers witness to what is missing to the Americans; our democracy is out of balance,.

The current system allows powerful corporate and wealthy interests to regularly defy the foundational principles of political democracy. Equity, ethics, accountability, and respect for the rule of law. The unfortunate result is that our government has become more responsive to corporate and wealthy interests to regularly influence our representatives, who are not representing their best interests when voting is a fundamental right and a civic responsibility. This is trying to influence our votes, and how and why policy is being made.

A broken democracy has clear and detrimental impacts on the issues important to us. We are faithful advocates who work within the existing political system, yet that system no longer seems capable of contending with the big problems facing our country, our communities, and our congregations. The faith community offers witness to what is obvious to the Americans: our democracy is out of balance.

We support attempts to restore ethical norms which inhibit self-interested corruption on the part of lawmakers. We support provisions that enhance the influence of low-income and middle-income people on policy-making through their vote and their engagement in the civic body. We support campaign finance reforms that sustain the ability of public officials to serve their constituents and to legislate on behalf of the common good.

We urge Congress to seize this moment to pass the comprehensive democracy reform H.R. 1.

March 6, 2019.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: As national faith-based advocates and congregations we urge passage of H.R. 1, The For the People Act.

Our organizations strive for policies and systems that diminish inequality, support the most vulnerable, nurture human potential, and provide and enhance well-being for all members of our society and of creation. We look to our government to reflect those ideals and we support a strong democracy, where voting is a fundamental right and a civic responsibility. Where our influence is based on the force of ideas, not the size of our wallets.

A broken democracy has clear and detrimental impacts on the issues important to us. We are faithful advocates who work within the existing political system, yet that system no longer seems capable of contending with the big problems facing our country, our communities, and our congregations. The faith community offers witness to what is missing to the Americans; our democracy is out of balance.

The National Council of Churches, the NETWORK Lobby for Catholic Social Justice, the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), Pax Christi USA; National Council of Jewish Women; National Council of Churches; Unitarian Universalist Association; Unitarian Universalists for Social Justice (UUSJ); the Good Shepherd; National Campaign for a Fairer Tax System; National Advocacy Center of the Sisters of the Good Shepherd; National Campaign for a Peace Tax Fund; National Council of Churches; National Council of Jewish Women; National Religious Campaign Against Torture; NETWORK Lobby for Catholic Social Justice; Pax Christi USA; Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.); South American Religious Provinces; Disciples Center for Public Witness; Ecumenical Poverty Initiative; Faith in Action Action Network; Friends Committee on National Legislation; Islamic Society of North America; Jewish Council for Public Affairs; Leadership Conference of American Jewish Women; Leadership Conference of Women Religious; National Assembly of Baptist Ministers; African American Ministers In Action; the Alliance of Baptists, African American Ministers In Action; American Friends Service Committee; Church World Service; Convocation of the Lutheran Women’s Organization; Congregation of Our Lady of the Good Shepherd, U.S. Provinces; Disciples Center for Public Witness; Ecumenical Poverty Initiative; Faith In Action Action Network; Friends Committee on National Legislation; Islamic Society of North America; Jewish Council for Public Affairs; Leadership Conference of American Jewish Women; National Council of Churches, the NETWORK Lobby for Catholic Social Justice, the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), Pax Christi USA; National Council of Jewish Women; National Council of Churches; Unitarian Universalist Association; Unitarian Universalists for Social Justice (UUSJ).

We support attempts to restore ethical norms which inhibit self-interested corruption on the part of lawmakers. We support provisions that enhance the influence of low-income and middle-income people on policy-making through their vote and their engagement in the civic body. We support campaign finance reforms that sustain the ability of public officials to serve their constituents and to legislate on behalf of the common good.

We embrace reforms that favor accountability and transparency in our government and in our lawmakers’ decision-making.

The faith community offers witness to what is missing to the Americans: our democracy is out of balance.

We recognize the historic opportunity our country faces to repair our political system and, as people of faith, we are hopeful in the possibility of renewal.

Mr. POOLAN. Madam Chairwoman, I rise to take the point of order on going into the voting machine business so he doesn’t have to worry about me anyway. I don’t think anyone in this body will.

I do urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POOLAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 39 OFFERED BY MS. FRANKEL

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 39 printed in part B of House Report 116–16.

Ms. FRANKEL. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 264, line 14, strike “and”.

Page 264, line 19, strike “office,” and insert “office; and”.

Page 264, insert after line 19 the following: “(3) to implement and model best practices for ballot design, ballot instructions, and the testing of ballots.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 172, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. FRANKEL. Madam Chair, I rise in support of my amendment, which is aimed at ensuring that a voter is not disenfranchised because of a bad ballot design that could lead to that voter overlooking a race—that is called an undervote—or even voting for the wrong candidate.

I want to explain the problem, Madam Chair, and then what I suggest is the remedy because, unfortunately, I have seen a bad ballot design basically cause chaos in my home State of Florida in two recent past elections.

First, I want to go back to the 2000 Presidential race, Gore v. Bush, where a very—unfortunately, a famous—poorly designed butterfly ballot confused voters in Palm Beach County. Many elderly citizens who thought they were voting for Al Gore actually voted for Pat Buchanan.

Why was this significant? Because we had a Presidential race where 6 million voters voted and it was decided by 500-plus votes, and Pat Buchanan got an unexpected 3,400 votes in a very liberal Palm Beach County.

Then, again, just recently in the 2018 midterm elections, again in a very close Senate race, this time a race that was about a 12,000-vote margin, more than 30,000 voters in Broward County did not make

Page 264, line 14, strike “and”. Page 264, insert after line 19 the following: “(3) to implement and model best practices for ballot design, ballot instructions, and the testing of ballots.”.
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I want to explain the problem, Madam Chair, and then what I suggest is the remedy because, unfortunately, I have seen a bad ballot design basically cause chaos in my home State of Florida in two recent past elections.

First, I want to go back to the 2000 Presidential race, Gore v. Bush, where a very—unfortunately, a famous—poorly designed butterfly ballot confused voters in Palm Beach County. Many elderly citizens who thought they were voting for Al Gore actually voted for Pat Buchanan.

Why was this significant? Because we had a Presidential race where 6 million voters voted and it was decided by 500-plus votes, and Pat Buchanan got an unexpected 3,400 votes in a very liberal Palm Beach County.

Then, again, just recently in the 2018 midterm elections, again in a very close Senate race, this time a race that was about a 12,000-vote margin, more than 30,000 voters in Broward County did not make
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First, I want to go back to the 2000 Presidential race, Gore v. Bush, where a very—unfortunately, a famous—poorly designed butterfly ballot confused voters in Palm Beach County. Many elderly citizens who thought they were voting for Al Gore actually voted for Pat Buchanan.
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a choice in a U.S. Senate race. It is arguable that this is because the Senate candidates’ names were under a set of long instructions, and according to experts, people don’t read long instructions, and then they overlooked this Senate race.

So this amendment makes a good attempt to remedy this situation. It would allow States to use the election assistance grants that are now being authorized by H.R. 1 to improve ballot designs. Although our Election Assistance Act establishes best practices and guidelines how to design a good ballot, these guidelines are voluntary, and local election administrators often face difficulties in trying to translate the best practices into the real world.

So with the funds provided by this amendment, States will be allowed to use their election assistance grants to create programs to train workers, research, model, and implement ballot designs based on the best practices. This promises Americans the chance to cast their vote for their intended candidate.

We have seen problems with bad ballots. They are not just theoretical hiccup. They can and will, literally, swing elections.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to this.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I thank my friend and colleague from Florida and fellow 2012 election year classmate.

We want to make sure every vote is counted. We want to make sure that every eligible voter in this country is registered, casts their votes, and that their vote is protected.

I have a lot of faith in the American people, and I have a lot of faith in the American voters. I think simple sets of instructions under, above, or below a race may or may not be a consideration in whether or not somebody decides to vote.

I find it ironic that most of the time my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will blame ballot design, but only when they lose. The fact that a Republican won in Florida meant that there was a problem with the ballot language that is scattered throughout the bill. If Members had more than 15 minutes of questions in one of the hearings as the ranking Republican on the committee, the only committee that marked this bill up—then we could have gotten to the bottom of this language.

Madam Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS), my colleague.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Chair, I just wanted to come down. I was listening to this debate. Some of it is good-hearted because, frankly, you cannot want to get so frustrated with a bill that was so rushed with 600-and-some pages that was not gone through.

I pointed out on the floor yesterday, Madam Chair, that there is a part of this bill that one of my colleagues wants to back and read it. The chairwoman of this great committee, whom I have a lot of respect for would not have done this, I believe, if she was allowed to have done this, but it actually criminalizes keeping a 4-year-old from voting.

Now, this amendment is fine, but it goes to this issue: Ten committees had jurisdiction. One of the biggest was the Judiciary Committee on which I am the ranking member. We had a hearing, but no markup—don’t want to get close to that; Oversight, hearing, no markup. This is what happens when you rush bills to the floor.

This is what happens when your agenda is bigger than the process. This is what happens when you don’t care what is on the floor, you just want a talking point.

If we are going to continue this for 2 years, fine. The American people will see through this. But I think my ranking member from committee is correct. You cannot continue to do this and people not figure out we are not sure what is going on anymore.

This is a frustrating point with this because some of this could have been taken care of. Couldn’t you have agreed on much of this. Some of this bill is actually good, Supreme Court ethics and some other things in here we could have worked on.

But when you come to the floor like this and you don’t mark it up and you do it like this, this is what you get: the hope of a lot of amendments to clarify the hope of a lot of amendments to change.

Just do the work of committee. That is what I don’t understand.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL).

Ms. FRANKEL. Madam Chair, I just want to say that this amendment is very simple. You do not want elections with asterisks. Voters should be able to vote for the candidate they intend to vote for. There should be no confusion because of the ballot.

Madam Chair, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, I rise in support of the amendment.

This amendment clarifies that the election administration improvement grants that are in the bill may be used by localities or the States to implement and model best practices for ballot design, ballot instructions, and, I will say, testing of ballots, which is very important.

Most of the grants are really oriented towards computer systems, which is very important, but I have seen some of these ballots where you could see why you could get confused; and, really, if you look at our friends in the tech world, you can design something so you vote yes or no just by the way the design is done.

Now, I think most of the ballot mistakes—there is no evidence it is by intention; it was just error. But you can create something so that people make a mistake.

The last thing we want for the most precious right that we have is for people to make inadvertent errors. We want people to cast their votes for whom they choose and then to have their vote counted for whomever it is they choose. It is that simple.

Madam Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for the amendment. I think it is a good one.

Mr. BEYER. Madam Chair, I thank the chairwoman for her comments, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL). The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 43 OFFERED BY MR. BEYER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 43 printed in part B of House Report 116–16.

Mr. BEYER. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

In part 5 of subtitle A of title I of division A (page 72, beginning line 3), add at the end the following:

SEC. 1052. GRANTS TO STATES FOR ACTIVITIES TO ENCOURAGE INVOLVEMENT OF MINORS IN ELECTION ACTIVITIES.

(a) Grants.

(1) In general.—The Election Assistance Commission (hereafter in this section referred to as the “Commission”) shall make
grants to eligible States to enable such States to carry out a plan to increase the involvement of individuals under 18 years of age in public election activities in the State.

(2) PLAN — A State's plan under this subsection shall include—

(A) methods to promote the use of the preregistration process implemented under section 410 of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (as added by section 2(a));

(B) modifications to the curriculum of secondary schools in the State to promote civic engagement; and,

(C) such other activities to encourage the involvement of young people in the electoral process as the State considers appropriate.

(b) ELIGIBILITY — A State is eligible to receive a grant under this section if the State submits to the Commission, at such time and in such form as the Commission may require, an application containing—

(1) a description of the State's plan under subsection (a);

(2) a description of the performance measures and targets the State will use to determine its success in carrying out the plan; and

(3) such other information and assurances as the Commission may require.

(c) PERIOD OF GRANT; REPORT — (1) PERIOD OF GRANT — A State receiving a grant shall use the funds provided by the grant over a 2-year period agreed to between the State and the Commission.

(2) REPORT — Not later than 6 months after the end of the 2-year period agreed to under paragraph (1), the State shall submit to the Commission a report on the activities the State carried out with the funds provided by the grant, and shall include in the report an analysis of the extent to which the State met the performance measures and targets included in its application under subsection (b)(2).

(d) STATE DEFINED — In this section, the term "State" means each of the several States and the District of Columbia.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS— There are authorized to be appropriated for grants under this section $25,000,000, to remain available until expended.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 172, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BEYER. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I am very pleased to be able to offer this amendment with my good friend from the First District of North Carolina, Mr. G. K. BUTTERFIELD.

Madam Chair, I am the father of four, and for the last 40 years I have tried always to take one of my children into the voting booth with me until they got too old, one by one, to come in because I wanted them to see by example how important it was to vote.

I think that that is a really big deal. Our dinner conversations for these 40 years have been always about the world, the country, inevitably, then about politics and then about government, because nothing is more important to our representative government than the idea of self-determination, that every one of us has the obligation to be part of our political process.

But, sadly, as we all know, way too many young people do not participate in our process. If we get to 10 percent, 11 percent, 12 percent under the age of 29, we are thrilled that they show up. So their voice is lost far too often.

So our amendment simply authorizes $25 million over the next 2 years, in grant money to be issued to the Election Assistance Commission, and that is for them to give to eligible States money to be used to carry out plans, policies, and programs to increase youth in the electoral. It does not authorize things like encourage States to implement methods to promote the preregistration of young voters.

I know this is probably already part of the bill itself, the requirement for preregistration, but in the 20 States that have that it that you can register at age 15 or 16—not vote until you are 18—but if you do that, then you get a much higher voter participation.

It petitions States to modify the curriculum of secondary schools to promote civic engagement and activities to inspire young people to engage.

Madam Chair, I try to accept every invitation that I get from a high school to come be part of their classes. I came to the presentation when I was Lieutenant Governor because I get so discouraged when not just kids, but even adults don't know the names of their Governor or their U.S. Senators or certainly not their Congressman, and they have no idea how the Constitution works and how valuable it is.

We have to educate them, and this is a small investment in encouraging States to provide those curricula and others that can make it. They need substantive opportunities to participate in our political process and contributing to practical solutions.

Madam Chair, I feel deeply, if you can give good practice to kids, that will lead to good habits, good habits to good citizenship, and as we all know, character is destiny.

So this small, humble amendment simply authorizes the Appropriations Committee to invest $25 in the Election Assistance Commission to help get our kids involved in politics at the best and young ages.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEYER. Madam Chair, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, I commend Mr. BEYER and Mr. BUTTERFIELD for this amendment providing grants.

Over the period of time that the bill covers, this is actually a pretty small amount of money, and it is subject to appropriations.

I do think it is difficult to put a price on our democracy. We need to make sure that young people are involved from the get-go. We have seen that young people don't necessarily have the tools to become engaged in our democracy.

It is fine if our ranking member gave his instruction to his twins around the dinner table. I commend him for that. But not every person in America has their local McDonal's, what have you, a lot of other priorities, and local organizations are doing right now.

I commend the gentleman for wanting to get more young people involved. I have got 18-year-olds. I sometimes feel that we are a little more interested in what was happening at all levels of government, but that comes with time.

It is interesting the gentleman talks about being around the dinner table with family talking about what it means to serve and what it means to enact policy. That is how I got here.

It is fine if our ranking member gave his instruction to his twins around the dinner table. I commend him for that. But not every person in America has their local McDonal's, what have you, a lot of other priorities, and local organizations are doing right now.

I commend the gentleman for wanting to get more young people involved. I have got 18-year-olds. I sometimes feel that we are a little more interested in what was happening at all levels of government, but that comes with time.

It is interesting the gentleman talks about being around the dinner table with family talking about what it means to serve and what it means to enact policy. That is how I got here.
those people, these amendments are going to create vigorous outreach to the young people of America so they can be participants, and I commend the gentlemen for offering it.

Mr. BEYER. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, may I inquire how much time I have left.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I appreciate the chairperson offering her support for this amendment. She mentioned it is tough to put a price on democracy. That is exactly what H.R. 1 is doing.

The price of democracy in every single congressional district, for every single candidate running for Congress, is now, according to this bill, $4.5 million in corporate money and, eventually, taxpayer dollars. That is the price of democracy that my Democratic colleagues have put into every Member of Congress’ campaign coffers if this bill goes through.

The price of democracy should be the freedoms that we enjoy on the floor of this great institution to be able to debate and amend the laws that we are creating. The price of democracy should not be legislated at $4.5 million for each and every Member of Congress who is blessed enough to serve in this institution.

Madam Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER).

Mr. BEYER. Madam Chair, my inquiry how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. BEYER. Madam Chair, I want to say that all we are doing is giving the Appropriations Committee the flexibility to do this. We are going to spend over $700 billion on defense for people fighting for our democracy. We can spend a tiny, tiny fraction of that to make sure that American citizens understand what they are fighting for. This is a really important thing.

By the way, the gentleman mentioned attack on teachers. Every teacher I have talked to would like more resources so they can do their job more effectively.

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

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, personally, Sunday mornings are sacred for me and my family and for a lot of other people, too, including those public servants who work the polls on early voting. But this action was struck down because the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals noted, it targeted African Americans with almost surgical precision.

Our democracy doesn’t work if we don’t give people the fullest opportunity to make their voices heard. We should make it easier for people to vote, not harder, and this amendment does exactly that.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me first start by thanking Mr. CHRIST of Florida for cosponsoring this amendment. I also want to recognize the members of my good State from Maryland, JOHN SARBIANES, on the underlying bill and his efforts to make our democracy work for the people.

My amendment would guarantee access to early voting during every day of the week, including Sundays, to every American.

Early voting makes voting more convenient by providing Americans with greater flexibility and opportunity to cast a ballot. More and more Americans are taking advantage of early voting, with more than 40 million citizens casting ballots before election day last year.

But guaranteeing fair and flexible early voting on Sundays is not just a matter of convenience. It is critical for minority voters who disproportionately take advantage of Sunday early voting and often face higher barriers and disparate burdens when deciding to cast a ballot: lost pay, childcare expenses, transit costs.

In my State and in States across the country, churches promote “take your souls to the polls” programs that take church parishioners from Sunday services to the voting booth. So cuts to Sunday early voting, as we have witnessed across this country, have had a negative impact, especially on communities of color.

Six States have cut back on early voting. But this action was struck down because the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals noted, it targeted African Americans with almost surgical precision.

Our democracy doesn’t work if we don’t give people the fullest opportunity to make their voices heard. We should make it easier for people to vote, not harder, and this amendment does exactly that.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, personally, Sunday mornings are sacred for me and my family and for a lot of other people, too, including those public servants who work the polls on early voting.

But this isn’t about Sunday or any other day. It is about my colleagues dictating to States and local officials on how they should run their elections.
State and local election officials know their voters best and what works for them. This amendment is yet another example of the Federal Government trying to push a one-size-fits-all standard on States and localities.

I do think the Federal Government should be mandating to States how to run their elections, even to the minute details such as polling hours, especially because, I guess, in my home State, it already happens.

When I live in my district, they have early voting hours on Sundays, so I don’t know how widespread the problem is since it already happens in Illinois. It seems like another top-down approach that could adversely affect some communities, especially rural communities, that may not be able to afford to have a polling place open on Sundays.

It is a problem with the entire bill. The trick is the keep going up and up and up on our local officials without a lot of certainty that funds are going to flow to help them with that.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Madam Chair, in an ideal world, perhaps, we don’t mandate from the Federal Government, but when the Fourth Circuit determines that the North Carolina Legislature did it to target African Americans with almost surgical precision in eliminating Sunday voting, it is time for action at the Federal level so we can ensure every American has the right to vote.

Madam Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRIST), my friend and a cosponsor of this amendment.

Mr. CRIST. Madam Chair, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN), for his leadership on this issue.

Souls to the Polls is a bedrock of Florida elections. For my colleagues who may be unfamiliar, minority communities, particularly African American and Latino, use Sunday early voting to energize their communities to make their voices heard. For those without reliable transportation or with unpredictable work schedules, Sunday voting is critical and sacred.

This is how a healthy democracy should work, communities organizing themselves to increase participation, doing their civic duty. Higher turnout and greater participation strengthen the democracy, giving elected leaders a stronger, more representative voice.

Unfortunately, some States have targeted Sunday Souls to the Polls voting. My own State tried to shut it down in 2012.

This amendment would block States from using voter suppression tactics against Souls to the Polls.

I urge my colleagues to support the Brown-Crist amendment and let the underlying bill pass.

Let’s refresh our democracy, for the people.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I have kind of said all I need to say about this amendment, so while I have a few extra minutes, I understand the chairperson has received an estimate from a joint committee regarding how much this new corporate funding program for congressional campaigns will bring into the Federal Government over the next 10 years.

First, I would love to see a copy of that, now that we are only 1 day away from voting on this bill. This is eerily similar to the games that my colleagues across the aisle played with the Congressional Budget Office score. I will remind them once again that we still don’t have a figure of how much this section of H.R. 1 will cost American taxpayers.

Second, if we look at the potential cost of the 6-to-1 government match program and the Presidential campaign matching program, these together could represent billions and billions of dollars every election cycle.

Now, what you will hear from the other side is that, if they don’t have the funds for these programs, the caps for these programs would uniformly be lowered. What that means is that either the programs will die or my counterparts across the aisle are going to turn to taxpayer dollars to ask us to fulfill what they have claimed as absolutely necessary programs.

What does this sound like to you, a well-thought-out public policy proposal or a shell game with American tax dollars?

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Madam Chair, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), the chairwoman of the Committee on House Administration.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, first, I would like to thank Congressmen Brown and Crist for an excellent amendment that improves the bill considerably.

On the point just raised by the ranking member, the report given by the Joint Committee on Taxation was put into the RECORD yesterday, and it is their estimate of how much will be raised, and their estimate that we will reduce the deficit by $33 million.

We are waiting; the CBO is crunching numbers, which is hard to do because each amendment has to be crunched as we go along.

But I will say this: During the markup in the House Administration Committee, we did outline the vessel for the Freedom From Influence Fund. We didn’t have the jurisdiction to do the assessment on criminal wrongdoing by corporations and tax cheats, but we did create the Freedom From Influence Fund, and we did say that we are going to ramp-up the funding if there is insufficient funding on the program if there is a new thing.

I think it is sound policy.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, how much time do I have left, if I may inquire?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, this is another clear example of why this bill needs to be voted down or put back, preferably put back to the Committee.

I am the ranking member of the House Administration Committee, and I stood across this floor from my colleagues who now use the excuse and say, Well, it was submitted into the RECORD yesterday.

There has been a lack of communication, a lack of bipartisan outreach from the Democratic side of the aisle, and this is another example of the Keyston-copish behavior of the folks that have introduced now an upward of 700-page bill that has not been marked up, has not been discussed, debated by 40 percent of the committees that have—nine other committees that have jurisdiction over 40 percent of the bill.

So when I hear the chairperson talk about jurisdictional issues as to why she couldn’t discuss this with me in our markup process, I am wondering why she couldn’t turn and tap me on the shoulder, since I was about 6 inches away, and say, Hey, we don’t have jurisdiction, but here is what we estimate this is going to cost.

It just goes to show that this is a shell game. This is a game that is going to cost taxpayers billions. This is a game that we, the American tax payers, are going to have to pay for; and it is offensive that we have zero communication.

I have shown time and time again—we Republicans have offered and supported bipartisan—supported Democrat amendments. We have offered the olive branch of bipartisanship throughout this process to try and make this bill better, and we have been shut down by the Democrats every single time we have every step of the way.

This bill is not going to guarantee that every single American voter who is eligible to vote has their vote counted and has their vote protected. What this is going to guarantee is that this bill is going to be rammed through on a partisan roll call tomorrow.

This bill is going to cost taxpayers billions, and we are not going to have the price tag because the Democrat majority, who is trying to enrich themselves, and their comrades, the Democratic majority, who is trying to keep themselves in a permanent majority, are going to obfuscate, put new programs, and plans, and charades, and shell games in place, that are going to end up costing taxpayers, put more corporate money into congressional campaigns and, in turn, break the American taxpayers under the guise of election reforms.

Madam Chair, this process is not what the Democratic majority promised when they took over. This process has been ridden with a lack of bipartisanship, a lack of transparency, and special interests helping write this
mammoth, now 700-page bill that is going to nationalize our election systems and put billions of dollars into the campaign coffers of Congressmen and Congresswomen throughout this Nation.

This is not what the taxpayers of this country want. That is not what we are demanding. And it is an affront. I hope everybody votes “no” on this amendment and this bill.

Madam Chair, I yield the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. Brown).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF MARYLAND

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 47 printed in part B of House Report 116–16.

Mr. Brown of Maryland. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 168, line 7, strike “before the date of the election:” and insert “before the date of the election or the first day of an early voting period (whichever occurs first):”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 172, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. Brown) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT NO. 47 OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF MARYLAND

Mr. Brown of Maryland. Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be modified with the form I have placed at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk reads as follows:

Modification to amendment No. 47 offered by Mr. Brown of Maryland:

The amendment is modified to read as follows:

Page 168, line 3, strike “before the date of the election:” and insert “before the date of the election or the first day of an early voting period (whichever occurs first):”.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is modified.

Mr. Brown of Maryland. Madam Chair, my amendment would require States to notify voters of polling location changes no later than 7 days prior to the first day of early voting, providing every voter as much time as possible to plan how and when they will vote, and avoiding last minute polling place changes that, more often than not, discourage people from exercising their right to vote.

Research shows that the most important factor that impacts whether someone votes or not is the location of the polling place and the effort it takes to get there.

A 2011 study in the American Political Science Review said changing a location of a polling place can significantly lower voter turnout.

Unfortunately, since 2008, and further accelerated in 2013, when the Supreme Court gutted the Voting Rights Act, nearly 15,000 polling places have been closed across the country; many of them are located in southern Black communities.

Polling places have been used as political tools to shape the outcome of elections for generations, and it continues to happen today.

Before the 2018 elections, States and local election boards closed polling places at colleges and universities, consolidated polling places in predominantly-minority neighborhoods to save money, and moved polling locations away from public transportation.

These changes discourage participation in our democracy, and make our system of government weaker. That is why Congress must take action to protect the rights of the people, to have a government by the people, for the people.

By providing sufficient notice, every voter can decide whether to cast a vote on Election Day or, as this bill provides, take advantage of early voting or no-excuse absentee voting.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Rodney Davis of Illinois. Madam Chair, I again thank my friend and colleague from the great State of Maryland for offering the amendment. Unfortunately, I have to be opposed to this amendment for the variety of reasons I mentioned.

I believe in the greatness of America. I believe we have a great system where other countries from around this globe only wish they could choose their own leaders. Unlike Americans get the opportunity to do so.

We have a system of federalism. We have a system that, I believe, works best from the bottom up; and I believe a top-down approach, that this 700-page mammoth bill will provide for our local election officials, will hinder them, and cost them, and stop them from being able to administer the best, most open elections they possibly can.

I have a lot of faith in the county election officials that are operating in my district, in central and southwestern Illinois. I believe they run a very fair election process. I want to give them the tools and the flexibility to meet the needs of our constituents and our constituents; and the Federal Government doesn’t need to be the voice to do so. Our local officials can do that better.

I am ready to close, so I will just reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Madam Chair, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. Lofgren), the chair of the House Administration Committee.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, I just want to say how much I appreciate the amendment offered by Mr. Brown. It improves the bill by making sure that voters are notified, not just 7 days before the poll is moved, but before early voting begins, maximizing the opportunity to actually get to the poll.

Many Americans have a single day to vote, and if you are a working person, you may not even have time off, you may not even be able to get to the polling place. That is what H.R. 1 is all about.

And just getting to the federalism issue, Article 1, Section 4 explicitly says, “Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations” about Federal elections. That is what we are doing here.

We need to do more because there are jurisdictions in our country that are specifically trying to prevent people from voting based on race. That is why we have got the Voting Rights Act that
Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 136, line 3, strike “and”.
Page 136, line 5, strike the period and insert “;”.
Page 136, insert after line 5 the following: “(3) allow such voting to be held for some period of time prior to 9:00 a.m. (local time) and some period of time after 5:00 p.m. (local time).”

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 172, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This amendment would require a portion of early voting hours to occur outside of normal business hours. This simple, yet effective amendment would ensure that every working individual has the opportunity to cast their ballot without taking time off from work, having to find child care, or risking being reprimanded by their employer.

While early voting has become increasingly commonplace, States and localities continue to change and restrict hours every election, sometimes closing as early as 4 p.m., making it problematic for those whose workdays may have irregular schedules or are unable to take time away from work.

Despite State laws guaranteeing many workers time off to go vote, too many Americans have neither the luxury of an employer that will give them time off to vote nor the financial freedom to risk losing a few hours’ wages in order to participate in our democracy. That is why early voting is so important.

But holding early voting during business hours is just another way citizens have been impeded from exercising their right to vote, particularly middle-class working Americans in the service, manufacturing, and other blue-collar industries. These Americans often rely on a 9 to 5 schedule and don’t have the same opportunity to vote.

To ensure everyone’s voice can be heard and early voting is convenient for every American, locations should remain open well after the traditional close of business.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I have said the same thing about previous amendments. I don’t think the Federal Government should be involved in the minute details of early voting.

States aren’t asking us to set our hours here in Congress; we shouldn’t, as the Federal Government, ask our State and local election officials who know better how to run free, fair, and a lot less costly election processes.

We have got a problem in this country, Madam Chair, with a shortage of election day workers. We have got a problem with poll workers.

In my home State of Illinois, every other year it is a holiday. It hasn’t helped us get more election workers. It hasn’t helped us get more poll workers. What it has done is it has created a holiday and a day off where many people can come vote or they can enjoy the already open early voting processes that States like mine have in place and the opportunities to cast their votes in a wide variety of ways.

This is another example of a Federal top-down approach that obviously shows there is a distinct difference between my Democratic colleagues and me and all of us on this side of the aisle. We believe in a bottom-up approach of governing; they believe in a top-down approach.

The bottom-up approach, I believe, leads to more efficiencies, leads to fairer and better and freer elections, and a top-down approach is nothing but costly to the taxpayers in unfunded mandates.

One thing that really frustrates me is, if you are going to impose Federal mandates, you cannot leave States open to the potential liability because the mandate is so broad. And that is exactly what this bill does. That is exactly why I am opposed to this amendment.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I thank my colleague from Maryland.

You know, like some of the legislation we pass here, it has to go through the rulemaking process later. That is no different than our forefathers and our Founders of the Constitution.

If you read Alexander Hamilton, he responds to the concerns that the power of the national government to determine the times, places, and manner of elections of the Representatives of the House might actually, at that time, result in the elevation of the wealthy over the mass of citizens.

The fear seems to be that the national government may conspire to hold elections in only parts of the States populated by the wealthy. That would presumably prevent lower income citizens from voting.

Hamilton rejected that fear on several grounds, including the fact that such places do not exist, but that the rich are scattered throughout the States.

Hamilton argued that every member of this country should have the right to vote, but the Federal overreach should not be something we are actually encouraging right now.

Let’s look at what our forefathers actually said about the provisions in the Constitution, just not using them to put forth a political agenda.

Madam Chair, I am urging a “no” vote on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN).
The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 49 OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF MARYLAND

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 49 printed in part B of House Report 116–16.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 182, line 21, strike the semicolon and insert the following: ‘‘, together with a description of any actions taken in response to such instances of voter intimidation or suppression.’’

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 172, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Madam Chair, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

This amendment will require States to include in their biannual report to Congress on the voter information hotline statistics to include a description of any actions taken in response to reports of voter intimidation or suppression.

Discouraging voter participation through intimidation or suppression tactics runs against the very foundation of our democracy, but these tactics continue to play an unfortunate role in our elections today.

When I ran for Lieutenant Governor of Maryland in 2010, my opponent hired a consultant who advised my opponent that ‘‘. . . the first and most desired outcome is voter suppression’’ by having ‘‘African American voters stay home.’’

To that end, my opponent made thousands of election day robo calls to Democrat voters telling them that Democrats had won; although, in fact, the polls were still open for 2 more hours.

The call told voters: Relax. Everything is fine. The only thing left is to watch it on TV tonight.

It reached 112,000 voters in majority African American areas.

This is just one example of the despicable tactics that have become commonplace in our elections.

We have the responsibility to confront these attempts to target individuals and influence whether or not they vote.

In 2019, too many Americans are still being harassed, threatened, and barred from exercising their right to vote. My amendment will ensure election officials do their job by helping voters who don’t know where to vote, why their polling place is closed, or why they are being turned away.

This is an essential element to make our elections more free, more fair, and will help safeguard the integrity of our elections by holding election officials accountable for protecting every citizen’s right to vote.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. It is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, this amendment would have the effect of the Federal Government compiling statistics without context and without vetting on very serious criminal matters. Unless there was some sort of follow-up on the reports, it could actually do more harm than good.

I am also afraid that certain partisan organizations could take advantage of this. So bear with me. Let’s talk through this and let’s see how this would work.

People call into this hotline, submit allegations on serious crimes, and then it is sent to the State and now the Federal Government. Partisan groups who helped author this bill would then use statistics from the hotline to then bring unverified lawsuits under the new third-party actions that are allowed in this bill.

This is a recipe for disaster. The stated purpose of H.R. 1 is to increase transparency in politics, but instead, unfortunately, this provision would only invite corruption.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Madam Chair, turning back to the amendment, what the amendment does is it simply holds local election officials accountable and to be responsive to the claims, the calls, the concerns that are raised to them regarding voter intimidation, voter suppression, ensuring that when they are collecting that information, that they also report on what the response is to the claims that are made.

Madam Chair, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), chair of the House Administration Committee.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, I would like to commend the gentleman for this amendment.

When you make a phone call in to complain about harassment or intimidation, that information may or may not ever become known, so this is really a pro-transparency measure.

The amendment says: ‘‘together with a description of actions taken in response to such instances of voter intimidation or suppression.’’

The State legislatures may not know, we may not know how many efforts are being made. We should know that to see whether what we have done here is sufficient, whether the Voting Rights Act that will be following along this bill later in the spring needs to address this.

Madam Chair, this is an excellent amendment.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I believe the EAC, Election Assistance Commission, is supposed to track this information.

The key point, too, that I made earlier is that there is no verification, and that is a problem with this amendment. It is a problem with the bill.

There are no protections for bad behavior.

This is why we tried to get rid of ballot harvesting. It was why the amendment was offered in committee. I mean, we have already seen what bad actors can do.

It costs taxpayers hundreds of thousands of dollars in North Carolina, and they have to run a new special election, but that is okay because that may not have been a crime in California. But that is all right. The Democrats didn’t want to accept that because they might like the process somewhere else.

I think what is wrong is wrong and we should take action to protect the American people to have protections that they need and that they deserve to stop what happened in North Carolina from happening somewhere else.

This is another example of overreach, another example of something already happening, already existing agencies that should be compiling this information; and there are no safeguards and there will be no verification of allegations, and that is unfortunate.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Madam Chair, may I inquire how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Madam Chair, the issue raised by the gentleman from Illinois is neither helped nor harmed by this amendment. He raises an issue that we can take up perhaps another day.

But what this bill simply does is it requires that local elected officials be responsive and report on the responses they take to claims of intimidation and suppression.

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, we would love to take up ballot harvesting today, too, but, unfortunately, we are not given the chance to. The Democrats voted it down in the only markup that we had, the full committee in Congress, 5 hours last week, with 40 percent of the bill not going through regular order, not going through the committee process.

This is not a process that has been open. It is not a process that has been transparent. It is not a process that has been bipartisan.

Clearly, we have accepted many Democrat amendments on our side. Not one single Republican amendment has been accepted by the Democrat side.

Madam Chair, I urge a no vote on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.
BUTTERFIELD) having assumed the
and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. 
Native Americans, Asian Americans and Pa-
cific Islanders and other people of color, 
Jews, Muslims, Hindus, Sikhs, the LGBTQ 
community, immigrants, and others with 
verbal attacks, incitement, and violence. 
Whereas the late Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., taught that persecution of any American is an assault on the rights and freedoms of 
all Americans; 
Whereas on August 11 and 12, 2017, self-
identified neo-Confederates, white national-
ists, neo-Nazis, and Ku Klux Klansmen held 
white supremacist events in Charlottesville, 
Virginia, where in the Marion County, on a syna-
gogue under the Nazi swastika, engaged in 
racist and anti-Semitic demonstrations and 
committed brutality, and deadly violence against peaceful Americans; 
Whereas a white nationalist murdered nine 
African American worshippers at the Emanuel African Methodist Episcopal Church in 
Charleston, South Carolina, on the evening 
of June 17, 2015, in the hopes of igniting a na-
nationwide race war; 
Whereas on October 27, 2018, the perpe-
trator of the deadliest attack on Jewish peo-
ple in the history of the United States killed 
11 worshippers at the Tree of Life Synagogue 
bldg. in Pittsburgh and reportedly stated that he “wanted all Jews to die”; 
Whereas anti-Semitism is the centuries-old 
bigotry and form of racism faced by Jewish people simply because they are Jews; 
Whereas in 2017 the Federal Bureau of In-
vestigation reported a 37 percent increase in 
hate crimes against Jews or Jewish institu-
tions and found that 71 percent of Jewish 
Americans or Jewish institutions made up 58.1 percent of 
all religious-based hate crimes; 
Whereas there is an urgent need to ensure the 
safety and security of Jewish commu-
nities, including synagogues, schools, ceme-
teries, and other institutions; 
Whereas Jewish hate crimes, which are at 
even higher rates in many other countries than they are in the United States; 
Whereas it is a foreign policy priority of the United States to monitor and combat anti-Semitism abroad; 
Whereas anti-Semitism includes blaming Jews as Jews when things go wrong; calling for, aiding, or justifying the killing or harm-
ing of Jews in the name of a radical ideology 
or extremist view of religion; or making 
mandaciously, or demonizing, or stigmatizing 
and stereotyped allegations about Jews; 
Whereas Jewish people are subject in the 
media and political campaigns to numerous 
other dangerous anti-Semitic myths as well, 
including that Jews control the United States Government or seek global, political, 
and financial domination and that Jews are 
obscured with money; 
Whereas scapegoating and targeting of 
Jews in the United States have persisted for 
many years, including by the Ku Klux Klan, the America First Committee, and by mod-
ern neo-Nazis; 
Whereas accusing Jews of being more loyal 
to Israel or to the Jewish community than to 
the United States is an anti-Semitic myth 
because it suggests that Jewish citizens cannot be patriotic Americans and trusted 
neighbors, when Jews have loyally served our Nation every day since its founding, 
whether in public or community life or mili-
tary service; 
Whereas accusations of dual loyalty gen-
erally have an insidious and pernicious his-
try, including— 
(1) the discriminatory incarceration of 
Americans of Japanese descent during World 
War II of the basis of race and alleged dual 
loyalty; 
(2) the Dreyfus affair, when Alfred Dreyfus, 
a Jewish French officer, was falsely con-
victed of passing secrets to Germany 
based on his Jewish background; 
(3) when the loyalty of President John F. 
Kennedy was questioned because of his Catholic faith; and 
(4) the post-9/11 conditions faced by Mus-
lim-Americans in the United States includ-
ing Islamophobia and false and vicious at-
tacks on and threats to Muslim-Americans for alleged association with terrorism; 
whereas anti-Muslim bigotry entails preju-
dicial attitudes towards Muslims and people 
who are perceived to be Muslim, including the irrational belief that Muslims are inher-
ently violent, diabolic, and foreign; 
whereas Muslims and people perceived to be Muslim are subjected to false and dan-
gerous stereotypes and myths including un-
founded assertions that they sympathize with individuals who engage in violence or terror 
or support the oppression of women, Jews, 
and other vulnerable communities; 
whereas in 2017, mosques were bombed in 
Bloomington, Minnesota, and burned in Aus-
tin, Texas, Victoria, Texas, Bellevue, Wash-
ington, and Thonotosassa, Florida, and mass 
attacks on Muslim communities were 
planned against communities in Isalamb, 
New York, in 2019, Jacksonville, Florida, in 
2017, and Garden City, Kansas, in 2016; 
whereas on October 27, 2018, the Federal Bureau of In-
vestigation reported that hate crimes against Mus-
lims or Muslim institutions in the United States increased by over 99 percent between 
2015 and 2016; 
whereas attacks motivated by bigotry 
against those who are Muslim or perceived 
to be Muslim have substantially increased 
since the September 11, 2001, terrorist at-
tacks; 
whereas the violation of an individual’s 
civil rights based on his or her actual or per-
ceived membership in a particular religious group clearly violates the Constitution and 
laws of the United States; and 
whereas all Americans, including Jews, Muslims, and Christians of all faiths and no faith, have a stake in fighting anti-Semitism, as all Americans have a 
stoak in fighting every form of bigotry and 
hatred against people based on religion, race, 
or place of birth and origin: Now, therefore, be it 
Resolved, That the House of Represen-
tatives— 
(1) rejects the perpetuation of anti-Semitic 
sterotypes in the United States and around 
the world, including the pernicious myth of 
dual loyalty and foreign allegiance, espe-
cially in the context of support for the 
United States-Israel alliance; 
(2) condemns anti-Semitic acts and state-
ments as hateful expressions of intolerance 
that are contradictory to the values that de-
define the people of the United States; 
(3) reaffirms its support for the mandate of the United States Special Envoy for 
Monitor and Combat Anti-Semitism as part of 
the broader policy priority of fostering inter-
national religious freedom and protecting human rights all over the world; 
(4) rejects attempts to justify hatred or 
violent attacks as an acceptable expression 
of disapproval or frustration over political 
events in the Middle East or elsewhere; 
(5) acknowledges the harm suffered by 
Muslims and others from the harassment, 
discrimination, and violence that result 
from anti-Muslim bigotry; 
(6) condemns anti-Muslim discrimination 
and bigotry against all minorities as con-
trary to the values of the United States; 
(7) calls on the Federal Bureau of 
Investigation to investigate reports that hate 
crimes against Muslims or Muslim 
organizations increased by over 99 percent 
between 2015 and 2016; 
(8) encourages law enforcement and gov-
ernment officials to avoid conduct that 
raises the specter of unconstitutional profiling 
gooding anyone because of their
race, religion, nationality, political, or particular social group, including the assignment of blame or targeting members of an entire religious group for increased suspicion based on the actual or perceived religion, ethnicity, race, or national origin; and

(9) encourages all public officials to confront the reality of anti-Semitism, Islamophobia, homophobia, and other forms of bigotry, as well as historical struggles against them, to ensure that the United States will live up to the transcendent principles of tolerance, religious freedom, and equal protection as embodied in the Declaration of Independence and the first and 14th amendments to the Constitution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. NADLER. 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 resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 183, which condemns anti-Semitism unambiguously, as well as anti-Muslim bigotry and all forms of prejudice against minorities, as contrary to fundamental American values and principles. This resolution makes clear that we condemn anti-Semitism, Islamophobia, and racism no matter where on the political spectrum they may emanate from, right, left, or center.

This resolution is a statement of our values. While it focuses on concerns raised in the last few weeks regarding anti-Semitism and Islamophobia, it addresses those noxious forms of bigotry in the context of our broader concern with all forms of bigotry and hatred in our country.

Bigotry against members of minority groups based on their actual or perceived religion, ethnicity, race, or national origin are among the cardinal sins of our Nation. As the resolution notes, tolerance and religious freedom are among our country’s fundamental principles, so much so that they are enshrined in the very First Amendment to the Constitution.

Sadly, without constant vigilance, our Nation has seen darker moments where religious and other forms of hate have reared their ugly heads. Often, our Nation has fallen short of its ideals when they succumbed to the demagoguery of bigots.

Indeed, one of the biggest problems facing our country today, and one that has bedeviled us in the past, is the fact that white supremacists have weaponized bigotry and hatred to achieve political gains. They do so by stoking hatred and division among Americans based on religion, race, ethnicity, or other characteristics.

To combat this, it is imperative that all of us—but especially those of us in public life—speak out against such hate. Unfortunately, sometimes the interpretation of other forms of bigotry are themselves public figures and even, distressingly, Members of this House.

Indeed, in the last few weeks, comments have been made by some of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that can fairly be characterized as anti-Semitic, and I have condemned these remarks.

Anti-Semitism is among the most ancient of prejudices and is associated with pernicious stereotypes, including the claim that Jews exert control over the government and the global political and financial systems, that they are obsessed with money, and that their loyalty to their home countries is somehow in question.

Assertion of these beliefs does not constitute merely making statements of political or policy positions. Rather, propagation of these beliefs has, throughout history, resulted in harassment, discrimination, violence, and murder against Jews.

While anti-Semitism is an ancient prejudice, its effects are not ancient history. Less than 6 months ago, a gunman murdered 11 worshippers at the Tree of Life synagogue in Pittsburgh, reportedly stating that he “wanted all Jews to die.” Nearly 2 years ago in Charlottesville, Virginia, white supremacists chanted, “Jews will not replace us.”

Despite this ugly history, Members on both sides have questioned the loyalty and patriotism of Members of this House. The trope that support for Israel, particularly among Jewish Americans, is the result of a “dual loyalty” to Israel and the United States is deeply offensive to me.

What I find equally despicable is a somewhat analogous “dual loyalty” trope increasingly deployed against Muslim Americans. This includes the recent implication by one of our colleagues that another colleague is a spy and a State Republican poster in the West Virginia State capitol that implied an association between that same colleague and the September 11, 2001, attacks in New York.

Indeed, statements have repeatedly been made in the recent past by public officials, including the President, which can fairly be characterized as anti-Muslim more generally.

Particularly since the September 11 attacks, Jews and Muslims have faced a gauntlet of prejudice alleging that they are inherently violent, disloyal, and foreign, and this has led to hate-motivated violence. In 2017, for example, at least five mosques were bombed or burned in various cities around the country.

Efforts to question the loyalty or patriotism of anyone in this country based on their religion or on any innate characteristic is completely out of bounds.

It is my fervent hope that this resolution will be a chance for us, both as an institution and also as a Nation, to remind ourselves of what we all believe in, and to come together and heal.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for this resolution today, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.
Mr. Speaker, I wish the Chair and I had more concern here. At 3:20 this afternoon, I was handed, or at least it was printed, one of the resolutions. I have three more of this resolution that has taken all we have. It takes to figure out "just don't hate?" How many times, how many, you know, pages does it take to cite evil is evil? My heart breaks, Mr. Speaker. My heart breaks for this institution when we rush. At the age of 17, when I entered the United States Naval Academy, I first took the oath to support and defend the Constitution against all enemies, foreign and domestic. I subsequently repeated that oath six times at every promotion in rank and, most recently, when I had the honor to become a Member of Congress. Is that not enough to prove my loyalty to our Nation? I deployed six times, serving in six ships in the Middle East and Western Pacific, working under challenging conditions while operating complex weapons systems, overseeing nuclear reactors, driving ships, and, ultimately, commanding a combat-ready unit of 400 sailors. Is that not enough to prove my loyalty to our Nation? In the first 3 years my husband and I were married, we spent almost 2 years in the Pacific, working under challenging conditions while operating complex weapons systems, overseeing nuclear reactors, driving ships, and, ultimately, commanding a combat-ready unit of 400 sailors. Is that not enough to prove my loyalty to our Nation? The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired. Mrs. LURIA. Mr. Speaker, I am a Jewish American woman who served for 20 years in uniform and continue to serve in the United States Congress. At the age of 17, when I entered the United States Naval Academy, I first took the oath to support and defend the Constitution against all enemies, foreign and domestic. I subsequently repeated that oath six times at every promotion in rank and, most recently, when I had the honor to become a Member of Congress. Is that not enough to prove my loyalty to our Nation? I deployed six times, serving in six ships in the Middle East and Western Pacific, working under challenging conditions while operating complex weapons systems, overseeing nuclear reactors, driving ships, and, ultimately, commanding a combat-ready unit of 400 sailors. Is that not enough to prove my loyalty to our Nation? The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired. Mrs. LURIA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. LURIA). Mrs. LURIA. Mr. Speaker, I am a Jewish American woman who served for 20 years in uniform and remain silent in the face of people questioning my loyalty to my country? I believe that I speak clearly for all fellow Jewish veterans that this echoes of language that has been used to marginalize and persecute the Jewish people for centuries. The resolutions of dual loyalty call into question the equal footing of Jewish Members in elected office and, by extension, all Jews living in America.
But, no, now we can’t come here and just emphatically, solely, forcefully condemn anti-Semitism and name names. But if it was a Republican, we would.

It is time to call out these statements for what they are: pointed, bigoted, unreasonable, illegitimate, anti-Semitic.

I commend my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who have been speaking out about all this anti-Semitism. But a few Members come to mind: Chairman ENGEL, Congressman DEUTCH, Congressman NADLER, Congresswoman LOWEY, Congressman GOTTHEIMER.

Many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, I believe, to their core know how very wrong this is.

There are many other Members to name as well, and I would be remiss if I didn’t take this opportunity to say thankyou for each and every one of them, because support of Israel, support of Jews, standing against anti-Semitism is bipartisan in the past. It should be bipartisan today, and it should be bipartisan for every moment in the future.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield ½ minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), the distinguished whip.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution condemning anti-Semitism, Islamophobia, and bigotry against minorities.

This resolution expresses our rejection of all attempts to weaponize words and sow discord and division.

Make no mistake, our Caucus is unified, but unity does not mean unanimity. We are a true reflection of who and what America is.

Each of us brings our own familiar background and personal experiences to this august body. Those experiences help shape our values and our perspectives as we do the work of the American people.

We learn from one another, and we do so following President Lincoln’s declaration: “With malice toward none; with charity for all; with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in.”

The resolution condemns hateful expressions of intolerance, honors the heritages and experiences of all who serve in this body, and commits all of us to the continued search of a more perfect Union.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS).

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) for yielding me time, and I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) for his comments.

We are here today because a Member of this body issued a series of anti-Semitic statements, and I couldn’t help but think of what justice means and what mercy means.

Well, we want to temper justice with mercy. So the first time we come to understand that maybe the depth of what was just said was maybe accidental; the second time maybe less so; and certainly the third time, we now have a pattern.

We begin to wonder how we extend mercy when justice cries out against one who has sinned.

It doesn’t help that the Democratic leaders have attempted to rationalize and protect this individual, whether it is appearing on the cover of a national magazine, whether it is saying: “She did not understand the full weight of the words.” One wonders what more needs to be done to try to eradicate anti-Semitism from this body.

Some have said that to specifically condemn these statements and remove her from her committee assignment would stifle legitimate criticism of Israel. But the problem with that argument is this:

The comments made were not directed at Israel, were not directed to policy, were not directed towards the America-Israel relationship. They were, instead, directed to Americans with the allegation that they have a dual loyalty, which is an ancient anti-Semitic cliche that has been used to target the Jewish community throughout history.

How about this in the future? If a Member of Congress desires to criticize Israel or criticize American policy towards Israel, maybe they can do so without resorting to an anti-Semitic rhetoric that is inflammatory, unnecessary, and, frankly, is hateful.

So we stand here today and we look at a resolution condemning hatred of any kind. Who can disagree with that? I don’t. I don’t disagree with that.

But what will you say is you cannot temper justice any longer with mercy, with rationalization. Sooner or later, you have to face what the awful truth is. And if someone is going to persist in making anti-Semitic, hateful statements, to bury that is inexcusable.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, let me suggest at the outset that no party be too self-righteous on the issue of supporting prejudice and bigotry too often. This is a very serious matter. It is important to call out anti-Semitism in a way that is unmistakable and unambiguous.

We must do so because whenever some people begin to question the allegiance or patriotism of Americans, indeed, whether certain people fully belong as part of our country, it is critical to set the record straight.

Recent statements employing time-worn tropes of dual loyalty have deeply and correctly unsettled American Jewish communities because their allegation is, simply put, that American Jews who support Israel are not loyal to this country.

I stand as a very strong supporter of Israel, and a very loyal American. Such allegations fall into the so-called “century-old and dark history of Jews being marginalized and set apart. They recall past evils that occurred in other countries and in our own when, according to the Anti-Defamation League, people accuse Jews of ‘being disloyal neighbors or citizens’ because of their connection to Israel or Jewish communities elsewhere in the world.

That was false, and it was bigoted.

To be clear, the First Amendment protects the right of every American to criticize policies and leaders, whether our own country or others.

That is the glory of our democracy.

However, in these past few weeks, those who say they are only criticizing Israel’s leaders or policies have, instead, been making claims about the allegiance and motivation of Israel’s defenders.

I do not believe there is anyone in our Caucus, not one, who wishes to silence debate over policy. Rather, what is being called for is an end to the invocation of age-old, anti-Semitic tropes that demonize people instead of criticizing policies.

Accusations that Jews bear dual allegiance because of support for Israel or concern for its safety are false and they are also hurtful canards that must be exposed and exposed for what they are: bigotry. They elicit legitimate fear and uncertainty in the individuals and communities they target.

In much the same way, we have also seen vile examples of hatred aimed at painting Muslim Americans as somehow disloyal to our Nation, or not fully belonging, causing similar feelings of insecurity and distress.

No Muslims could come to our country. Those feelings cannot be discounted either. One of our own colleagues was the target of an Islamophobic attack, impugning a Member of this House. That ought to be unacceptable to all of us.

We have seen this same form of exclusion, hatred in recent years whenever acts of bigotry have been directed towards African Americans, and when Latino and Latina citizens have been yelled at to “go back” to their country. This is their country.

This phenomenon is also a reminder of the horrific internment of Japanese Americans during the Second World War. None of us ought to be like Pontius Pilate and think that we have not fallen short of the principles enunciated in our Declaration.

In our multicultural Republic, sometimes it is incumbent upon the American people to speak as one Nation, indivisible, and make a clear affirmation that all Americans have an equal share
in our Republic, that no one’s race, or creed, or origin can call into question one’s love of country.

I will continue to urge unity in the face of anti-Semitism, Islamophobia, xenophobia, homophobia, transphobia, racism against African American, Latino, Asian Americans, and in union with the principles of our Constitution, as amended and perfected, both of which proclaim the dignity and rights of individuals endowed by our Creator.

But America has also seen, too often, the denial of that dignity and equality to millions of its citizens based upon the color of their skin, the land of their birth, or the faith of their forebears.

My colleagues, if we are to be better than our past, we must reject all forms of bigotry and prejudice directed at any of our fellow human beings and fellow Americans. Let us all, in solidarity and in union with the principles of our country, support this resolution.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, could you please tell me how much time the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) has remaining, and how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) has 8 3/4 minutes remaining.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOMERT).

Mr. GOMERT. Mr. Speaker, according to the gentleman from Georgia, so much time has Georgia has 8 3/4 minutes remaining.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOMERT).

Mr. GOMERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to go back to our colleague from Minnesota last week touched a very real, very raw place for me. My desire for the House to go on record again, specifically condemning anti-Semitism, was not a desire to single the gentlewoman out or to stifle debate on U.S. policy towards Israel, but it was a desire and need to say that certain words, no matter who utters them, have no place in our public discourse and, indeed, can be very dangerous.

When a Member of our body speaks the way the Representative from Minnesota spoke, then we need to single it out and say we will not tolerate it. In the last few weeks, these problems have been compounded.
Since the comments that sparked this controversy, the gentlewoman from Minnesota has become the target of vile, racist Islamophobic smears and threats. One begets another. And we have got to put a stop to it now. That is how it is on this House floor, order, so everything has to be the fault of a President who is creating more economic opportunity, reducing unemployment, ending wars, and doing a hell of a job for the country.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 45 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GOTTHEIMER).

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Mr. Speaker, as a Jewish Member of Congress who lost family in the Holocaust and whose grandfather fought the Nazis, I need no reminder about our responsibility to confront bigotry, hatred, and intolerance wherever it is found.

No matter how hard one tries, the allegation of dual loyalty simply does not constitute legitimate opinion about foreign policy. It is a slur against Jews. It is indefensible, and it is deserving of condemnation by everyone in this Chamber. It is offensive to question my loyalty or anyone's loyalty to the United States of America here simply because I am Jewish, the same way it was appalling to question President John Kennedy's loyalty to the United States because he was Catholic.

I am glad that Congress is voicing its opposition to anti-Semitism and made it clear that a dual loyalty smear is unacceptable.

Unfortunately, it was also clear from the discussions this week and the ultimate resolution that anti-Semitism is being treated differently than other forms of bigotry and hatred. There shouldn't be an asterisk next to anti-Semitism, and I will continue to fight it.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has 4 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I fully associate myself with the comments of the gentleman from New York condemning anti-Semitism, full stop, an entirely appropriate thing to do.

I just think it is curious how we got everything together to support this resolution with all kinds of hatred, whether it is Islamophobia, anti-Semitism, any kind of hatred that is what we need to do. And any time that anti-Semitism rears its ugly head, we need to stop it.

This resolution is a fine resolution, and I will support it. But I am very disappointed that we weren't able to have a separate resolution to specifically condemn anti-Semitism and what our colleague said that really was a very hateful term.

I hope we can put everything together in this House. I know we can. I know people on both sides of the aisle want to work together. We want to stomp out any form of hatred, particularly anti-Semitism.

I will continue to work with anybody who wants to do that.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 45 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. Gaetz).

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I fully associate myself with the comments of the gentleman from New York condemning anti-Semitism, full stop, an entirely appropriate thing to do.

I just think it is curious how we got everything together to support this resolution with all kinds of hatred, whether it is Islamophobia, anti-Semitism, any kind of hatred that is what we need to do. And any time that anti-Semitism rears its ugly head, we need to stop it.

This resolution is a fine resolution, and I will support it. But I am very disappointed that we weren't able to have a separate resolution to specifically condemn anti-Semitism and what our colleague said that really was a very hateful term.

I hope we can put everything together in this House. I know we can. I know people on both sides of the aisle want to work together. We want to stomp out any form of hatred, particularly anti-Semitism.

I will continue to work with anybody who wants to do that.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 45 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. Gaetz).

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I fully associate myself with the comments of the gentleman from New York condemning anti-Semitism, full stop, an entirely appropriate thing to do.

I just think it is curious how we got everything together to support this resolution with all kinds of hatred, whether it is Islamophobia, anti-Semitism, any kind of hatred that is what we need to do. And any time that anti-Semitism rears its ugly head, we need to stop it.

This resolution is a fine resolution, and I will support it. But I am very disappointed that we weren't able to have a separate resolution to specifically condemn anti-Semitism and what our colleague said that really was a very hateful term.

I hope we can put everything together in this House. I know we can. I know people on both sides of the aisle want to work together. We want to stomp out any form of hatred, particularly anti-Semitism.

I will continue to work with anybody who wants to do that.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I fully associate myself with the comments of the gentleman from New York condemning anti-Semitism, full stop, an entirely appropriate thing to do.

I just think it is curious how we got everything together to support this resolution with all kinds of hatred, whether it is Islamophobia, anti-Semitism, any kind of hatred that is what we need to do. And any time that anti-Semitism rears its ugly head, we need to stop it.

This resolution is a fine resolution, and I will support it. But I am very disappointed that we weren't able to have a separate resolution to specifically condemn anti-Semitism and what our colleague said that really was a very hateful term.

I hope we can put everything together in this House. I know we can. I know people on both sides of the aisle want to work together. We want to stomp out any form of hatred, particularly anti-Semitism.

I will continue to work with anybody who wants to do that.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I fully associate myself with the comments of the gentleman from New York condemning anti-Semitism, full stop, an entirely appropriate thing to do.

I just think it is curious how we got everything together to support this resolution with all kinds of hatred, whether it is Islamophobia, anti-Semitism, any kind of hatred that is what we need to do. And any time that anti-Semitism rears its ugly head, we need to stop it.

This resolution is a fine resolution, and I will support it. But I am very disappointed that we weren't able to have a separate resolution to specifically condemn anti-Semitism and what our colleague said that really was a very hateful term.

I hope we can put everything together in this House. I know we can. I know people on both sides of the aisle want to work together. We want to stomp out any form of hatred, particularly anti-Semitism.

I will continue to work with anybody who wants to do that.
on every provision or any consideration in that relationship. That is a separate and complete issue from anti-Semitism.

Anti-Semitism, whether it is in the form of attacks on Jewish people, anti-Semitic tropes, prejudicial accusations or any other form of hatred, is deeply and unequivocally offensive and must be condemned wherever it is heard. All of us must remember, as Members of Congress and as the President of the United States, that our words and actions once we cross the threshold into Congress, and, indeed, they weigh a ton when someone becomes the President of the United States.

It is also disturbing that Islamophobia and white supremacy remain a sinister and shameful presence in America today. Too often that goes unnoticed or unchecked. Such attacks have even targeted some of us in this body.

We must condemn these attacks and confront them. As Members of Congress and Americans, we have a solemn and urgent responsibility to fight to end the scourge of bigotry, racism, and hatred in our country.

I did we today salute our colleague, CEDRIC RICHMOND, our distinguished former chair of the Congressional Black Caucus and now distinguished leader in the whip’s operation, for his leadership in shaping this legislation and, again, Congressman JAMIE RASKIN of Maryland for his leadership role in all of this.

I salute all of our Members for demonstrating the courage to have this difficult conversation and for doing so in a spirit of great respect, disagreeing sometimes, but never questioning the patriotism or motivation of anyone with whom we serve.

I thank Chairman NADLER of the Judiciary Committee for the work that he has done to give us this important moment on the floor of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that we will have a unanimous vote in support of this resolution.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I do again want to go back to something. I appreciate the words that have been said here. Again, I cannot emphasize this enough. It took seven pages to describe what simply can be said is: Don’t hate; watch what you say; you are a Member of Congress; we deserve better; the House deserves better. When we understand this, then we can begin to understand.

Also, I want to go back to something that I will hit again. It goes back to this is again something put together because we couldn’t come to agreement on the very nature of what started this which was anti-Semitic comments. And having to have some of our Jewish legislators come down here and condemn that is sad, wanting to have to vote for something that, at the very heart, tore them apart. You can hear it in their voices, but yet they have to vote for this.

We also put it together getting it at 3:20 this afternoon. We left out the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. We left out Wiccans. We left out Jehovah’s Witnesses. We left out disabled people who are often discriminated against and have hateful things said about them.

We also, in the thing, found out that the only ones we are going to condemn getting death threats are Jewish Members and Muslim Members. We are not condemning anything else. This is just another attempt to rush to do something, to fix something.

I said last week, and I will say it again: What makes you feel good doesn’t always heal you. This is another example of a rush project.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. McCARTHY), who is the minority leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I want to start by thanking a Member from the other side of the aisle, Chairman ELIOT ENGEL. I thank the gentleman, for when he heard the language, he stood up. I thank the gentleman for his work.

To all the Members who are here, this shouldn’t be this hard. We should not have to go through the number of versions that we had to. We shouldn’t have to be on this floor even speaking about this. I hope we won’t be back.

Of all the things that have happened this Congress, this is what we have talked about the most. This is the action that this Congress has taken the most. Twice we have to make a statement that we are opposed to anti-Semitism.

The first time it took the minority. It doesn’t have very many abilities to bring something to the floor, but we did, and we spoke with one voice. But now we have a few weeks stating the same thing, but without apologies, without apologies from that voice.

It did not have to be this hard. Mr. Speaker, we didn’t have to break the 72-hour rule that you put in this year to make it less than an hour because of fear of what would happen tomorrow on a motion to recommit.

I will pledge to you this from this side of the aisle, and I hope you understand this clearly: Any hatred, we take action.

I hope you have seen from the action on this side of the aisle where we stand, Mr. Speaker. We didn’t have to have a resolution, but when it came to the floor, we voted for it. We took action on it and to the floor, and it wasn’t simply: Please apologize.

It didn’t have to be this hard.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, our Madam Speaker was right. America is better than this. But to my Members, Congress is better than this.

Please do not make history write about our time with these 2 years that the most we have ever done is that we had to keep bringing resolutions to the floor to tell people that anti-Semitism is wrong if that is the only action we are going to take. I know we are better than this.

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

Mr. Speaker, as we come to the conclusion of our second time doing this, I will echo the sentiments of our leader who just spoke, and I will echo the sentiments of most everyone who has spoken here that this is wrong.

One time, we should learn; two times, we are getting nothing out of this anymore because, undoubtedly, we are getting no input because we are just putting everything we can imagine that we could think of in a short amount of time unless somebody brought it up into a resolution and saying: This is hate. We don’t need to do this.

We don’t need a manual to tell us who we can’t hate. How is it so hard?

Why do we blow process?

Why do we disrespect this institution by bringing together things that are thrown together at the last minute that leave out death threats to any Member besides two groups of Members, that leave out others who have been hated upon?

It breaks my heart. After just a day or so ago speaking of the institutional spirit and hearing the dean of this House talking about working together, it breaks my heart that we are 8, 9 weeks into the session and this is our largest accomplishment, telling the world: Don’t hate.

That is our largest accomplishment? Mr. Speaker, my fear is, with this today, I don’t want to be here again. But with the way this was handled, I fear we may be.

We are better than this. This should not be where we are at.

Why do we keep coming back? Because many times, Members forget the awesome responsibility that they have been given as Members of Congress.

Our mouths and our tongues can be our greatest enemy. Let us remember that as we seek guidance each day.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RICHMOND).

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding.

Let me just say that we are better than this, and we have seen in this body where we have had Members attacked. We came together right here in this body, where we all held hands. We said that words have consequences, and we are going to do better. We were going to set an example. Before we could walk off the floor, there was a commercial running to attack the
character of our then-leader, NANCY PELOSI.

So hollow words mean nothing to me. Booker T. Washington once said that we are as separate as the fingers, but we are as whole as the hand. We come together today, hopefully as the hand, to condemn anti-Semitism, bigotry, racism, all of the phobias, Islamophobia, homophobia. What we do is push love, like Dr. King said.

But in the eulogy for Dr. King, Dr. Benjamin E. Mays blamed, in part, the American experience for the assassination. He pointed out that the assassin heard enough condemnation of Dr. King and of Negroes to feel that he had public support.

When Dylann Roof murdered nine worshippers in Charleston, he thought he had public support. The shooter at the Tree of Life synagogue in Pittsburgh thought he had public support. The neo-Nazis and the white nationalists who marched in Charlottesville thought he had public support.

He pointed out that the assassin heard enough condemnation of Dr. King and of Negroes to feel that he had public support.

When Dylann Roof murdered nine worshippers in Charleston, he thought he had public support. The shooter at the Tree of Life synagogue in Pittsburgh thought he had public support. The neo-Nazis and the white nationalists who marched in Charlottesville thought they had public support.

The shooter of Gabby Giffords thought he had public support. The shooter of STEVE SCALISE thought he had public support.

What are we doing here today is making it unequivocally clear to the public that no one has the support to engage in discrimination and racism and anti-Semitism.

Dr. King’s words are what we need to challenge us as Americans to do better. He said: “We, and not the assassin, represent America at its best.” He said we have the power—not the prejudiced, not the bigoted, not the anti-Semitic, not the assassin—to make things better.

We, too, in Congress have the power and the obligation to make things right. Though we come from dramatically diverse backgrounds and though we have lived very different lives, we must all, right now, stand together against that tragedy.

We must make clear to those who traffic in all forms of hatred—neo-Nazis, white nationalists, racists of all kinds, anti-Semites, Islamophobes, homophobes, transphobes, and those who demonize and demean immigrants from Latin America and throughout the world—that they have no place in the public discourse.

For the record, this will be our third time on anti-Semitic measures. We voted against both of them. You all voted for one and then voted against the other.

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

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, as one of the first Muslim woman elected ever in the history of the United States to Congress, I rise in support of opposing all forms of hate. No one should ever experience feeling less than, live in fear, or be exposed to oppression, discrimination or violence because of their sexual orientation, their immigration status, their skin color, their religion or their ethnicity, their in- come status or any other form of identifiers. I rise in support of our United States Constitution where all beings are created equal and will fight every day to oppose racism in our country.

I urge my colleagues to have an open heart, to be present, to serve with compassion, and to hear one another. My colleagues have a rare opportunity to serve with me, an American Muslim woman, who can offer a different perspective, their immigration status, their faith, and not the assassin, represent America at its best.” He said we have the power—not the prejudiced, not the bigoted, not the anti-Semitic, not the assassin, represent America at its best.”

Mr. Speaker, as one of the first Muslim woman elected ever in the history of the United States to Congress, I rise in support of opposing all forms of hate. No one should ever experience feeling less than, live in fear, or be exposed to oppression, discrimination or violence because of their sexual orientation, their immigration status, their skin color, their religion or their ethnicity, their in- come status or any other form of identifiers. I rise in support of our United States Constitution where all beings are created equal and will fight every day to oppose racism in our country.

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, as one of the first Muslim woman elected ever in the history of the United States to Congress, I rise in support of opposing all forms of hate. No one should ever experience feeling less than, live in fear, or be exposed to oppression, discrimination or violence because of their sexual orientation, their immigration status, their skin color, their religion or their ethnicity, their in- come status or any other form of identifiers. I rise in support of our United States Constitution where all beings are created equal and will fight every day to oppose racism in our country.

Mr. Speaker, as one of the first Muslim woman elected ever in the history of the United States to Congress, I rise in support of opposing all forms of hate. No one should ever experience feeling less than, live in fear, or be exposed to oppression, discrimination or violence because of their sexual orientation, their immigration status, their skin color, their religion or their ethnicity, their in- come status or any other form of identifiers. I rise in support of our United States Constitution where all beings are created equal and will fight every day to oppose racism in our country.

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, as one of the first Muslim woman elected ever in the history of the United States to Congress, I rise in support of opposing all forms of hate. No one should ever experience feeling less than, live in fear, or be exposed to oppression, discrimination or violence because of their sexual orientation, their immigration status, their skin color, their religion or their ethnicity, their in- come status or any other form of identifiers. I rise in support of our United States Constitution where all beings are created equal and will fight every day to oppose racism in our country.
A recorded vote was ordered. The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 219, noes 215, not voting 3, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ayes</th>
<th>Noes</th>
<th>Not Voting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amendment No. 3 offered by Mr. RASKIN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

A recorded vote has been demanded.

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 199, noes 235, not voting 3, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ayes</th>
<th>Noes</th>
<th>Not Voting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

☐ 1747

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MS. PRESSLEY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

[Vote results are not provided in this description.]
The Acting CHAIR. A record vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—aye 200, noes 233, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 112]

AYES—200

Abraham
Aderhold
Allen
Amaesh
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Barker
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bischabron
Blinderman
Boehm
Bones
Bouker
Burchett
Burgos
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cloud
Colle
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curts
Davidson (OH)
Davis, Rodney
Davis, taller
Diaz-Balart
Dulan
Emmer
Erb
Eshoo
Eshoo
Fentener Van Vlack
Fox
Frelinghuysen
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez (TX)

ASSENDER=“PRESENT”—2

Himes
Porter

NOT VOTING—4

Clay
Gonzals

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

[1754]

Mmes. PLASKETT, SPEIER, WATERS, and Mr. CICILLINE changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. Chair, during rollcall vote Number 111 on H.R. 1, I mistaken recorded my vote as “yes” when I should have voted “no” on amendment No. 24 from Ms. PRESSLEY.

AMENDMENT NO. 25 OFFERED BY MR. GREEN OF TENNESSEE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GREEN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

Cueello
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutsch
Digsell
Doggett
Doe, Michael F.
Engel
Espaillat
Louise
Eveland
Evans
Fineman-Kenan
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel
Fudge
Garcia
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Garden
Galloway
Garrett
Gates
Gehanna
Gallagher
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez (TX)

NOES—233

Adams
Allen
Anne
Barragan
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyrer
 Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt
Bourjous
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brandt
Brown (MD)
Brownley
Brown
Caulfield
Carballo
Carbajal
Cardenas
Caron (IN)
Carter
Caster (IL)
Caster (FL)
Castro (TX)
Che, Judy
Clark
Clarke (NY)
Clarke
Cleaver
Clifford
Cohen
Connolly
Connolly
Corrrea
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Craig
Crow

REFERENCE:

Mr. ROYBAL-ALLARD: I am still of the opinion that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON) will press his amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.
The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded. A recorded vote was ordered. The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 194, noes 237, not voting 5, as follows:

[Vote results not included]

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 195, noes 237, not voting 5, as follows:

[Vote results not included]
The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will record the following new section:

"SEC. 308. LIMITING VARIATIONS ON NUMBER OF HOURS OF OPERATION OF POLLING PLACES WITHIN A STATE."

(a) LIMITATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2) and subsection (b), each State shall establish hours of operation for all polling places in the State on the date of any election for Federal office held in the State such that the polling place with the greatest number of hours of operation on such date is not in operation for more than 2 hours longer than the polling place with the fewest number of hours of operation on such date.

(2) PERMITTING VARIANCE ON BASIS OF POPULATION.—Paragraph (1) does not apply to the extent that the State establishes variations in the hours of operation of polling places on the basis of the overall population or the voting age population (as the State may select) of the unit of local government in which the polling place is located.

(b) EXCEPTIONS FOR POLLING PLACES WITH HOURS ESTABLISHED BY UNITS OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT.—Subsection (a) does not apply in the case of a polling place—

(i) whose hours of operation are established, in accordance with State law, by the unit of local government in which the polling place is located;

(ii) which is required pursuant to an order by a court to extend its hours of operation beyond the hours otherwise established.

(2) PERMITTING VARIANCE ON BASIS OF POPULATION.—Paragraph (1) does not apply to the extent that the State establishes variations in the hours of operation of polling places in the State on the date of any election for Federal office held in the State.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 172, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BRINDISI) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BRINDISI. Mr. Chair, I first want to thank the gentleman from Maryland for his work on this important topic, and I also want to thank him for his willingness to work with Members of this body to address our concerns regarding the finance of this bill.

Thanks to the changes that I supported and pushed for, we have ensured that no taxpayer dollars will go towards financing political campaigns. It is a testament to what we can accomplish when we work together and compromise.

This bill has many important provisions which will make it easier for working families to have their voices heard. My amendment would extend these wins to the people of upstate New York who have been treated unfairly for years by arbitrary restrictions on polling hours.

In New York State, voters in New York City and neighboring counties have had to travel to vote in the State legislature in order to cast their vote in Federal primary elections compared to voters in my district. A voter in New York City can vote on their way to work when the polls open at 6 a.m. A voter in Binghamton, on the other hand, can't vote in that same election until their polls open at noon.

My amendment would fix this situation and institute some basic rules to prevent States from reducing polling hours for people based solely on where they live. This is an important step to ensure that all voters across the State are treated fairly.

I urge adoption of my amendment, and I again thank the gentleman from Maryland for his leadership on this bill, and I urge our colleagues to pass the underlying legislation.

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

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Chair, as we look at H.R. 1, at least the limited amount of time that we have had to actually consider H.R. 1 as it has been rushed through the committee process and it has been rushed to the House floor—it grew from 571 pages when we had the opportunity to briefly review it our first day or for 5 hours before the House Administration Committee. It has significantly grown since then before it even came to the floor.

But as those who do take a look at it realize, yes, there may be some good ideas in H.R. 1 and a lot of good ideas that are in H.R. 1 are things that are already in the States. They are ideas that States have implemented.

This amendment, when you look at it, it sounds like a good idea. Well, let's put all of the polling places on the same timeframe.

I submit to my good colleague from New York, if there is an issue in New York, then the gentleman ought to lobby his State legislature to make that change because the Constitution gives that power to the State legislatures.

Mr. Chair, as I was coming to Washington again this week, I left my home early on Tuesday morning, and I went to the State capitol in Georgia where I had the opportunity to address both the house and the State legislature, which I served in both of those bodies.

What was amazing, as I talked about this bill, there was bipartisan opposition to this bill. Why? Because this bill strips away the authority of States to actually set their own laws regarding elections.

No one may think it is a good idea to centralize that power here in Washington, D.C., but the problem is the landscape of America is diverse. The geography of America is diverse, and the States are more well-suited to actually meet the constituencies' needs of their State. 1.

Some would say that the Federal Government is more powerful; we can actually enforce this across the board.
Well, the one-size-fits-all doesn’t work, and besides that, we don’t do very much very efficiently.

As I was looking at the State legislature, there is one thing that I know: Their session in Georgia is going to end in a few days, and by the end of that session, they will have passed a budget and appropriations to fund the State of Georgia for the next year, and it will balance.

Mr. Chairman, do you know the last time that we did that by our deadline? Newt Gingrich was Speaker of the House. We can’t even pass our own appropriations here. We are not even following our own laws, but we want to take this New law and force the United States to follow what we think is a good idea?

Early voting, we established that in Georgia years ago, and it has worked well, and we have worked to perfect that.

Mr. Chairman, while this amendment may sound good and it may be well-needed in New York, I would submit to my colleague that this is something that the New York Legislature should take up. This is not something that should be under the purview of Congress.

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

Mr. BRINDISI. Mr. Chairman, I again urge adoption of my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Chairman, again, I love this country. I love what this country has stood for, I love the idea of our Founding Fathers, who made the greatest of all constitutions in the history of the entire world. It is unique because our Founders understood that a government that is closest to the people is the most effective and the most efficient. This bill will undo 220-plus years of States setting their own voting requirements, running their own voter laws.

As I have stated, there is little that we do efficiently here, and we have already uncovered that there are a lot of unintended consequences in this bill. If the States make mistakes, they are much faster, much quicker, and more responsive to correct those mistakes than we would be here.

I encourage my colleagues to vote against this amendment and vote against the underlying measure.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. BRINDISI).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BRINDISI. Mr. Chair, I demand a recrimination.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 172, the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. CASE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chair, I rise today to speak in favor of my proposed amendment.

This amendment will empower small dollar donors to participate in our elections process and focus the attention of candidates and political parties on earning financial support from a broader base of voters.

All across our political spectrum, we decry the historically low esteem in which Congress is now held, as well as the utter absence of many, if not most, of our fellow citizens from their government, as well as the very few, mostly moneyed and influential interests of our country, then that does not lead to representative decisions and erodes the consent of the governed, the political and social consensus on which our democracy is based.

As just one manifestation of this dangerous and worsening syndrome, the Center for Responsive Politics reviewed 2018 election-cycle contributions and found that, still again: “Only a tiny fraction of Americans actually give campaign contributions to political candidates, parties, or PACs. The ones who give contributions large enough to be itemized, over $200, is even smaller. The impact of these donations, however, is huge.”

In fact, according to the center, while less than a half percent of the population contributed $200 or more, their contributions totaled 71 percent of all individual contributions in 2018 to candidates, PACs, parties, and outside groups.

The clear corollary is that the vast majority of Americans do not participate in our elections with their financial support and that, of those who do contribute, their voices are drowned in a sea of larger contributions from a precariously narrow, interest base.

This is why leading reform groups such as Issue One and its ReFormers Caucus, a fully bipartisan group of now over 30 former Congress, Governors, and Cabinet members committed to nonpartisan solutions to fixing our broken system, cites increased and broadened voter participation in the election process through means such as amplifying the voices of small donors as key to returning our government to the people.

My amendment would take one small but meaningful step in that direction by authorizing national political party committees to provide enhanced support to candidates through use of separate small dollar accounts.

SEC. 4501. PERMITTING POLITICAL PARTY COMMITTEES TO PROVIDE ENHANCED SUPPORT FOR CANDIDATES THROUGH USE OF SEPARATE SMALL DOLLAR ACCOUNTS.

(a) INCREASE IN LIMIT ON CONTRIBUTIONS TO CANDIDATES.—Section 313(a)(2)(A) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30116(a)(2)(A)) is amended by striking “$5,000” and inserting “$5,000 or” and, in the case of a contribution made by a national committee of a political party from an account described in paragraph (1), exceed $10,000”.

(b) ELIMINATION OF LIMIT ON COORDINATED EXPENDITURES.—Section 315(d)(5) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30116(d)(5)) is amended by striking “subsection (a)(9)” and inserting “subsection (a)(9) or subsection (a)(11)”.

(c) ACCOUNTS DESCRIBED.—Section 315(a) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30116(a)), as amended by section 512(a), is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(11) An account described in this paragraph is a national committee account of a national committee of a political party (including a national congressional campaign committee of a political party) consisting exclusively of amounts made during a calendar year by individuals whose aggregate contributions to the committee during the year do not exceed $200. . .

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to elections held on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 172, the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. CASE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chair, I rise today to speak in favor of my proposed amendment.

This amendment will empower small dollar donors to participate in our elections process and focus the attention of candidates and political parties on earning financial support from a broader base of voters.

All across our political spectrum, we decry the historically low esteem in which Congress is now held, as well as the utter absence of many, if not most, of our fellow citizens from their government, as well as the very few, mostly moneyed and influential interests of our country, then that does not lead to representative decisions and erodes the consent of the governed, the political and social consensus on which our democracy is based.

As just one manifestation of this dangerous and worsening syndrome, the Center for Responsive Politics reviewed 2018 election-cycle contributions and found that, still again: “Only a tiny fraction of Americans actually give campaign contributions to political candidates, parties, or PACs. The ones who give contributions large enough to be itemized, over $200, is even smaller. The impact of these donations, however, is huge.”

In fact, according to the center, while less than a half percent of the population contributed $200 or more, their contributions totaled 71 percent of all individual contributions in 2018 to candidates, PACs, parties, and outside groups.

The clear corollary is that the vast majority of Americans do not participate in our elections with their financial support and that, of those who do contribute, their voices are drowned in a sea of larger contributions from a precariously narrow, interest base.

This is why leading reform groups such as Issue One and its ReFormers Caucus, a fully bipartisan group of now over 30 former Congress, Governors, and Cabinet members committed to nonpartisan solutions to fixing our broken system, cites increased and broadened voter participation in the election process through means such as amplifying the voices of small donors as key to returning our government to the people.

My amendment would take one small but meaningful step in that direction by authorizing national political party committees to provide enhanced support to candidates through use of separate, small dollar accounts, this change would incentivize greater attention by committees of all parties to small dollar donors, greater participation by such donors in the political process, and representation of a broader and more representative America by those elected.

I urge support for my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEUSER), my good friend, one of our newest Members, and a great guy.
Mr. MEUSER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1.

The people have a right to know what this bill truly is: a Big Government, central command takeover of our elections by the new House majority. This bill shall be called the Democracy Protection Act.

This legislation is virtually a complete takeover by the Federal Government of State and local voting jurisdictions. It imposes new mandates, including more than 2 weeks of mandatory early voting and same-day registration, and diminishes the process of election day voting by expanding absentee voting and allowing both current and newly registered voters to cast their ballots by mail, with no additional safeguards to that process.

The bill also allows felons to vote, violating our Constitution by usurping the 14th Amendment ability of States to determine whether felons may vote or not.

An example of its impracticality can be seen in Lenhartsville Borough, Berks County, in my district, a small borough with a polling place that averages 60 voters each election. This bill would mandate that Lenhartsville open and operate a polling place for 15 days of early voting that is absurd.

Astonishingly, this bill also includes a 6-to-1 match of public funds to the campaign of a candidate that individual taxpayers may not even support on contributions up to $200. That is a possible $1,200 match of public funds going to fund political campaigns for each contribution.

This legislation is not for the people. It is for partisan power. H.R. 1 isn’t just terrible policy, it is an attempt to rewrite the rules of the political process itself and change the rules to favor one side.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose it, and I hope they will stand with me in defending the Constitution and the sanctity of our elections. I urge a “no” vote.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I appreciate the comments of my colleague, but I did not detect in his comments any objection to the amendment.

I am still opposed to the amendment because these incentivization programs that are code word incentivized are part of H.R. 1, and instead I think they are going to be gamed by many of the same people who are gaming the system right now.

Many of my colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle said they want to get money out of politics, and we are talking about putting more in. The amendment here is just a small part of a big problem of what this bill is about. The gentleman from Hawaii said that we need to block both parties, he could agree to sit down with the gentleman in a bipartisan way to talk about how we can make campaign finance reforms work.

But the clear fact is we have been shown zero consideration as Republicans over here to go and work out solutions in this bill. We weren’t asked to even be considered to help write provisions in this bill. No one was even called, none of us, no one on our side. As a matter of fact, I guess we didn’t know the special interest groups who helped write this bill and who were touted in the press conference when this bill was announced.

We got zero Republican amendments passed during our markup in only one committee, which left 40 percent of the bill out from being marked up. That is not the regular order that the Democrats promised when you took the majority. That is what we get.

Today, the olive branch has been extended numerous times. I have accepted Democrat amendments, and do you know what? Not a single Republican amendment has passed, even one during the last round of votes that all it did was give a sense of Congress that we like free speech.

Seriously? You have got to be kidding me. You couldn’t even accept that amendment? How partisan can this new Democrat majority be?

This is why this bill is terrible. It is the biggest terrible bill I have ever seen in my time here in Congress. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, first of all, to my colleague, I accept the gentleman’s offer to work in a bipartisan way to fix some of these major problems. I look forward to it, number one.

Number two, the gentleman referenced that special interest groups had drafted this amendment. If there is a special interest group, it is the Reformers Caucus, on a bipartisan basis.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Real quick, I was not referring to the amendment. It was the bill itself.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. CASE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 57 OFFERED BY MS. HOULAHAN

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 57 printed in part B of House Report 116-16.

Ms. HOULAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 136, line 1, strike “4 hours” and insert “10 hours”.
Page 136, line 3, strike “4 hours” and insert “10 hours”.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 172, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Ms. HOULAHAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Ms. HOULAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I was sent to Congress by the Sixth District of Pennsylvania.
to fix the broken culture in Washington. H.R. 1 will help to reduce the role of money in politics and address the culture of corruption in Congress. I rise today to support my amendment, No. 57.

This bill also takes key steps to expand voting access to eligible voters. Currently, my constituents in Pennsylvania have no access to early voting and have severe absentee restrictions on voting by mail. This bill will introduce early voting and vote by mail to all 50 States which will greatly help working families who may have trouble voting around their working schedules on election day.

I am introducing an amendment to further expand this early voting provision to mandate at least 10 hours of early voting each day for the final 15 days before election.

Expanding access to early voting, especially in Pennsylvania, is a key component to bringing the government back to the people by helping people with inflexible hours or people who work shift work to exercise their right to vote. This ensures that their voice is heard and that they are represented in our government.

This week, with H.R. 1, we are taking a big step to returning us to government of, by, and for the people.

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, it is great to have you in the chair again tonight. I rise to oppose this amendment; although, again, I want to compliment my new colleague, Ms. HOULAHAN, for coming back here and being a participant in the legislative process. It has been great to get to know the gentlewoman and work with her, and I look forward to working together on a bipartisan basis as we move forward during this term.

I have got to oppose this amendment because I have opposed others that are just like it.

We want every American to be able to cast their vote, to be registered to vote, and have the ability to have their vote counted and their vote protected. My issue is with a top-down approach from the Federal Government versus the State and local governments. This amendment, though well-intentioned, just, again, infringes on our State and local authority to determine how best to run their elections.

Additionally, this mandate increases the cost of all election offices, as it is tasked to recruit, train, and deploy additional poll workers, where we already know we have a shortage.

I would love to work with my colleague, Ms. HOULAHAN, moving forward to address many issues involving election reform. Unfortunately, I just don’t think H.R. 1 is the answer, and I don’t think it is going to be passed into law, so there are going to be opportunities for us to work together. Again, my bipartisan olive branch is reaching out, once again, to the gentlewoman’s side, and I certainly hope she will accept.

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

Ms. HOULAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I very much appreciate the bipartisan spirit and the olive branch that the gentleman has reached out to me.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES).

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentlewoman for yielding her time, and I want to commend her on this amendment.

I want to respond to this idea of this kind of top-down federalization of our voting. That is not what is happening here. The States need to continue to have the authority to put together how elections operate. What we are doing is we are collecting best practices and then making a policy decision at the Federal level that those best practices ought to extend across the country.

If you think about it, Mr. Chairman, that is our role as Federal legislators. Our purpose here is to gather up wisdom from all parts of the country, figure out what things work and what things don’t work, and if it rises to a level of being a good policy suggestion, then putting that into legislation. That is what we are doing, and that is what this particular change would do, and it would make it much easier for people to access the ballot box.

So, again, I want to thank Congresswoman HOULAHAN for this amendment, and I support it.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments from the author of this bill. He and I have had some spirited discussions over the last day and a half, but I appreciate his willingness to want to address issues. I just don’t think this bill is the answer.

To respond to the author of the bill, there is a big difference between offering best practices to our State and local officials about how best to run their elections, making a difference between best practices and suggestions versus mandates, and that is clearly what H.R. 1 is. It is going to be a mandate.

It is so nebulous. We get answers one day that change the next. There is zero bipartisanship. We haven’t been included. All of a sudden, we get a new shell game: Move over; we are going to fund it by doing this and put corporate money now into congressional campaigns, which is illegal now, but I guess it is a solution to get the money out of politics to the majority. I don’t understand this. This has got to be one of the most discombobulated processes that I have ever been a part of. I can’t help myself to think there is no way that every Democrat who cosponsored this bill on day one thinking they were going to talk about election reform had any idea of so many of the terrible, terrible provisions for taxpayers that are in this bill.

Again, Mr. Chairman, if you vote for this bill, you are putting corporate cash into congressional campaigns. There is no way the billions upon billions of promises that are made to congressional candidates and incumbents are going to be able to be fulfilled with this new, nebulous corporate malfeasance fund that we haven’t even had scored by the CBO.

Billions of dollars of taxpayer money are going to fight a revamp of how public money goes into congressional campaigns. This is the worst of the worst of what the D.C. swamp is all about.

I am going to lightly oppose this amendment because I really respect Ms. HOULAHAN and her efforts. I just have a big problem with the bill, as I think you can tell.

Mr. Chairman, I will give Ms. HOULAHAN, likely, the last word. I reserve my right to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. HOULAHAN. Mr. Chairman, again, I urge the adoption of my amendment and also the adoption of H.R. 1 so that we can once again restore the faith of the people and focus on the working Americans of today.

Mr. Chairman, if you do a shift or even if you have a 9 to 5 job, it is very, very hard to get to the polls, particularly in Pennsylvania.

Mr. Chairman, I look forward to supporting my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I think every American who is eligible to vote deserves to have the right to vote, to have their vote counted, and to have their vote be protected.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. HOULAHAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I think every American who is eligible to vote deserves to have the right to vote, to have their vote counted, and to have their vote be protected.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. HOULAHAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I think every American who is eligible to vote deserves to have the right to vote, to have their vote counted, and to have their vote be protected.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. HOULAHAN).

The amendment was agreed to.
The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, the language of the amendment is pretty innocuous. The problem I have is the portion of the bill that it amends. Thus, in this now almost 700-page, mammoth bill that anyone thinks it is a good idea to weaponize the FEC by making it partisan. It is the furthest thing from where we should be as an institution.

This amendment does nothing to address this partisan FEC that the bill establishes.

The biggest threat to our elections is actually partisanship, and a partisan FEC will undermine the neutrality that voters expect of an agency that oversees Federal elections, especially when the billions upon billions upon billions of new dollars come in from the programs that are created in this bill.

A partisan FEC is going to give enhanced powers to the chairman to make decisions on behalf of the commission that have been reserved for years for the full commission.

I fully expect a higher standard of protection of free speech to be embraced by a partisan FEC.

As former chairman of our own Franking Commission here in the House of Representatives, I think bipartisan agencies can work together, but bipartisan commissions can work together.

Heck, we are not even allowed to send a bulk mail piece out of this institution without Republicans and Democrats signing off on it. If we can’t send bulk mail out without it being bipartisan, why in the world would we want to make the FEC partisan?

Do the Democrats really want the Trump administration to have a partisan FEC? I don’t want any party to have a partisan FEC. I want it to remain an institution where it takes bipartisanship to get results.

I would urge my good friend, Mr. PHILLIPS, if he hasn’t, to sit down with some of the FEC commissioners and talk to them about their opinion of why the FEC is bipartisan, and I would urge the gentleman to work with them. This bill is not going to pass. The amendment, likely, will get ruled by two vacancies. They can’t make a decision.

And then it allows the commission tocentralize litigation within the Department of Justice.

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

Mr. Chair, I am going to oppose the amendment because of the underlying language regarding the FEC. It empowers the FEC to actually do its job, which is to look out for voters. That is quite simple and quite apparent to me.
I commend Mr. PHILLIPS for being here to legislate. I welcome the gentleman to Congress, and I look forward to working with him and appreciate his opportunity to be a part of the process. I thank the gentleman for letting me be a part of it with him.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PHILLIPS).

The amendment was agreed to.

**AMENDMENT NO. 62 OFFERED BY MR. LEVIN OF MICHIGAN**

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 61 printed in part B of House Report 116–16. Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 220, insert after line 16 the following:

(E) The individual or (in the case of the covered periods described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (3)) an immediate family member of the individual paid a civil money penalty or criminal fine, or was sentenced to a term of imprisonment, for violating any provision of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended (2 U.S.C. 3001 et seq.).

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 172, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Chair, I am a proud cosponsor of H.R. 1, the For the People Act.

This historic package of democracy and anticorruption reforms will put power back in the hands of the people and restore the American people’s faith that government works for the public interest, not the special interests.

I am pleased that my bill, the Transparency in Corporate Political Spending Act, and amendment to H.R. 1, will protect our democracy by prohibiting campaign finance law violators and their immediate family members from serving on redistricting commissions.

Congress needs to ensure that we set out commonsense minimum criteria for people who will serve on redistricting commissions in States across the country. We must ensure that redistricting commissions nationwide are free of individuals and immediate relatives of individuals who have knowingly and willfully committed a violation of the Federal Election Campaign Act.

In November 2018, the people of Michigan overwhelmingly passed Voters Not Politicians, a ballot initiative that sets up a nonpartisan redistricting commission to create State legislative and congressional districts after the 2020 census. About seven or eight States have already done this, and more are considering it.

If we are going to transform our democracy, we must do it right. I could not be more proud to vote to end the dominance of big money in our political system, to guarantee free and fair elections that are open to all, and to ensure public officials work for the public interest.

I would like to thank Congressman SARBANES and the members of the Democracy Reform Task Force for their unrelenting efforts to reclaim our democracy for and by the people. Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support the For the People Act and to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

**Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, I am going to rise in opposition to this amendment, although I am not opposed.**

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

**Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, I am not opposed to this amendment.**

I just want to take the time to welcome our new colleague, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), and I would like the gentleman to give my utmost thanks to his dad, who we stood on this floor with these same microphones, and I was able to work in a bipartisan way with him to pass the EACH Act that allowed for a religious exemption from the individual mandates of ObamaCare, of the Affordable Care Act.

That is now law, and that is a sign of bipartisanship that I hope to be able to continue while we work together. Give him my best. The Christian Scientists that are in my district at Principia College, one of the largest Christian Science institutions in the Nation, are very thankful that they are not now being penalized by the Tax Code for a religious exemption from seeking medical care from doctors and medical professionals.

So my thanks to the gentleman’s father, and I thank the gentleman for being here.

**Mr. Chair, I am not going to oppose this amendment. I will reserve just in case somebody wants to come up and talk about something else and I can rebut them, but I am ready to close if the gentleman is.**

The CHAIR. I reserve the balance of my time.

**Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Chair, I deeply appreciate the gentleman from Illinois’ kind remarks. I will absolutely do so. I will call him tonight and tell him truly, that the gentleman said that.**

I really appreciate the incredible honor and opportunity to be here working with the gentleman to do the people’s business. I really hope we will get a chance to work together on any number of bills to perfect and expand our democracy.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

The amendment was agreed to.

**AMENDMENT NO. 62 OFFERED BY MRS. TRAHAN**

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 62 printed in part B of House Report 116–16. Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 220, insert after line 16 the following:

(E) The individual or (in the case of the covered periods described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (3)) an immediate family member of the individual paid a civil money penalty or criminal fine, or was sentenced to a term of imprisonment, for violating any provision of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended (2 U.S.C. 3001 et seq.).

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 172, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mrs. TRAHAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. TRAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I commend my friend, the Congressman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES) for offering one of the most significant reforms to our election system in a generation. I am particularly pleased that H.R. 1 puts redistricting in the hands of independent commissions, where it belongs.

Under the bill, each State will create 15-person independent redistricting commissions that represent the public’s interests first and foremost, without consideration of political party advantage.

However, to prevent the real or perceived risk of bias, H.R. 1 excludes several categories of people from serving
on these commissions, including political candidates or officeholders, campaign officials, big donors, and lobbyists.

My amendment would simply add to this list those individuals who are registered under the Foreign Agents Registration Act, FARA.

FARA has been in law since the 1930s. It requires disclosure when an individual is acting as a political representative of foreign governments.

As a former election official, adding foreign agents will help ensure that those serving on the independent redistricting commissions are not at risk of actual or perceived conflicts of interest.

Coming from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, which gave our Nation the term “gerrymander,” I am pleased that H.R. 1 will put an end to this device by allowing voters to choose their representatives rather than the other way around.

My amendment aims to close a loophole by ensuring that registered foreign agents, like lobbyists and big donors, may not serve on redistricting commissions.

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from Massachusetts. It is great to see her, and I thank her for putting this amendment forward.

I have a problem with the underlying provisions of the bill. I actually support redistricting reform.

I am from Illinois. I am a Republican. We are not going to have a single say in how the Democrats in the super-majority Illinois House and the super-majority Illinois Senate, and our newly elected progressive Governor, are not going to have a say in how these maps are drawn.

I certainly hope we can get an independent redistricting commission because, since this bill is not going to pass the Senate, it is not going to become law. I certainly hope that we could come together and work on some independent redistricting issues.

Mr. Chair, I will, again, not oppose the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. TRAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I applaud the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the gentlewoman from Massachusetts for simply an excellent amendment. This strengthens the provisions in the underlying bill to make sure that agents of foreign principals would have no role in these commissions.

I think it is important that we understand that the citizens who serve on these commissions have no agenda, not for one party or the other, and certainly not for some foreign country.

It is really a very good amendment. I am so glad that she offered it.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I am highly concerned with the redistricting provisions in this bill, as it seems that now, as part of the bill, that one State is going to be exempted.

At what point, then, do we not question why everyone doesn’t have the same ability to opt out of provisions of this bill, just like the State of Iowa has done in an amendment that was accepted.

The sheer fact that if Iowa’s independent redistricting commission is better and, thus, we shouldn’t have to apply the same standards as the other 49 States in this great Nation, then why don’t we use Iowa’s independent redistricting commission standards for everyone? Why don’t we make the whole bill about Iowa?

I mean, I have been talking about federalism and States having to follow top-down Federal mandates, in most cases, that are going to be unfunded or needlessly funded because we really don’t know how they are going to get those funds to our States and localities.

But the sheer fact that we are debating a bill that has a provision about independent redistricting that could have been very, very bipartisan, now we have exempted one State out, it basically tells all of us that is a better commission.

I hope that when we come back, after this bill passes the House, unfortunately for many of my colleagues who are going to vote for it on the other side of the aisle, I hope we can come together and have the debate on whether Iowa’s commission is better than what was proposed in this bill.

You cannot have a 360-page bill that talks about something seriously good for the people it is, for all of the provisions that are this top-down approach, and then, all of a sudden, you exempt one State out of what could have been one of the most bipartisan provisions, and that is independent redistricting.

If you are serious about governing, the majority ought to offer an amendment, ought to offer a change, to make Iowa’s independent commission the language of the bill. Make it work in States, even where they have independent commissions.

I would sure like it to work in Illinois. Maybe California would want to use Iowa’s commission because clearly it is better than what you have in the bill, or we wouldn’t have had to take an amendment on it.

Well, I think I got my point across.

I say to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Mrs. TRAHAN), your amendment is a good amendment. I apologize I had to use this time to address an issue that is very frustrating, but the gentlewoman is talking about redistricting.

I appreciate what she has done. I welcome her to the floor of the House, and I look forward to working with her.

Again, my offer to the gentlewoman is the same as others. When this bill fails in the Senate, let’s come together on some provisions. I will continue to throw the bipartisan olive branch out toward that side of the aisle, and I look forward to working with the gentlewoman. Congratulations. I won’t oppose the amendment.

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

Mrs. TRAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Illinois. I also look forward to working in a bipartisan way to restore our government to the people.

I urge a “yes” vote on this amendment. I urge a “yes” on H.R. 1. I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Mrs. TRAHAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

Amendment No. 51 offered by Mrs. TRAHAN

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 53 printed in part B of House Report 116-16.

Mrs. TRAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

SEC. 1705. EXTENDING GUARANTEE OF RESIDENCY FOR VOTING PURPOSES TO FAMILY MEMBERS OF ABSENT MILITARY PERSONNEL.

Section 102 of the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act (52 U.S.C. 20302) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(j) GUARANTEE OF RESIDENCY FOR SPOUSES AND DEPENDENTS OF ABSENT MEMBERS OF UNIFORMED SERVICE.—For the purposes of voting for in any election for any Federal office in the State or local office, a spouse or dependent of an individual who is an absent uniformed services voter described in subparagraph (A) or (B) of section 107(1) shall not solely by reason of that individual’s absence and without regard to whether or not such spouse or dependent is accompanying that individual—

“(1) be deemed to have lost a residence or domicile in that State, without regard to whether or not that individual intends to return to that State;

“(2) be deemed to have acquired a residence or domicile in any other State; or

“(3) be deemed to have become a resident in or a resident of any other State.”.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 172, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mrs. TRAHAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. TRAHAN. Mr. Chairman, under current law, our brave men and women serving our country in uniform are able to maintain their residency status for the purposes of voting during deployment. Current law also protects voting residency status if a spouse of a servicemember is absent from their State in order to accompany the servicemember on a deployment.
However, current law does not protect the residency status of a spouse if he or she is absent but without accompanying the deployed servicemember. My amendment fixes this loophole. It will ensure that these spouses may maintain their residency status, regardless of whether they accompany their spouse. Moreover, my amendment would extend the same protection to voting-age dependents.

The absence of a servicemember who is deployed can be an enormous hardship on a family. It means a caregiver is no longer at home to share in parenting duties. In these cases, it is natural to rely upon friends and family, even those in another State, for support. However, these families should not lose the right to vote in their home district if they are absent while their spouse is deployed. Furthermore, my amendment extends those same protections to voting-age children.

This is an amendment about ensuring those who sacrifice the most for the defense of our Nation are treated fairly and that they have a voice and a vote in our elections.

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although, once again, I am not opposed to the amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, this is a great amendment. I commend Mrs. TRAHAN because it is vitally important that we protect the families of our Nation’s military. It is very important we remember those who sacrifice everything to serve us, and we should ensure that they are not lose the right to vote in their home district if they are absent while their spouse is deployed. Furthermore, my amendment extends those same protections to voting-age children.

This is an amendment about ensuring those who sacrifice the most for the defense of our Nation are treated fairly and that they have a voice and a vote in our elections.

Mrs. TRAHAN. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman from Illinois once again. I thank the gentlewoman from California. She made this easy on me, and I appreciate that.

I urge a “yes” vote on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The Chair is the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Mrs. TRAHAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

SECTION 1505. PAPER BALLOT PRINTING REQUIREMENTS.

Section 301(a) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21081(a)), as amended by section 1504, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(8) PRINTING REQUIREMENTS FOR BALLOTS.—All paper ballots used in an election for Federal office shall be printed in the United States or on paper manufactured in the United States.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 172, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. KIM) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. KIM. Mr. Chair, I rise to offer my amendment to H.R. 1, which will require Federal election ballots to be made in America.

In short, this is a win-win for the American people. It will help protect American jobs by ensuring that manufacturing stays right here in America. It will help protect the integrity of our Federal elections, which are increasingly under attack by foreign powers.

We have an opportunity today to not only help clean up our government, but create jobs and secure our elections.

I hope that my colleagues from both sides of the aisle will come together to make the democracy we swore to protect truly of, by, and for the people.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense made-in-America amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, I don’t know if I have had a chance to formally meet Mr. KIM. I welcome him and thank him for being here to participate in the process.

Mr. Speaker, I guess I would like to have some details on what percentage of ballots that are used in the United States right now are not printed in the U.S.

The issue I have is not with United-States-made printing materials, it is with the sheer fact that we are having a top-down approach once again.

I mean, there is always going to be exceptions. Some of our territories may raise the cost of importing paper to be able to now live up to the paper ballot marking whatever requirements that are in this 700-page bill.

We can work together on these provisions, but we also might want to work together as this bill fails in the Senate.

Mr. Chair, if this is something Mr. KIM wants to work on together, I am willing to work on it with him, but let’s have some room in there for some exceptions.

I mean, let’s say it is almost election day, you have got wildfires roaring all over California and there is a paper shortage in the country. We can’t stop them, maybe we need some exceptions. We can’t stop the election, maybe we need an exception.

So let’s work together, let’s do something like that so that nobody loses a chance to be able to cast their vote on election day, to have their vote counted, and even just as importantly, to have their vote protected.

Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for his amendment. I have got to oppose this, because there are no exceptions in here, but I appreciate the gentleman’s willingness to work together after this is done.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.
Mr. KIM. Mr. Chair, I just want to start by saying that I am very much looking forward to being able to continue to work with the gentleman from Illinois throughout my time here. I appreciate his welcome to me here on the House floor.

Mr. Chair, for me, as we go about this, it is essential that we understand that our ballots are the most fundamental form of our democracy that citizens here are engaged in, that we understand that this tangible manifestation of that participation that each and every voter plays.

So this is a manifestation of our value, our collective value that this is the sacred symbol of our democracy, this tangible form that our voters take, that this should be something of, by, and for the American people. That is something that I think would be an important signal from the United States Congress across this country that we recognize the importance of that and we want to hold and commit to making sure that this tangible piece of our democracy is something that is made in America.

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey.

Look, I am all for increasing American manufacturing. I am all for building new paper plants, but I would urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to remember they are probably going to burn more fossil fuels. You know, if we are going to have to cut down more trees, maybe we will get some bipartisanship when it comes to deforestation, which could help cut down on forest fires that may cause the problems that would need the exceptions to talk about earlier.

So I certainly hope this fits into the New Green Deal provisions that are going to be voted on in the Senate. There is a lot of talk about paper in this bill. And in this bill, actually the paper keeps growing. It is upwards of 700 pages now.

Mr. Chair, I just got a very important piece of paper with the new CBO score, so I assume we are going to be talking about that soon.

Ms. LOFGREN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chair, I would remind the gentleman of the recycled ballot amendment that had passed earlier today relative to the issue of cutting down trees.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, I am all for more paper production. Those paper plants that exist in my district, you know, they use recycled materials, too. I am more than happy to have more trees be deforested out of areas that are caught up in wildfires on an annual basis.

If we could have the paper that is going to work, if the other side is okay with burning more fossil fuels to make this happen, hey, maybe we won’t need those exceptions I talked about, maybe we will have enough American manufacturing and paper jobs. Some of the best paying jobs in my district are at the paper mills.

Mr. Chair, I am certainly looking forward to working with the gentleman when this bill fails. Especially after seeing some of the preliminary numbers out of this new CBO score. I don’t know how many cosponsors of this bill are going to be able to cast a vote for it, but I will reserve judgment until I see the board tomorrow.

Mr. Chair, I am ready to close, but since I have the right to close, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KIM. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the perspective on the other end, and I understand our common value that, of course, we would want to see things made in America, and I want to make sure that I constantly, as I will every time on this floor, talk about bipartisanship as we move forward.

I reiterate that this is a commonsense amendment that is simply good policy. My amendment would give a leg up to domestic supply chains and ensure that taxpayer dollars are used to support local middle-class jobs and boost our economy.

Amendments like mine also ensure that when Federal agencies buy products to carry out their responsibilities, that they put American manufacturers first.

Mr. Chair, I urge adoption, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. KIM).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 68 OFFERED BY MS. SPANBERGER

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 68 printed in part B of House Report 116–16. Ms. SPANBERGER. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 291, insert after line 20 the following:

SEC. 3106. PRE-ELECTION THREAT ASSESSMENTS.

(a) Submission by DNI. Not later than 180 days before the date of each regularly scheduled general election for Federal office, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit an assessment of the full scope of threats to election infrastructure, including cybersecurity threats posed by state actors and terrorist groups, and recommendations to address or mitigate those threats, as developed by the Secretary and Chairman, to—

(1) the chief State election official of each State;

(2) the Committees on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and Rules and Administration of the Senate; and

(3) any other appropriate congressional committees.

(b) UPDATES TO INITIAL ASSESSMENTS.—If, at any time after submitting an assessment under paragraph (a), the Director of National Intelligence determines that the assessment should be updated to reflect new information regarding those threats involved, the Director shall submit a revised assessment under such sub-section.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the following definitions apply:

(1) The term “Chairman” means the chair of the Election Assistance Commission.

(2) The term “chief State election official” means the individual designated by the State under section 10 of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (52 U.S.C. 20506) to be responsible for coordination of the State’s responsibilities under such Act.

(3) The term “election infrastructure” means storage facilities, polling places, and centralized vote tabulation locations used to support the administration of elections for public office, as well as related information and communications technology, including systems across the globe, with the rise of state actors, and foreign intelligence operatives, as they rise as formidable and dangerous adversaries.

Right now, we are seeing an uptick in hostile attacks against election systems across the globe, with the rise of the internet, anonymous hackers, non-state actors, and foreign intelligence organizations, as they take as formidable and dangerous adversaries.

Our elections are the bedrock of our democracy.
If our voting infrastructure is compromised or attacked, the entire integrity of our electoral system could come into question.

This was especially clear following Russia’s interference in the 2016 election, and it is almost certain that nefarious actors will continue their deliberate attempts to attack our elections or put in doubt the outcome of those elections.

During this time, it is critical that the U.S. election officials have accurate election information about where our election security systems are most vulnerable.

This amendment pushes back against foreign attempts to interfere in our electoral process and helps identify any potential threats that may exist.

This amendment would use the invaluable expertise of public servants in the intelligence community and Department of Homeland Security to strengthen the security of Federal and State election systems.

My amendment would require a Federal assessment of the scope of potential threats to the security of America’s election system, including cyber, terror, and state actor threats.

This amendment would happen 180 days prior to every general election to allow the States the opportunity to respond and strengthen their voting systems.

Additionally, this legislation would direct the Director of National Intelligence and DHS to update Federal and State officials on possible vulnerabilities and to provide assessments on how best to stop these threats.

As a former CIA case officer, I greatly appreciate the objective and non-partisan work of the national security and intelligence communities. With their help, we can fight back against foreign interference, we can safeguard our elections.

The dedicated men and women of our national security agencies and of our intelligence agencies have demonstrated their ability to collect information on foreign actors’ intentions and provide election security assessments that are intellectually rigorous, objective, timely, and useful to the States they would provide them to.

As we are having an important discussion about safeguarding the integrity of the vote, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment to H.R. 1.

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, even though I am not opposed to it. I think this is a darn good amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, I am going to support this amendment.

Mr. Chair, it is great to work with Ms. SPANBERGER, and I thank her for her service as an intelligence officer for our great Nation. This is an issue that she knows better than me and she knows better than most of us here in this institution. I look forward to supporting this amendment, and I welcome the gentlewoman to the U.S. House of Representatives and look forward to working with her.

Mr. Chair, I would love to work with the gentlewoman on issues like this when this bill does not pass the Senate and is signed into law and we can work together in a bipartisan way. I will continue to show bipartisanship. I congratulate and welcome the gentlewoman.

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

Ms. SPANBERGER. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) for his comments and for his support of this amendment.

Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), my colleague. Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, just goes to show how lucky we are to have her service as an intelligence officer in the CIA, with a special expertise in issues of national security.

You know, States don’t have a CIA, they don’t have an NSA, and if foreign actors are attacking us, they are not in a position to find that out. I think that the gentlewoman from Virginia understands the workings of our national security agencies and the importance of giving them metrics on what to do and with whom so that we are completely safe.

Mr. Chair, I am so delighted that she has offered this very smart amendment, and I look forward to approving it, and I thank her so much for the wisdom that she brings to the House.

Ms. SPANBERGER. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SPANBERGER. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman from Illinois and the gentlewoman from California in congratulating Congresswoman SPANBERGER on this excellent amendment and emphasizing, as they did, how lucky we are to have the benefit of the expertise that is brought to this Chamber by Congresswoman SPANBERGER, based on her national security experience. We need to maximize what people can offer here, and this amendment is a perfect example of that.

There is increasing anxiety out there among the populace about these attempts to hack into our election infrastructure. This measure will make sure that we are all on alert to that. I thank the gentlewoman for the amendment.

Ms. SPANBERGER. Mr. Chair, I am ready to close, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, how much time do I have left?

The CHAIR. Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois has 31/2 minutes remaining.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, I am so delighted that she has offered this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. SPANBERGER. Mr. Chair, I am ready to close, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Ms. SPANBERGER. Mr. Chair, I am ready to close, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman yields back the balance of the time.

Ms. SPANBERGER. May I reclaim my time, Mr. Chair?

The CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Virginia?

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. May I reclaim my time?

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Illinois and the gentlewoman from Virginia both reclaim their time.

There was no objection.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Virginia is recognized.

Ms. SPANBERGER. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES).

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Actually, I want to echo the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois and the remarks of the gentlewoman from California in congratulating Congresswoman SPANBERGER on this excellent amendment and emphasizing, as they did, how lucky we are to have the benefit of the expertise that is brought to this Chamber by Congresswoman SPANBERGER, based on her national security experience. We need to maximize what people can offer here, and this amendment is a perfect example of that.

There is increasing anxiety out there among the populace about these attempts to hack into our election infrastructure. This measure will make sure that we are all on alert to that. I thank the gentlewoman for the amendment.

Ms. SPANBERGER. Mr. Chair, I am ready to close, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, how much time do I have left?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois has 91/2 minutes remaining.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, I am having a lot of fun down here, but I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. SPANBERGER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 69 OFFERED BY MS. SLOTKIN

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 69 printed in part B of House Report 116-16.

Ms. SLOTKIN. Mr. Chair, as the designee of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES), I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 323, insert after line 6 the following:

SEC. 4103. DISBURSEMENTS AND ACTIVITIES SUBJECT TO FEDERAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS.

(a) DISBURSEMENTS DESCRIBED.—Section 319(a)(1) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 is amended in paragraph (1) by adding at the end the following: 'Contribution to a Federal political committee is a Federal election campaign contribution within the meaning of subsection (a)(2).'
Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30121(a)(1)) is amended—
(1) by striking “or” at the end of subparagraph (B); and
(2) by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:
‘‘(C) an expenditure;
‘‘(D) an independent expenditure;
‘‘(E) a disbursement for an electioneering communication (within the meaning of section 304(f)(3));
‘‘(F) a disbursement for a paid internet or paid digital communication that refers to a clearly identified candidate for election for Federal office and is disseminated within 60 days before a general, special or runoff election for the office sought by the candidate or 30 days before a primary or preference election, or a convention or caucus of a political party that has authority to nominate a candidate for the office sought by the candidate;
‘‘(G) a disbursement for a broadcast, cable, or satellite communication, or for a paid internet or paid digital communication, that promotes, supports, attacks or opposes the election of a clearly identified candidate for Federal, State, or local office (regardless of whether the communication contains express advocacy or the functional equivalent of express advocacy); or
‘‘(H) a disbursement for a broadcast, cable, or satellite communication, or for a paid internet or paid digital communication, that discusses a national legislative issue of public importance in year in which a regularly scheduled general election for Federal office is held and is made for the purpose of influencing an election held during that year, but only if the disbursement is made by a foreign principal who is a government of a foreign country or a foreign political party or an agent of such a foreign principal under the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended.’’.
(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to disbursements made on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The Chair. Pursuant to House Resolution 172, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. SLOTKIN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Ms. SLOTKIN. Mr. Chair, the legislation before us today, the For the People Act of 2019, represents a major step forward toward improving government transparency and accountability, expanding voting rights, and draining the corrosive influence of money in our politics.

These are the very issues I hear about over and over again as I travel across my district in mid-Michigan, and these are the issues that my constituents sent me to Washington to address.

Simply put, people in Michigan and across the country know in their bones that the current system isn’t working and want a return to honesty and decency in our politics. Passing H.R. 1 is a huge step forward in increasing confidence in our system.

Mr. Chair, my amendment today would add important provisions to close a loophole in our current campaign finance laws that allows foreign governments and foreign nationals to influence American elections through campaign ads. Right now, a foreign entity can legally buy an ad through social media that supports or attacks a candidate. Right now, a foreign entity can legally purchase an ad that focuses on an issue of legislative importance.

My amendment would close this loophole by implementing new requirements to ensure that foreign governments don’t influence our elections.

The amendment specifically would prohibit a foreign entity from buying a campaign ad, on digital media or on TV, that supports or attacks a candidate or an ad that focuses on an issue that is meant to divide us rather than unite us.

Mr. Chair, I am a former CIA officer, a former Pentagon official. I have spent my life preventing homeland attacks and preserving the democratic system that we all love. I am introducing this amendment because the attempts by Russia to interfere in the 2016 elections targeted vulnerable voters and took advantage of the lack of disclosure in our laws. During the 2016 elections, a former colleague of mine, a former member of the Michigan House of Representatives, we were specifically targeted and witnessed disturbing evidence of Russian interference in our elections.

It is important to remember what we are talking about. These ads, which I have a bunch printed out here, purposely divide us. They sow discord. They target ethnic groups. And they generally attempt to influence American elections.

Some may say that these ads were a relatively small number of the ads in our elections and that it is a relatively meager investment. As defenders of American interests and our national security, we must ensure that our laws do not allow this to happen at any level.

I urge my colleagues to do the right thing: Support preservation of the American democracy. Reject foreign influence in our elections.

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, I claim time in opposition, all my time.

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

Ms. SLOTKIN. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to my colleague from Maryland (Mr. SARBNES).

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Well, I would be remiss to not thank my colleague from Maryland (Mr. SARBNES) for being a cosponsor of this amendment and the gentu­­lewoman's amendment does. I thank her for it. I support it.

Ms. SLOTKIN. Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Ms. SLOTKIN. Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chair, I join in the celebration of the new Members of this House of Representatives. The gentlewoman from Michigan has experience in preserving our national security. Not everyone who is here serving has done what she has done, and the gentlewoman who preceded her.

Our body is richer because of the experience that they have brought to this Chamber, and I think this excellent amendment really is a product of the expertise that she brings to this institution.

I am grateful for her amendment. I look forward to joining the ranking member in approving it and in celebrating her service to our country here in the House of Representatives.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, I include in the RECORD a list of groups such as the Hispanic Leadership Fund, The LIBRE Initiative, American Tax Reform, Coalition to Reduce Spending, the National Right to Life, Heritage Action for America, and the Chamber of Commerce and several.
letters in opposition to H.R. 1, obvi-
ously, or I don’t think I would be en-
tering them into the RECORD. The fol-
lowing organizations oppose H.R. 1:

ACLU
U.S. Chamber of Commerce along with over 300 Chamber’s of Commerce and indus-
try groups
Freedom Works
National Right to Life
Heritage Action for America
Republican National Lawyers Association
March for Life Action
Conservative Action Project
Club for Growth
Americans for Tax Reform
National Taxpayers Union
Coalition for National Expansion
Americans for Prosperity
The LIBRE Initiative
Concerned Veterans for America
Families United for Life
Hispanic Leadership Fund
National Association for Gun Rights
Goldwater Institute
Americans for Insurance Associates
Agricultural Retailers Association
American Petroleum Institute
National Grocers Association
Associated Builders and Contractors
National Association of Manufacturers
Insurance Associates, Inc.
Airlines for America

NATIONAL RIGHT TO LIFE
COMMITTEE, INC.

Washington, DC, March 5, 2019.

Re H.R. 1, the so-called “For the People Act of 2019”.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The National Right to Life Committee (NRLC), representing state right-to-life organizations nationwide, urges you to oppose the so-called “For the People Act of 2019” (H.R. 1), introduced by Rep. John Sarbanes. This legislation has been carefully crafted to maximize short-term political benefits for the dominant faction of one political party, while running roughshod over the First Amendment protections for political speech that have been clearly and forcefully articu-
lated by the U.S. Supreme Court in a series of landmark First Amendment rulings, cul-
minating in FEC v. Wisconsin Right to Life, 551 U.S. 459 (2007) and Citizens United v. Fed-
eral Election Comm’n, 558 U.S. 310 (2010).

Because this legislation would severely im-
pede the exercise of our organization’s con-
stitutional rights and privileges, as well as those of our donors and supporters, NRLC intends to include any roll call that occurs on H.R. 1 in our scorecard of key roll calls of the 116th Congress.

Enactment of H.R. 1 would not be a curb on corruption, but is itself a type of corruption—an abuse of the lawmaking power, by which incumbent lawmakers employ the threat of criminal sanctions, among other deterrents, to reduce the amount of private speech regarding the actions of the law-
makers themselves. Further, this legislation would add a commissioner to the Federal Election Commission (FEC), causing a par-
tisan takeover by significantly increasing FEC’s power to make prosecution decisions, to reduce the credibility of the FEC, which would be empowered to make prosecutorial decisions, and to significantly increase the number of elections that would be subject to FEC’s scrutiny.

The main beneficiaries of H.R. 1 would be incumbent politicians and campaign finance attorneys while those who would suffer most would be grassroots activists. The legislation would greatly increase the already onerous legal and administrative compliance costs, liability risk, and costs to donor and associational privacy for public groups that help inform citizens speak about policy issues and politicians. Instead of being able to afford these costs or will violate the law un-
affordably. Less speech by private citizens and organizations means politicians will be able to act with less accountability to public opinion and criticism.

When our great nation’s founders articu-
lated the rights of America’s Founders, they only included the right to life but also the right to free speech. As those who speak for the unborn, we uniquely combine those two rights, the right to life and the freedom of speech, making it al-
most impossible for us to speak up for those
Heritage Foundation opposes the For The People Act and would include it as a key vote on our legislative scorecard.

This week, the House will vote on H.R. 1, the “For The People Act.” Lawmakers should not let this legislation’s misleading name deceive them. The broad and unchecked powers of the Democratic Party would use it to hijack America’s election processes. H.R. 1 is a very long, complex bill that is a liberal wish list of “reforms” ranging from voter registration and elections to campaign finance, lobbying, and judicial ethics.

The problems are the bedrock of American government. They are fundamental to our way of life and confidence in our national system. It is a顶层设计 that cloaks itself in the guise of transparency and fairness but in reality is a partisan scheme to choke off dissent and squelch Republican candidates and conservative political voices. This bill is aptly “renamed” by Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell as the “Democrat Politician Protection Act.” It is an unprecedented attempt to seize control of elections through federal government power.

This fundamentally flawed legislation establishes a new taxpayer-funded ballot of political campaigns, weaponizes the Federal Elections Commission by destroying the current bipartisan makeup, and creates a new, subjective category of “campaign-related speech” that is regulated by Washington bureaucrats who are empowered to enforce these regulations with penalties and censorship.

According to The Heritage Foundation, H.R. 1 would implement the following changes:

1. Makes it easier to commit fraud and promotes chaos at the polls through same-day registration, as election officials have no time to verify the accuracy of voter registration information and cannot anticipate the number of voters, ballots, and precinct workers that will be needed to ensure a safe and secure election process.

2. Degrades the accuracy of registration lists by automatically registering individuals from state databases, such as DMV and welfare offices, which provides an opportunity for huge numbers of ineligible voters, including felons and as well as multiple or duplicate registrations of the same individuals.

3. Constitutes a recipe for massive voter registration fraud by hackers and cyber criminals through online voter registration not tied to an existing state record, such as a driver’s license.

4. Requires states to count ballots cast by voters outside of their assigned precinct, overriding the precinct system used by almost all elections that allows election officials to monitor votes, staff polling places, provide early ballots, and prevent election fraud.

5. Prevents election officials from checking the eligibility and qualifications of voters and from removing ineligible voters. This includes restrictions on using the U.S. Postal Service and by allowing anyone to verify the address of registered voters; participating in state programs that compare voter registration lists to detect individuals registered in multiple states; or even removing registrants due to a failure to vote.

6. Cripples the effectiveness of state voter ID laws by allowing ballots to be cast without an ID and to merely sign a statement in which they claim they are who they say they are.

7. Expands regulation and government censorship of campaigns and political activity and speech, including online and policy-related speech. H.R. 1 imposes onerous legal and administrative compliance burdens and costs on candidates, citizens, civic groups, unions, corporations, and nonprofit organizations.

8. Requires states to unconstitutionally restore the ability of felons to vote the moment they are out of prison. Section 2 of the 14th Amendment gives states the constitutional authority to decide when felons who committed crimes against their fellow citizens may vote again. Congress cannot override a constitutional amendment with a statute.

9. Transfers the right to draw congressional districts from state legislatures to “independent” commissions whose members are unaccountable to voters. H.R. 1 makes it a violation of federal law to engage in “partisan” redistricting and mandates inclusion of alien population, both legal and illegal, in all redistricting. This is an anti-democratic, unconstitutional measure that takes away the ability of the citizens of a state to make their own decision about redistricting.

10. Violates separation of powers and directly interferes with the President’s constitutional duties. H.R. 1 bans his political appointees, such as the Attorney General, from participating in, directing the defense of, or assisting in any matter (including lawsuits against a President’s policies, programs, or actions) under the law in which the President is named as a party.

Although Democrats are promoting H.R. 1 as a bill that would “strengthen our democracy and return political power to the people”, it is an anti-democratic bill that would wreak havoc on our election system by manipulating election rules in favor of Democrats. It is nothing but a progressive power grab and Heritage Action urges all House Members to vote against it.

Heritage Action opposes the For The People Act (H.R. 1) and will include it as a key vote on our legislative scorecard.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. I am not going to oppose this amendment, and it has been great debating with the other side tonight. I look forward to a livelier debate tomorrow.

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

Ms. SLOTKIN. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the spirit of the gentleman from Michigan (Ms. SLOTKIN). The amendment was agreed to.

Ms. SLOTKIN. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the spirit of the gentleman from Illinois and look forward to working with everyone.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. SLOTKIN). The amendment was agreed to.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Chairman rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. HILL of California) having assumed the chair, Mr. CUELLAR, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) to expand Americans’ access to the ballot box, reduce the influence of big money in politics, and strengthen ethics rules for public servants, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

REQUEST TO CONSIDER H.R. 962, BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SURVIVORS PROTECTION ACT

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 962, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers, as recorded in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the request unless it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, for the sake of innocent lives, I urge the Speaker to immediately schedule this important bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not recognized for debate.

COMMUNICATION FROM DISTRICT DIRECTOR, THE HONORABLE JACKIE SPEIER, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Brian Perkins, District Director, the Honorable Jackie Speier, Member of Congress:


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

Dear Madam Speaker: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a subpoena related to the testimony issued by the Superior Court of the State of California for the County of San Mateo, in a criminal proceeding involving an alleged threat of violence against our office personnel.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and rights of the House.

Sincerely,

BRIAN PERKINS, District Director.
NEVER FORGET THE HEROES ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN) is recognized for 5 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. ZELDIN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include additional materials on the topic of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ZELDIN. Madam Speaker, I rise today alongside Mr. ROSE, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. KING of New York, and others, to urge the immediate passage of the Never Forget the Heroes Act, introduced by Representatives CAROLYN B. MALONEY, NADLER, and KING, which would fully fund and extend the 9/11 Victim Compensation Fund authorization through 2090.

Representatives MALONEY, NADLER, and PETER KING have been stalwart advocates of this effort fighting on behalf of 9/11 victims and their families since the beginning, and it is thanks to their leadership that we passed the Zadroga Act, creating the 9/11 Victim Compensation Fund and why we are still here fighting today.

I can’t thank enough and praise enough the leadership of Representatives MALONEY, NADLER, and KING on this very important issue on behalf of the victims of September 11.

James Zadroga was one of those fearless leaders who rose up on 9/11. He was also the first NYPD officer whose death in 2006 was connected to toxic pollutants at the World Trade Center site. The James Zadroga 9/11 Health and Compensation Act was later signed into law in 2011 to help our 9/11 first responders.

Five years later, the Zadroga Act was permanently reauthorized and included $4.6 billion for the 9/11 Victim Compensation Fund over 5 years, which was established to provide compensation for the victims of 9/11 and their families, and it continues to provide compensation for those suffering from 9/11-related illnesses decades later and their loved ones.

First responders who worked on the pile day and night aiding in the search, rescue, and cleanup efforts were breathing toxic debris and ash that are now known to have caused over 50 different types of cancer. However, last month, the 9/11 Victim Compensation Fund issued an alarming report, which stated its funding was insufficient to compensate all claims, and the fund would have to make severe cuts to awards across the board.

This is unacceptable. And regardless of party affiliation, regardless of which district or State you come from, it is imperative that this legislation is passed and sent to the President immediately so we can ensure these victims receive the compensation they deserve.

This isn’t a one-off issue. This isn’t just a New York issue. This isn’t a Democratic Party platform or political football. This is a responsibility we all shoulder as Americans, first and foremost. It is the spirit of our Nation, and it is who we are as a people.

It is important to remember that 9/11 first responders live not only in New York, but in 433 out of 435 congressional districts across this country.

These were the very men and women who, in the face of evil, were willing to put it all on the line to help save their fellow Americans, who ran into the towers as everyone else ran out. It is unconscionable that time and again they have been forced to plead their case as to why they are worthy of our support.

People who came down when the Zadroga Act was first getting authorized—sick—weren’t there to fight in 2015 when it was permanently reauthorized because they had passed away due to their injuries.

People who were here in 2015 when that fight was made for the Zadroga Act to be permanently reauthorized are not here today to fight for the Victim Compensation Fund because they passed away and succumbed to their injuries.

We should not make them take dozens of trips down here to Washington, D.C., begging for support. Let them stay where they are and take care of their health. That is most important.

It is so important that we immediately pass the Never Forget the Heroes Act, which will ensure these heroes receive the support they have more than earned.

This past September 11, 17 years since the attacks, we came together, as we always do, to remember those who were taken from us that day. But this year marked an especially harrowing occasion. By the end of 2018, more people had died from 9/11-related illnesses than were killed on September 11.

Tonight, we are going to hear from the authors of the Never Forget the Heroes Act, Representatives CAROLYN B. MALONEY, PETER KING, and JERRY NADLER, and so many others from both sides of the aisle, on why this legislation is important for the victims of 9/11, for their communities, and for our Nation.

In addition to those who are joining us this evening, there are also so many activists and outside organizations fighting on behalf of 9/11 victims and working to ensure they receive full compensation: Jon Stewart, who has traveled to Washington countless times to fight for them and was just here last week; John Feal, from my district, and the FealGood Foundation; and so many more, including the great advocates from organized labor, especially law enforcement and first responders in New York and nationwide.

From everyday men and women in my district to us on the floor of the House of Representatives Maloney, Nadler, and King, to the heroic9/11 first responders, their families, those suffering from 9/11-related illnesses, and all those affected by this dark moment in our Nation’s history, I am so grateful to Mrs. MALONEY for her tireless work on behalf of them.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN), my friend and colleague, for initiating this Special Order and for bringing us together to speak out in support for the bipartisan Never Forget the Heroes Act, which we must pass in this Congress.

On September 11, 2011, we lost 2,997 people. But the death tolls from 9/11 may be far higher. It seems like every week I hear about the passing of another first responder and survivor. Soon the deaths from 9/11-related illnesses may outnumber those lost on that horrific day.

Thousands more are living with the effects of 9/11, with chronic diseases, with cancer, with a whole host of other 9/11-related illnesses.

Over 10,000 responders and survivors have been certified as having 9/11-related cancers. These are the men and women who rush in and spent months combing through the wreckage. They are the residents and the workers who were told by the Federal Government, they were told that the air they were breathing was safe when, in fact, it was filled with toxic pollutants.

They are firefighters, police officers, Federal and local law enforcement,
medical workers, construction workers, and other heroes. All of them are victims of 9/11 as well.

The 9/11 attacks caused one of the biggest public health crises our country has ever faced. And those aren't just my constituents. They aren't just from New York or New Jersey. They are Americans.

We were attacked because we were a site of economic strength in America. Then we mobilized our Pentagon, a symbol of the strength of our military. And then they were coming to the Capitol, a symbol of strength of our democracy.

These people live in every single State. We documented, and the GAO documented, 434 of the 435 congressional districts had someone who was harmed by 9/11.

Our whole country owes them a debt. On 9/11 we counted on them, and in return, we made a promise never to forget.

This needs to be more than a slogan and more than a bumper sticker. It is our sacred duty to make sure that they get to try to have the care they deserve.

In 2010, after years of tireless effort, Congress reaffirmed its commitment to never forget the sacrifices made on September 11 by passing the bipartisan James Zadroga 9/11 Health and Compensation Act.

We established the World Trade Center Health Program and the Nationwide Provider Network and reopened the Victim Compensation Fund to provide the thousands of injured and ill 9/11 responders and survivors with medical treatment for 9/11 health-related conditions and economic compensation for losses resulting from the attack.

In 2015, we permanently authorized the World Trade Center Health Program and reauthorized the Victim Compensation Fund until 2020.

So now we need to get to work again.

The problem is bigger than expected.

The number of cancer cases has jumped.

Cancer claims now account for one-third of claims—up from one-fifth just a few years ago. Death rates have gone up.

This January saw a 235 percent surge in death claims to the Victim Compensation Fund compared to the end of 2015, most of which are the result of cancers.

More and more 9/11 first responders and survivors are in need of the Victim Compensation Fund. Increased enrollment has led to a need for more funding.

And in February, the special master of the September 11 Victim Compensation Fund announced that the fund was running out of money and would cut compensation awards by 50 percent to 70 percent because of budget shortfalls. These cuts went into effect on February 25, and have already devastated first responders, survivors, and their families.

This is unacceptable. We cannot let this stand, and we won't.

Last week, with my colleagues, Representatives NADLER, KING, and I introduced the Never Forget the Heroes Act. Already, we have an unprecedented 150 cosponsors in 1 week.

Our bill will ensure that all future eligible recipients are fully compensated, and make the Victim Compensation Fund a permanent program for the lives of the recipients.

We promised sick and injured 9/11 first responders and survivors that we would fully compensate them for the losses they have suffered. They shouldn't have to come begging for us to do our job, come begging back over and over again to Congress.

For some, 9/11 is a distant memory. For them, they remember this and 9/11 with every breath, with every cough, with every doctor's appointment, and with every death in their families.

They are ours. They are counting on Congress, just like we counted on them on that terrible day and in the weeks afterwards.

Never Forget is a promise. I urge my colleagues to join us in ensuring that we honor it.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN), my distinguished colleague, for organizing this important remembrance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to maintain proper decorum in the Chamber.

Mr. ZELDIN, Mrs. MALONEY really inspires us all. And when she said that these 9/11 victims, their families are counting on us, they certainly know that they can count on her.

So I thank Congresswoman MALONEY for leading this effort for so many years. She has been a great champion in this cause, and it is great to assist her but also why Congressmen Rose and I wanted to be here coleading this Special Order on a bipartisan basis to support Congresswoman MALONEY, Congressman NADLER, and Congressman KING, who have been the champions of this effort.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mrs. MALONEY really inspires us all. And when she said that these 9/11 victims, their families are counting on us, they certainly know that they can count on her.

So I thank Congresswoman MALONEY for leading this effort for so many years. She has been a great champion in this cause, and it is great to assist her but also why Congressmen Rose and I wanted to be here coleading this Special Order on a bipartisan basis to support Congresswoman MALONEY, Congressman NADLER, and Congressman KING, who have been the champions of this effort.

2000

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZELDIN. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I thank Congresswoman ZELDIN, Congressman Rose, and Congresswoman GOTTHEIMER for really helping to achieve the 150 cosponsors that we have.

I have asked, and the gentleman has joined me in asking, Chairman NADLER to schedule hearings as quickly as possible. We hope to continue getting cosponsors. Hopefully, we will get everyone in this body to make a firm statement in support of the survivors and the heroes.

I thank the gentleman and others so much for all that they have been doing.

Mr. ZELDIN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her comments.
and ill 9/11 first responders and survivors would receive cuts of 50 or 70 percent of their benefits that they were promised, that their families could count on, that their children could count on. That is absolutely unacceptable. We can't leave law enforcement and first responders with brain tumors and end-stage lung disease by the wayside.

It is heartbreaking to hear their stories. We've heard so many earlier this week in New Jersey when we got together. They talked about how there are hundreds of first responders and volunteers still going through the Mount Sinai monitoring program, hoping for the best, but expecting the worst. It is in the back of the minds of all those who were there that day: When will I be diagnosed? Will it be too late? What will happen to my children and my family?

As Mr. ZELDIN said, this year, more than 47,000 claims have been filed with the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund and more than 11,000 additional claims are expected by 2020 when the fund is set to expire unless Congress acts. We must do the right thing by our first responders once and for all. No excuses.

That is why I am very proud to be an original cosponsor of this bipartisan legislation, the Never Forget the Heroes Act, to fully fund the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund so that no 9/11 survivor has to ever worry.

As Mr. ZELDIN said, there is nothing partisan about this. The bipartisan Pro Caucus just talked about it this morning, how important it is, including Mr. Rose.

This is a fight where we have had many champions, from Jon Stewart to Congresswoman MALONEY to Congressman KING, and I am grateful to all of them. Representatives NADLER, ZELDIN, ROSE, FITZPATRICK, SHERRILL, and SMITH, I thank all these Members for coming together in this bipartisan fight. Again, this was an attack on America by terrorists. I thank all the families and all our first responders for their incredible service to our great country.

Mr. ZELDIN, Madam Speaker, I thank Congressman GOTTIEB for his words and his leadership with what is a bipartisan caucus here in the House of Representatives where people from across the entire country come together. As the name of the caucus says, you just want to solve problems. You want to make your time here in Congress worthwhile. You want to be able to go back to the voters 2 years later and say this is what I did during my term, and have something positive, proactive, and constructive to show for it.

The fact that the gentleman dedicates so much of his energy toward solving problems, building bridges, and bipartisanship is to be commended. I thank all my colleagues for his efforts here on the floor tonight.

Mr. ZELDIN, Madam Speaker, next, I get to introduce an amazing colleague who was here in the Chamber, a Member of Congress, during the attacks on September 11. He was here in the days afterward, the years when the Zadroga Act was still getting passed and reauthorized, and here now during this fight for the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund.

He has been there every single step of the way since day one, and he is really an amazing Member of Congress and leader, really on the global stage. I just got back from the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly, and he is leaving his mark on human trafficking and other issues around the globe.

At this time, on this really important issue tonight, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. ZELDIN for his leadership, not just tonight, but it has been ongoing and very effective. I thank CAROLYN MALONEY for her prime sponsorship of this important legislation.

I am very proud to be a Never Forget the Heroes cosponsor, along with another very strong group of bipartisan Members who will not let this opportunity to enact this legislation pass. We will get it done.

Madam Speaker, everyone remembers where they were and what they were doing. I was actually chairing a Veterans Affairs Committee hearing when a group of cowards hijacked four airliners in the most terrible act of terrorism in American history.

Nearly 3,000 innocent people lost their lives that day, including 700 from my State. Who can forget the courage and determination of the brave men and women who ran into the burning buildings, the stairs of the burning buildings with total disregard for their own safety, saving others at the expense of their own lives.

One no longer remembers the shock, horror, and numbing sorrow of this day, however, more than the families and the close friends of the victims. I have worked with and befriended many family members of 9/11 victims, and I can state unequivocally that there would not have been a 9/11 Commission and other historic policy initiatives without our extraordinary tenacity, commitment, and courage. That includes what was known as the four Jersey girls, widows who simply would not take no for an answer. They were a driving force behind the establishment of that very important historic commission.

I got to know a lot of the others. I actually hired a school principal who lost her husband. Alan, in 9/11, and I am reminded every time I am in the district office, and other days as well, what she has lost and how painful and how sorrowful that was on that day.

For more than 17 years, the families and the friends of those who died have had to endure their loss and a broken heart. Now we know the carnage, the consequences, the ongoing loss of life, and the health crisis attributable to 9/11 are even worse than anyone could have imagined. New cases of 9/11-caused conditions are being diagnosed by the doctors at the World Trade Center Health Program every day, with close to 12,000 cases of 9/11-caused cancers diagnosed so far, including 600 cases with breast cancer, 2,400 with prostate cancer, 600 with thyroid cancer, 500 with lung cancer, and 500 with kidney cancer.

There have also been other kinds of catastrophic consequences, with people who are suffering from PTSD, some 9,000 so far and counting.

Congress enacted the World Trade Center Health Program Fund and September 11th Victim Compensation Fund to provide health services for responders at the three crash sites, and others in the vicinity of the World Trade Center site for health conditions related to toxic exposures from the attacks.

There are over 6,800 New Jerseyans receiving healthcare services from the World Trade Center Health Program, 1,200 of whom are from my district, constituents of mine.

Just last month—and this was shocking, frankly—the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund special master announced that, due to a lack of funding, the Justice Department will have to turn away or delay paying claims by 50 percent and any new claims that are filed by 70 percent.

These cuts will devastate the first responders, our firemen, police, and emergency personnel. They will also devastate countless families and ill 9/11 first responders and survivors and their families who spent countless hours and days in search of their loved ones.

I remember going to the site a couple of days after. I went with Tony Principi, who was then the Secretary of the Department of Veterans Affairs. Unfortunately, there was a sense, a falsely conveyed sense, that maybe you didn’t have to wear the mask, so many of those guys and the ladies in the Assembly were breathing in a toxic mix of chemicals that now have manifested into very serious disease.

This is an important bill. It is bipartisan, and again, I thank the gentleman (Mr. ZELDIN) for bringing us all together tonight, my colleagues on both sides of the aisle; Congresswoman MALONEY for her leadership; and of course, all the others who are cosponsors of this bill.

Mr. ZELDIN, Madam Speaker, I thank Congressman SMITH for his words tonight and pointing out that special master’s report that just came out, which really stresses the urgency to get this done immediately. That is why everyone, the advocates for all those victims to read that report, and for the advocates, so I thank the gentleman for his leadership.

Congressman SMITH from New Jersey is fighting hard on behalf of his constituents on this issue and for all 9/11 families.

Tonight’s Special Order, I just asked Kevin from my team here to see—it
might be a fun fact as to when was the last time that there was a bipartisan Special Order in the Chamber. I don’t know, is this even a first?

I am leading tonight’s event with Congressman MAX ROSE of Staten Island, who is our next speaker. Congressmen ROSE is a freshman who was elected to represent a great congressional district in New York. I represent the greatest congressional district in New York.

Staten Island, I know, is a pretty special place as well, and Congressman MAX ROSE is a military veteran. I have a tremendous amount of respect for him, for his military service.

Right after World War II, almost 100 percent of the House was made up of military veterans. Right after Vietnam, it was a little over 75 percent. I think it was about 77 percent right after Vietnam. Now the number is less than 1 in 5. We have to get that number up. Republicans, Democrats, conservative wherever you are in the 50 States, it is good to have more vets here in Congress. I thank the gentleman for running, for serving, and for co-leading tonight’s Special Order.

The gentleman contacted me as soon as he heard the November election to talk about different ways that we can work together, and it is great that our bipartisan Special Order here tonight is for this particular cause. It is an honor to lead tonight with him.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROSE), the freshman Congressman from Staten Island.

Mr. ROSE of New York. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. ZELDIN for his kind words. The honor is all mine, from one post-9/11 veteran to another post-9/11 veteran, from Staten Island or Long Island. I truly respect your service as well to our great country and applaud the gentleman for putting the country first ahead of any other political considerations as we try to do what is right here.

I would also like to, of course, thank the other original cosponsors of this bill, people who have fought for this incredibly important project and initiative for more than a decade, CAROLYN MALONEY, JERRY NADLER, and PETE KING.

I wanted to start off by telling a story of one of my constituents, Rob Serra. Rob graduated from the academy on September 10, 2001. His first day on the job with the New York City Fire Department was 9/11. When he saw the burning towers from the Verrazano-Narrows Bridge, he did exactly what first responders across the city and across the country did without hesitation, and that is, he raced to the scene. He raced right to danger.

For weeks, he joined so many in digging through the rubble, looking for survivors, looking for their friends, looking for those who were not as fortunate. Dust loaded with cement, asbestos, lead, glass fibers, and other chemicals caked to his face. He knew this would probably kill him, but he served without question because it was the right thing to do.

Rob is a young man, but he is now in a wheelchair, retired from the FDNY before he could even truly begin his career. He is not looking for handouts. He is looking for respect, for acknowledgment, and for his government to just do the right damn thing, not just for him and for his family, because he is already covered, but he knows there are thousands of American just like him across the country who are getting sick but facing drastic cuts to their benefits.

Just about every Member in this body has a constituent like Rob and his family. They all deserve more than our tweets and statements. They need action. They deserve nothing less because we need to do more than just say, “Never forget.” We need to do more than just shake somebody’s hand and say that we admire the picture of the Twin Towers in our office or that we decided to serve in this body because of 9/11.

We need to make sure that these heroes are never forgotten and are always taken care of. That means making sure every victim and their families get the benefits and care they deserve, because this wasn’t an attack on New York. This was an attack on the United States of America.

Keeping our promise to these heroes is not a New York problem. It is an American issue that we have to address and fix as a country. There are VCF claims from all 50 States and 99 percent of congressional districts. In a few years, we may face the tragic fact that more people will have died from 9/11-related injuries and diseases than were lost on the day of the attacks.

Each and every person that dies is yet another victim of al-Qaeda’s attack. Unless Congress acts to fully and permanently fund the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund, benefits will be cut and promises will be broken. This isn’t due to mismanagement or fraud or any other fact than that more people are getting sick.

I applaud this administration for doing the right thing and effectively managing this program. I applaud the President for that. But it is unacceptable that we will not adequately fund it, and I won’t stand for it. I am hopeful we can get this done, because we truly have no other choice.

Mr. ZELDIN. Madam Speaker, I didn’t realize Congressman ROSE is a Purple Heart too.

Mr. ROSE of New York. I was in the wrong place at the wrong time for that one.

Mr. ZELDIN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his service in the military and for his new service he just started here in the House. I had to look up that charging that we do have another speaker here who is a Navy helicopter pilot, if I understand correctly. We have got a couple of Army folks in the House. I thank the gentleman for his service to our country going back many years, even though he just started here in the House 2 years ago.

Mr. ROSE of New York. Absolutely, I thank the gentleman. Go Army.

Mr. ZELDIN. Madam Speaker, our next speaker tonight also had a distinguished career serving in government before joining Congress. He rose up the ranks at the FBI, a well-respected member of the FBI who believes in law enforcement and the rule of law. He also loves our military so much that over the course of years, every single year for Christmas we have been able to travel to Iraq or Afghanistan, going to the Middle East, to visit the troops as we did this past Christmas, all over Kuwait on Christmas Day.

The FBI was impacted greatly on 9/11, I am not going into the towers as well while many people were running out. So I thank Brian, not only for his service with the FBI, but for his continued fight for all of those first responders, as we should remember those FDNY and NYPD who went in to the towers. There were many other types of law enforcement who ran in as well, including many FBI agents.

On behalf of all those FBI agents, I thank the gentleman for continuing the fight. It is great to have another State Representative from Pennsylvania.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK).

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my colleagues from New York, LEE ZELDIN, Mr. ROSE, Mr. KING, Mrs. MALONEY, and Mr. NADLER, for holding this Special Order tonight to keep our promise to the military veterans. There were many other types of first responders.

As my colleagues can attest, we lost some amazing human beings on that day: firefighters, police officers, EMTs, medics, mothers, fathers, sons, and daughters.

As my colleagues can attest, we lost some amazing human beings on that day: firefighters, police officers, EMTs, medics, mothers, fathers, sons, and daughters.

Victor Saracini, a resident of Bucks County, Pennsylvania, a constituent in my district, was the captain and pilot of United Airlines Flight 175 which our entire country and the entire world witnessed fly into the south tower.

9/11 was a very preconceived notion we have had, it strengthened our collective American identity. Our Nation emerged from that day stronger because of the bravery and selflessness of the heroes who risked and lost their lives to save people they didn’t know and had never met.

Their sacrifice has come at a tremendous cost. In over 17 years since that fateful day, nearly 10,000 people have suffered from 9/11-related illnesses. From 9/11’s first responders to 9/11 survivors to their families, and all others affected, there’s never been a more important time to pass the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund.

Mr. KING. Madam Speaker, I must yield to the gentleman from New York, Mr. ROSE, for his service to our country.

Mr. ROSE of New York. Absolutely, I thank the gentleman. Go Army.
Madam Speaker, in just one statistic on how this problem is still prevalent, the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial reported that 15 police officers died in 2018 from 9/11-related illnesses, 15 just last year alone. This problem is real, and this problem is persistent. It is incumbent upon the Federal Government to stand up and defend those who defended us. The September 11 Victim Compensation Fund must be reauthorized immediately. It is a moral obligation of this body. It simply cannot be ignored.

Again, I want to thank the members of the New York delegation for holding this Special Order and for giving me the opportunity to express my gratitude for the heroes and their families and the need to reauthorize this fund. I second my colleagues’ sentiment tonight. This is a moral obligation of this House. We must get this done, and we must get it done immediately.

I want to thank Mr. ZELDIN for representing the Problem Solvers Caucus tonight. In recognizing Josh Gottheimer, I wanted to say to my colleague, Max Rose and I am going to be testing a new rule that we put into place, and we are going to get to 250 cosponsors come hell or high water. We will get there which will force that matter on to this floor. It will pass. It will pass overwhelmingly, and we will get this done for the 9/11 victims and their families.

Mr. ZELDIN. Madam Speaker, I want to thank Congressman Fitzpatrick for setting his goals with cosponsorship not just high but also appropriately. Every Member of this Chamber should be cosponsoring this bill so, hopefully, we will get those numbers up a lot, but much credit to Congresswoman Maloney, to Congressman Nadler, and to Congressman King, for the advocates from the outside, especially across the New York City metropolitan area, we are already starting strong with 150 cosponsors.

The next speaker is a United States Naval Academy graduate. She was a helicopter pilot. She is a new Representative from New Jersey’s 11th District, and she is hitting the ground running with important leadership on this issue fighting for her constituents. There is a story to be told to Members of Congress who maybe weren’t here in 2015 or even 5 years before that when Congressmen, whom we will be hearing from next, was getting the Zadroga Act first passed, a lot of Members were new in 2015 when we were permanently reauthorizing the Zadroga Act. Now, if you look back to 2015, we have a lot of new Members who weren’t here in 2015. The education, as we talk to people who live far away from where we live in New York and New Jersey, they might not even know what the Zadroga Act is. They might not know what the September 11 Victim Compensation Fund is. That is why it is great to see Congressman Rose and Congresswoman Sherrill leading the fight to educate their fellow freshman and others to make sure that they cosponsor this effort.

I thank the gentlewoman for her service. I kind of apologize for my Go Army joke before. I won’t mention the three-game winning streak that MAX Rose and I didn’t bring the gentlewoman down too much before we hear her great remarks tonight.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Ms. Sherrill).

Ms. SHERRILL. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York, as I like to call it the suburbs of northern New Jersey.

But as my colleagues before me have made clear, this Congress must honor the first responders and survivors of 9/11 and make the September 11 Victim Compensation Fund permanent.

For months after September 11, police officers, firefighters, first responders, FBI agents, and Federal officers from across the country came together in New York. In a gesture of national unity that we have not forgotten, they worked sometimes far away from home, to help.

Firefighters like Gerry Lynch from the Bloomfield Fire Department in my district. Gerry and the Bloomfield firefighters were assigned to help Ladder 105 Engine 29 in Brooklyn because they were at Ground Zero looking for their brothers. After being told that they could go home to Jersey, Gerry didn’t think twice about what he would do next. He went down to help on the bucket brigades at Ground Zero working with men and women on the line.

Madam Speaker, we now know that first responders, as well as students, residents, workers, and business owners of Lower Manhattan were exposed to toxic fumes in the aftermath of the attack. What some have called a toxic soup of mercury, dust, silica, lead, fiberglass, benzene, and many other substances, were pulverized and released into the body, leading to develop cancers, pulmonary disease, respiratory disease, and sleep apnea, among many other ailments.

Those suffering from 9/11-related illnesses include Mike, a firefighter from New Jersey, who lugged, by hand, the equipment that his firefighters brought from New Jersey into Ground Zero. Mike worked from 7 a.m. through the next morning, and by the time he was finished, he was so exhausted that a human chain had to carry him off the pile. His feet never hit the ground.

Mike told me that a lot of firefighters, including himself, didn’t want to come forward. They didn’t want to and have going. Hopefully that didn’t happen to him. His captain made sure that they went forward for monitoring, and so he started that in 2004. Since 9/11, Mike has developed breathing problems, sleep apnea, and preexisting conditions. He admits he didn’t know how hard the firefighters worked for us and that we need to do whatever we can for those who have fallen sick.

Madam Speaker, we are here tonight to let Mike and all those suffering know that we consider it our responsibility and our duty to get this done. We established the victim compensation fund in 2011 to provide care for Mike and all those suffering from health issues after 9/11.

There are 8,614 New Jerseyans who have registered for the victim compensation fund, and nearly 4,000 have submitted claim forms. That is 500 residents in my district alone. If anyone else thinks this is just a New Jersey issue, consider that the victim compensation fund helps Americans from 434 out of 435 congressional districts.

The fund is running out. Madam Speaker. As my colleagues said, benefits are being slashed by 70 percent and thousands of claims go unpaid. To let the fund go broke or give another temporary extension and force our heroes and their families to worry about the reauthorization pulled out of another Congress is simply unacceptable. It is embarrassing to think that we would have to fight for this, that people who are ill cannot concentrate solely on getting the treatment they need or seeing the right doctors.

Firefighters like Mike and Gerry were the ones who didn’t run away from the crisis, but ran right into it. People who have displayed this bravery and courage need to be taken care of. They should not be made to feel guilty that they are asking for help when they have medical issues related to their service.

Madam Speaker, I believe in this country. I believe in our values and that as a Nation we know that when we step up and when we take care of our own, we are helping those people to whom we owe the most to. We need to give these first responders and survivors the peace of mind that their sacrifice for this country is recognized and valued by the rest of America. I call upon each and every Member of this Congress to join us and to make the September 11 Victim Compensation Fund permanent.

Go Navy.

Mr. ZELDIN. Madam Speaker, I will get back to the gentlewoman in December on that one. We will see if we keep the winning streak going.

I thank the gentlewoman again for her service, for her fight, and for running for office. I look forward to working with the gentlewoman on this.

The next speaker certainly needs no introduction. He is last but certainly not least, someone who has been a rock solid presence, a voice, a leader, a fierce advocate for all 9/11 victims and their families, the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, and someone who is not just one of the main thrusts to have been leading this effort from Congresswoman Rose and Congressman King, but really back to the very beginning, since September 11, 2001, so personally on behalf
of my constituents back home on the east end of Long Island, for all 9/11 victims, their families, thank you to Chairman NADLER for his leadership.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), who is the chair of the House Judiciary Committee.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. ZELDIN, Madam Speaker. I thank Mr. ROSE for holding this Special Order hour on the importance of reauthorizing the Victim Compensation Fund and ensuring that every responder and survivor is made whole, as Congress intended.

As you and I have also discussed, we have been pushing for more than 15 years to finally address the moral obligations we have to those made ill by exposure to toxins on September 11 and in the weeks and months after the attack. It is a twofold moral obligation.

First, the attacks on September 11 were not just attacks on New York or on Washington, D.C. They were attacks on America.

In the last few weeks, we have heard an objection raised to this bill that New York should handle this issue because it is a “New York problem.”

The World Trade Center stood in my district. Many of the people who ran into those towers were my fellow New Yorkers. The people who fled their homes and offices to find safety were New Yorkers. The people who worked, breathing that air, for hours in the first 3 days when people may have still been alive who worked with proper respiratory protection to save lives. But after the first 3 days, it was a recovery mission; and people worked, breathing that air, for hours and days without adequate protection.

I think of the families sent back to their apartments in Lower Manhattan and told to wipe away the layers of asbestos from their furniture and their windows with a damp cloth.

I think of the students sitting in their classrooms at Stuyvesant High School, bloodied andאה and the barge removing debris as trucks full of asbestos idled below the high school’s open windows.

The Federal Government bears the burden to care for and support all those who went back to Ground Zero because the Federal Government told them it was safe when it was not safe.

And since the day the EPA and others told people it was safe to go back to work, to school, and to their homes, since that day, told those responders at Ground Zero that it was safe to work with minimal protection, I have been fighting alongside my colleagues Mrs. MALLOWY and Mr. KING to secure healthcare and support for the people who became sick because of that exposure.

We fought for nearly 10 years to get the first Zadroga Act passed in 2010. That bill created the World Trade Center Health Program and reopened the Victim Compensation Fund.

But we only authorized the VCF for 5 years. We knew we needed more than 5 years, and we came back in 2015 and passed the reauthorization bill.

That bill made the health program permanent—or, at least, until 2090—which gave much-needed certainty to those suffering from 9/11 illnesses and their families. But, again, we authorized the Victim Compensation Fund, the VCF, for just another 5 years.

As those 5 years have gone by, people have become sicker. More and more responders and survivors have been diagnosed with various cancers, particularly cancers with long latency periods, and, tragically, more and more have died from those illnesses.

As people become sicker and pass away, the VCF has functioned exactly as Congress directed. It has provided those individuals, those first responders, those survivors, and their families with compensation and resources they need to get through these difficult times.

But, just as people are getting sicker, the VCF is running out of money. Last month, the Justice Department announced that, because of the high demand for claims, because the cancers are more numerous than anticipated, because more people of the heroes of 9/11 than anticipated are getting sick, the Department would be forced to cut awards by 50 percent if they were filed by February 1 and 70 percent if they were filed after February 1.

Can you imagine that? You are dying of stomach cancer, unable to work, unable to leave your house for more than your doctor’s appointments, and waiting for compensation so you can pay off your house and protect your family before you die, and the award you anticipated is cut in half or by 70 percent. Your wife dies after a long struggle with breast cancer, and you are waiting for your claim to pay her funeral expenses, and your compensation is cut in half or by 70 percent.

That is not the promise we made to those first responders and survivors. That is not fulfilling the moral obligation that pushed us to create the VCF in the first place.

That is failing Lincoln’s statement of our duty “to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphan.”

That is failing our promise to never forget 9/11 and failing the brave men and women who have borne this day and who struggle and fight to this day.

But that doesn’t have to happen. If we pass the Never Forget the Heroes Act, we can stop these cuts and make the Victim Compensation Fund permanent, providing responders and survivors the certainty that, no matter how sick they get, they will have us at their backs and the resources they need.

I thank my colleagues who have been with us in this fight from the start, and I thank the 142 bipartisan cosponsors who have already signed on to this bill.

We will get this done. We must get this done. We will meet our moral obligations.

We will never forget these heroes.

Mr. ZELDIN. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman NADLER for his remarks tonight and for his leadership through the years. It is a very important voice from New York, from Ground Zero, and something that couldn’t have possibly impacted the heart of his district any more than what was the largest attack on our soil on September 11, 2001.

A lot of Members of this Chamber don’t realize that 9/11 first responders came from almost every single congressional district represented here.
But it was all throughout Chairman NADLER’s district on September 11, 2001, that we saw people going into danger while everyone else was running out, and it reminded us of the strength of New Yorkers, the pride and strength and courage of Americans.

There have certainly been great sacrifices since but, most importantly, sacrifices from those who have been victims because of September 11, 2001, either due to the attack that day or service in our military.

As we are here tonight, there are 9/11 first responders who are very sick, and I just want to, right before we close, share one quick story.

This is a constituent of mine from East Hampton. This is a single mother, a sole provider of her 12-year-old son, who lived and worked within blocks of the World Trade Center on 9/11 and during the aftermath.

She said: “My colleagues and I saw it as our patriotic duty to show the terrorists that they could not destroy our neighborhood and way of life.”

I think, many times, people forget that, in the aftermath of 9/11, we were not only tending to Ground Zero, but we were rebuilding the spirit of our Nation.

It is thanks to Americans like this constituent of mine and her coworkers and all those who faced the unconscionable horror, who did not cower in fear, that our Nation rose stronger than ever.

In late 2017, she was diagnosed with stage III ovarian cancer, which has never occurred on either side of her family.

Her coworker at the time of 9/11 developed prostate cancer, and three of her coworkers now have an extremely rare skin condition.

In response to learning that the fund is running out of money and would cut claims by 70 percent, she said: “I don’t think I ever express in writing how devastated I feel. Even worse, I feel extremely distraught over the others who are in the same situation as me or who are about to find they are . . . as they will, too, receive a devastating diagnosis like mine.”

The one other story is Kevin from Smithtown. I represent a district that is just over 50 miles from Ground Zero, and fighting for my constituents who were affected by September 11 is my job, but it is also very personal.

Kevin is a former NYPD officer who said he “picked up human remains for 2 days, without any hesitation, because at the time that is what had to be done.”

He continued to work on and around the pile for close to 12 months.

In January of 2018, Kevin was diagnosed with non-Hodgkin’s diffuse large B-cell lymphoma and underwent 6 months of chemotherapy, which left him with devastating symptoms that will stay with him the rest of his life.

He wrote to me about how he missed his children and loved ones. He said: “To give out awards reduced by 70 percent is a slap in my face and all others that are now suffering,” and he is right.

When he was working the pile day and night for months on end, he wasn’t thinking about himself or what this might mean for his future. He was thinking about our Nation. He was committed to getting the remains of victims of 9/11 home to those who survived them.

Kevin was there for us, and it is important for all of us to step up to the plate for him.

Lastly, I thank Congresswoman MALONEY, Congressman KING, and Chairman NADLER for taking the lead on this legislation yet again. I thank Congressman ROSE for coleading tonight’s Special Order. Hopefully, it is the start of something new and that we will see more often: bipartisan Special Orders on the floor of the House of Representatives.

I think our constituents back home all across America want to see more of us working together to get good things done. It makes them feel good that their government is working for them.

But I will tell you, with regards to the 9/11 Victim Compensation Fund, it is not until this Chamber, the Senate, and the President signs it that this is done, fully funded, that we are going to be able to take credit for anything good and right, because this needs to actually get over the finish line.

Tonight is just another positive step. Everyone signing on as cosponsors is a positive step. And I hope that everyone who is watching, whether you are a Member of this Chamber, you are a staffer of a Member of this Chamber, or you are an advocate, that you get involved, cosponsor, to get our numbers up.

I thank Madam Speaker for her leadership tonight with this effort, for presiding over the Chamber during this very important hour, and I yield back the balance of my time.

STATUS OF ABORTION IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, today I would like to address the status of abortion in America.

In the past 2 months, there have been two stories that show a significant shift. I believe, in America regarding the status of abortion.

In New York, one of our original 13 Colonies, they recently expanded the right to have abortions up to 9 months and, as a practical matter, left it to be okay for a baby born alive not to receive protection. The Governor of New York was so proud of this situation that he lit up the World Trade Center and people applauded in the Senate chamber.

In Virginia, another one of our original 13 States, the Governor came out for a bill that also allows 9-month abortions. The morally bereft Governor said that, if a baby was born alive, that baby would only be resuscitated if the mother wanted.

By the way, I want to point out here there is this myth out there that late-term abortions are only for babies who may not survive.

I once heard a speech from a woman who quit a late-term abortion clinic in Ohio. She was there only one day. At that time, there were six babies delivered. Five had no health problems whatsoever, and the other had either spina bifida—I think it was spina bifida. And, of course, many people live productive lives with that disease.

Only 10 years ago, Kermit Gosnell of Philadelphia was convicted of delivering babies alive and killing them after they were born—perhaps hundreds, perhaps thousands.

You can read about them in a book by that name, “Gosnell.” There is a movie out as well; kind of very interesting to see the mindset of the abortion industry.

But Gosnell was defiant. When they talked to him after he was convicted, as a practical matter, put in prison for life, he said, in the end, he would be vindicated. And I think when he said vindicated, he meant that he felt America would come around to the position that it would be okay to kill a baby born alive.

Who would dream that less than 10 years later, Gosnell may be on the verge of being proven right, and that the moral compass of America had shifted so much that it would be okay to allow a born-alive baby to die.

How did we get here? There are a variety of culprits to blame. Part of it, of course, is the thinly disguised racism of our old friend, Margaret Sanger, feminist hero, was opposed to abortion because as recently as 60 years later, Sanger, feminist hero, was opposed to abortion because in her view, the views of the early progressives.

Who would dream that less than 10 years later, Gosnell may be on the verge of being proven right, and that the moral compass of America had shifted so much that it would be okay to allow a born-alive baby to die.

But she did want her organization to reduce people from races she considered inferior, and this was typical of the views of the early progressives.

We also have people viewing it also as a way to hold down the people that we consider undesirable.

Justice Ginsberg was quoted in the New York Times that she thought Roe was decided, in part, because of a concern about population growth in populations we don’t want too many of.

Now, she was subsequently allowed to say that that quote was taken out of context, but that was the quote that was listed. They kind of gave her a chance to try to walk that thing back; a chance that wasn’t given STEVE KING. I find that the situation by an article in the Harvard Journal crediting abortion with the reduction in crime rates.
Part of the problem is the usual weight of promiscuous politicians who would obviously be for abortion; people like the Ted Kennedys or Bill Clintons or Bob Packwoods of the world, and, obviously, there are a given number of men who have a vested interest in making sure abortion is always available.

Part of the problem is the pernicious influence of Hollywood. The “Me Too Movement” has opened up eyes as to the many powerful people in Hollywood and that, perhaps, is one of the reasons why the popular culture would be all largely pro-choice to the extreme or pro-abortion to the extreme.

But still, there is this profusion in this country where we peaked out at over a million abortions a year, and we are still over 600,000. You look what is going on in Virginia, and you look at what is going on in New York; and it seems to be fertile ground for the priest or minister looking for something to say.

Nevertheless, I have taken to spending the last few weeks kind of talking to people at random as to how often in the past year, when the priests and ministers are looking for 50 different topics to talk about, how often they have addressed the abortion issue.

It is not unusual, as a matter of fact, I would say the majority of people I talked to who go to a church, it is not brought up. I will tell you, it would be very difficult to come up with 50 different topics a year. But how you can come up with 50 different topics a year; and with 600,000 abortions in this country every year, and not deal with it.

But I think a lot of the blame has to lie there. Whenever there are great tragedies in human history, I think people expect the clergy to step up and provide some moral guidance.

So I end this speech by saying three things:

First of all, I ask the pro-life groups not to give up.

Secondly, I ask the politicians to bring forth bills like the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, which, by the way, in itself, shows some weakness, and we have a relatively weak bill. And that is, I guess, what our pro-life position is today, or the bill we can bring to the floor. But it is kind of a law that didn’t even get a final vote on that in the Senate, but the bill should be brought up to educate America on the state of abortion in America right now.

And finally, and most importantly, I ask the churches to finally step up. You know, I look on a calendar, and this June there will be five weekends. Okay. So your average priest, your average minister out there is going to have to think of five topics to talk about.

So I would like to ask the people of this country, and any clergy who happen to hear this speech, to devote at least one of those 5 weeks in June to this stained of over 600,000 abortions in this country every year, and ask yourself, what is the right or wrong thing to do?

And if you are one of those clergy-men who, over the last year has not addressed this issue—see, I am making your life easier for you, you only have to think of four other things to talk about, rather than the five weekends in June—I ask you to spend one week in June addressing this issue and encouraging people to finally say no more of this scourge in the United States.

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

229. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Subpart Nongenate Change (Docket No.:APHIS-2018-0070) received March 6, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

330. A letter from the Director, Issuances Staff, OPDP/FSIS/USDA, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Eliminating Unnecessary Requirements for Hog Carcass Cleaning (Docket No.: FSIS-2018-0005) (RIN: 0583-AD68) received March 6, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

331. A letter from the Alternate OSD FRLO, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Standard Rates of Subsistence Allowance and Commutation Instead of Uniforms for Members of the Senior Reserve Officers’ Training Corps (Docket ID: DOD-2018-OS-0046) (RIN: 0709-AK32) received March 6, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

332. A letter from the Alternate OSD FRLO, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Elminating Unnecessary Requirements for Hog Carcass Cleaning (Docket ID: DOD-2018-OS-0084) (RIN: 0709-AK46) received March 6, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

333. A letter from the Alternate OSD FRLO, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Retired Serviceman’s Family Protection Plan (RSPFP) (Docket ID: DOD-2018-OS-0058) (RIN: 0709-AK31) received March 6, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

334. A letter from the Alternate OSD FRLO, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Availability of DoD Directives, DoD Instructions, DoD Publications and Changes to Directives (Docket ID: DOD-2018-OS-0004) (RIN: 0709-AK48) received March 6, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

335. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of the Securities and Exchange Commission, Division of Investment Management, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission’s interim final rule — Amendments To The Timing Requirements
For Filing Reports On Form N-Port (Release No. IC-33384; File No.: ST-02-19) (RIN: 3235-AL42) received March 6, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 686); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

336. A letter from the Deputy Chief, Mobility Division, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission’s final rule — In the Matter of Service Rules for the 998-746,747-762, and 777-792 Bands [WT Docket No.: DA 19-77] received March 6, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 686); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

337. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 23-19, “Sports Wagering Lottery Clarification Amendment Act of 2019” [Docket No.: 170816769-8162-02] received March 6, 2019, pursuant to Public Law 93-196, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

338. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 23-20, “Bryant Street Tax Increment Financing Temporary Amendment Act of 2019” [Docket No.: 170816769-8160-02] received March 6, 2019, pursuant to Public Law 93-196, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

339. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 23-34, “Rental Housing Registration Extension Temporary Amendment Act of 2019”, pursuant to Public Law 93-196, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

340. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 23-41, “Federal Worker Housing Relief Temporary Amendment Act of 2019”, pursuant to Public Law 93-196, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.


342. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration’s temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reallocation of Pacific Cod in the Bearing Sea Management Area [Docket No.: 161032085-7101-02] (RIN: 0648-XF94) received March 6, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 686); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

343. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration’s temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Ocean Perch in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Areas [Docket No.: 18090623-8099-02] (RIN: 0648-XG502) received March 6, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 686); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

344. A letter from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration’s final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder, Scafell Sculpin, and Black Sea Bass Fisheries; 2019 Specifications [Docket No.: 18090623-8099-02] received March 6, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 686); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

345. A letter from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration’s temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Ocean Perch in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 170918908-8999-02] (RIN: 0648-XG512) received March 6, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 686); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

346. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration’s temporary rule — Fisheries of the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands; 2018 Management Area 1B Directed Fishery Closure [Docket No.: 15121599-6960-02] (RIN: 0648-XG512) received March 6, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 686); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

347. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration’s temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Atlantic Herring Fishery Off the Eastern United States; Atlantic Mackerel, Squid, and Butterfish Fishery; 2018 Illex Squid Quota Harvested [Docket No.: 149002-5224-02] (RIN: 0648-XG519) received March 6, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 686); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

348. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration’s temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Ocean Perch in the West Yakutat District of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 170816769-8162-02] (RIN: 0648-XG400) received March 6, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 686); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

349. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration’s temporary rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Shrimp Fishery Off the Southern Atlantic States; Closure of the Penaeid Shrimp Fishery Off South Carolina [Docket No.: 120919470-3513-02] (RIN: 0648-XG369) received March 6, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 686); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

350. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration’s temporary rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Sea Scallop Fishery; Closure of the Mid-Atlantic Scallop Access Area [Docket No.: 18090623-8099-02] (RIN: 0648-XG502) received March 6, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 686); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

351. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration’s temporary rule — Fisheries of the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands; 2018 Management Area 1B Directed Fishery Closure [Docket No.: 15121599-6960-02] (RIN: 0648-XG512) received March 6, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 686); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

352. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration’s temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Ocean Perch in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 170918908-8999-02] (RIN: 0648-XG512) received March 6, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 686); to the Committee on Natural Resources.
Administration’s temporary rule — Reel Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; 2018 Recreational Accountability Measure and Closure for Gulf of Mexico Gray Triggerfish [Docket No. 129-2018 Penalties for Infants and Children (CG-421)] received March 6, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

360. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the Department’s final regulations — Adjustment of Civil Penalties for Infants and Children (Docket ID: ED-2019-OCE-0004) (RIN: 1801- AA18) received March 6, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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. PAPPAS (for himself and Mr. BERGMAN):

H.R. 1579. A bill to amend title 36, United States Code, to require that the POW/MIA flag be displayed on all days that the flag of the United States is displayed on certain Federal property; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. McCaul, Mr. Smith of Washington, Mrs. Wasserman, Mr. Keating, and Mr. Rooney of Florida):

H.R. 1580. A bill to enhance stabilization of conflict-affected areas and prevent violence and fragility globally, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Appropriations, 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 Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts (for herself, Ms. Barragan, Ms. Bass, Mr. Bera, Mr. Bryer, Ms. Blunt Rochester, Mr. Blumenauer, Ms. Brownley of California, Mr. Carbajal, Mr. Cardenas, Mr. Cartwright, Mr. Case, Mr. Casten of Illinois, Ms. Castor of Florida, Mr. Castro of Texas, Ms. Chu of California, Mr. Cicilline, Mr. Cisneros, Ms. Clarke of New York, Mr. Cleaver, Mr. Connolly, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Cox of California, Ms. Craig, Mr. Crow, Mr. Cummings, Mrs. Davis of California, Ms. Dean, Mr. DeFazio, Ms. Delgado, Ms. DeLauro, Mr. Drucker, Mrs. Dingell, Mr. Engel, Ms. Escobar, Mr. Espallardo, Mr. Evans, Mrs. Fletcher, Mr. Foster, Mr. Gabbard of Hawaii, Mr. Galloway, Ms. Garcia of Illinois, Ms. Garcia of Texas, Mr. Gomez, Mr. Green of Texas, Mr. Grijalva, Ms. Haaland, Mr. Hasting of Florida, Mr. Heck, Ms. Bill of California, Mr. Himes, Ms. Houlahan, Mr. Huffman, Ms. Jayapal, Mr. Johnson of Georgia, Ms. Kaptur, Ms. Kelly of Illinois, Mr. Kilmer, Mr. Kind, Mrs. Kirschpatrick, Mr. Krishnamoorthi, Ms. Kuster of New Hampshire, Ms. Lawrence, Mr. Lewis of Florida, Ms. Lee of California, Mr. Levin of Michigan, Mr. Lowenthal, Ms. Lowey, Mr. Lucan, Mr. Malinowski, Mrs. Carolyn B. Maloney of New York, Mr. Sean Patrick Maloney of New York, Ms. Matsui, Ms. McCollum, Mr. McGovern, Mr. McNerney, Ms. Meng, Ms. Moore, Mr. Morelle, Mr. Moulton, Mr. Nadler, Mrs. Napolitano, Mr. Neuse, Mr. Norton, Ms. Ocasio-Cortez, Mr. Perlmutter, Ms. DeGette, Mr. Payne, Mr. Peters, Ms. Pingree, Mr. Pocan, Ms. Pressley, Mr. Quigley, Mr. Raskin, Miss Rice of New York, Mr. Raskin of Maryland, Mr. Ruppersgerd, Mr. Rush, Mr. Ryan, Ms. Sanchez, Mr. Sarranes, Ms. Schakowsky, Mr. Schiff, Mr. Schuler, Mr. Shalala, Mr. Sherman, Ms. Sherrill, Mr. Sires, Mr. Smith of Washington, Mr. Soto, Ms. Speier, Ms. Tausch, Mr. Tonko, Ms. Torres of California, Mr. Trahan, Mr. Trone, Mr. Vargas, Ms. Velázquez, Mr. Wasserman, and in addition to Mr. Coleman, Mr. Welch, and Ms. Wildil):

H.R. 1581. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to include in the Annual Country Reports on Human Rights Practices a section on reproductive rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CUMMINGS:

H.R. 1582. A bill to amend title 44, United States Code, to require preservation of certain historical documents of military agencies, to require a certification and reports relating to Presidential records, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Appropriations, 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. MORELLE (for himself, Mrs. Dingell, Mr. Fitzpatrick, and Mrs. Rodriguez-Velázquez):

H.R. 1583. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to establish an initiative, to coordinate Federal efforts and programs for home modifications enabling older individuals and individuals with disabilities to live independently and safely in a home environment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PERRY:

H.R. 1584. A bill to repeal section 115 of the Clean Air Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. BASS (for herself and Mr. Fitzpatrick):

H.R. 1585. A bill to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. BUTTERFIELD:

H.R. 1586. A bill to amend the National Telecommunications and Information Administration Organization Act to establish a digital network technology program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, 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. BUTTERFIELD:

H.R. 1587. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to enter into a 10-year arrangement with the National Academy of Sciences to conduct and update biennially a study on the effects of State legalized marijuana programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Education and Labor, 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 Ms. GABBARD (for herself, Mr. Young, Mr. Brown, Mr. Soto, Ms. Norton, Ms. Schakowsky, Mr. Cohen, Mr. Carrajal, Mr. Gaetz, Mr. Amash, Ms. Pingree, Ms. Lee of California, Mr. Pocan, Mr. Swalwell of California, Mr. Khanna, Mr. Gallego, Mr. Correa, Mrs. Luria, Mr. Smith of Washington, and Mr. DeFazio):

H.R. 1588. A bill to limit the application of Federal laws to the distribution and consumption of marijuana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. WALKER (for himself and Mr. King of New York):

H.R. 1589. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide for a digital network technology program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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. KING of New York:

H.R. 1590. A bill to require an exercise related to terrorist and foreign fighter travel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mrs. BEATTY:

H.R. 1591. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide grants to local educational agencies to encourage girls and underrepresented minorities to pursue studies and careers in STEM fields; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LANGEVIN (for himself and Mr. Thompson of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 1592. A bill to direct the Secretary of Education to establish a pilot program to award competitive grants for the integration of cybersecurity education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself, Mr. Thompson of Mississippi, and Mr. Green of Texas):

H.R. 1593. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish a school security coordinating council, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself, Mr. Thompson of Mississippi, and Mr. Green of Texas):

H.R. 1594. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish a process to review applications for certain grants to purchase equipment, or systems that do not meet or exceed any applicable national voluntary consensus standards, and for other
purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. PERLMUTTER (for himself, Mr. HECK, Mr. STIVERs, Mr. DAVIDSON of North Carolina, Mr. BARRAGÁN, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BROOKS of Indiana, Ms. CARRASCO, Mr. CUSTODIO, Mr. DÍAZ BALART, Mr. DÍAZ-BALART of Florida, Ms. DIJKSTRA, Mr. DÍAZ-BALART of Illinois, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. SANCHEZ, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCHLOETZEL, Mr. SCHUMACHER, Mr. SCHUMACHER of Texas, Mr. SCHODER, Mr. SCHWEIZER, Mr. SCHWARTZ, Mr. SCHWARTZ of New York, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. SCHWARZ, Mr. SCOTT of North Carolina, Mr. SEBASTIANO, Mr. SEBERA, Mr. SENG, Mr. TAYLOR, Ms. TAYLOR of California, Mr. TAYLOR of Georgia, Mr. TAYLOR of Idaho, Mr. TAYLOR of South Dakota, Mr. TAYLOR of Virginia, Mr. TAYLOR of West Virginia, Mr. TAYLOR of Wyoming, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. TRUE, Mr. TURNER, Mr. TURNER of Texas, Mr. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. VELAZQUEZ of California, Ms. VELAZQUEZ of Florida, Mr. VELAZQUEZ of Illinois, Mr. VELAZQUEZ of New York, Mr. VELAZQUEZ of Texas, Mr. VELAZQUEZ of Utah, Mr. VELASQUEZ of Nevada, Mr. VELASQUEZ of New Mexico, Mr. VELASQUEZ of New York, Mr. VELASQUEZ of Ohio, Mr. VELASQUEZ of Pennsylvania, Mr. VELASQUEZ of Virginia, Mr. VELASQUEZ of Washington, Mr. VELASQUEZ of Wisconsin, Mr. WHEELER, Mr. WICKER, Mr. WICKER of Mississippi, Mr. WICKER of Tennessee, Mr. WILLIAMSTON, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mr. WILLIAMSSON, Mr. WILLIAMSSON of Tennessee, Mr. WOHRLE, Mr. WOOD, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. WOODALL of West Virginia, Mr. WOODER, Mr. WOODRUFF, Mr. WOODRUFF of Georgia, Mrs. WOODWARD, Mr. WOODWARD of New York, Ms. WOODWARD of New York, Mr. WOODWARD of New York, Mr. WOODWARD of New York).
consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CHEFFSWAY (for himself, Mr. BILIRAKIS of Florida, and Mr. HUNTSKIRCH of South Carolina): H.R. 1622. A bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to authorize a study on the impact of the federal political campaign expenditure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PORTER: H.R. 1623. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide for the treatment of payments for child care and other personal use services as non-campaign expenditures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. PORTER (for herself and Mr. GOSAR): H.R. 1624. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to authorize certain contributions and donations by foreign nationals in connection with State or local ballot initiatives or referenda; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RICE of South Carolina: H.R. 1625. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a safe harbor for determinations of worker classification, to require increased reporting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUZIA: H.R. 1626. A bill to prevent the enrichment of certain Government officers and employees or their families through Federal funds or grants; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, 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. SCHIFF (for himself, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. TORRES of California, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. KILMER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. WATERS, Mr. HASTERT of Illinois, Mr. RUSH, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. BLUMENAUER of California, Ms. NAPOLITANO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. KRUSHNA MOORTHY, and Mr. RUSH): H.R. 1627. A bill to direct the Attorney General to submit to Congress investigative reports on the expungement of certain political expenditures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. STEUER (for himself and Mrs. LURIA): H.R. 1628. A bill to direct the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to enter into an agreement with the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine to conduct a study on the impact of the 2010 Census on the Federal and State budget, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mrs. TORRES of California (for herself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. SHALALA, Mr. MEADOWS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. KRANHA, Mr. STAUBER, and Ms. WILD): H.R. 1629. A bill to require the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to review and make certain revisions to the Standard Occupational Classification System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TORRES of California (for herself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. SHALALA, Mr. MEADOWS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. KRANHA, Mr. STAUBER, and Ms. WILD): H.R. 1630. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to coordinate Federal and State permitting processes related to the construction of new surface water storage projects on lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture and to designate the Bureau of Reclamation as the lead agency for permit processing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PANETTA (for himself, Mr. MAST, Ms. SLOTKIN, and Mr. HURD of Texas): H.R. 1631. A bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to limit experimentation on cats; to the Committee on Agriculture.
H.R. 1630. A bill to impose sanctions under the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act to combat corruption, money laundering, and impunity in Guatemala, for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. VEASEY.

H.R. 1632. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide that any absentee ballot may be mailed free of postage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, 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 Ms. WAGNER (for herself, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, and Mr. YOHO); 

H.R. 1633. A bill to improve the productivity, energy efficiency of the manufacturing sector by directing the Secretary of Energy, in coordination with the National Academies and other appropriate Federal agencies, to develop a national smart manufacturing plan and to provide assistance to small- and medium-sized manufacturers in implementing smart manufacturing programs, for such purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, 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. GRJALVA (for himself and Mr. REED);

H.R. 1634. A bill to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to provide for the establishment of Youth Corps programs to provide work and job-related experiences for young people to create jobs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself and Mr. REED);

H.R. 1636. A bill to establish the Commission on the Social Status of Black Men and Boys, to study and make recommendations to address social problems affecting Black men and boys and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of Florida;

H.R. 1637. A bill to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to require States to designate public high schools as voter registration agencies, to direct such schools to conduct voter registration drives for students attending such schools, to direct the Secretary of Education to make grants to reimburse such schools for the costs of conducting such voter registration drives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, 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. NADLER (for himself, Ms. WATERS, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. NEAL);

H. Con. Res. 24. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the report of Special Counsel Mueller should be made available to the public and to Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SYRES (for himself and Mr. BRADY);

H. Res. 182. A resolution providing amounts for the Committee on Ways and Means in the One Hundred Sixteenth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BASS (for himself and Mr. RICHMOND);

H. Res. 183. A resolution condemning anti-Semitism as hateful expressions of intolerance that are contrary to the values and aspirations of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, 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, considered and agreed to;

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself and Mr. BISHOP of Utah);

H. Res. 184. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Natural Resources in the One Hundred Sixteenth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MCGOVERN (for himself and Mr. COLE);

H. Res. 185. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Rules in the One Hundred Sixteenth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BYRNE (for himself, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. WALKER, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. CLAY, Mr. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. RUSH, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. DACUS of Illinois, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. NORTON, Mr. WILD, Mr. TRONE, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. HILL of Arkansas, Ms. BONAMASSA, Mr. SEWELL of Nevada, Mr. BUDD, and Mr. GOHMET);

H. Res. 186. A resolution commemorating the 75th anniversary of the United Negro College Fund, Inc.; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DEUTCH (for himself, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mrs. LOWRY, Mr. SCHWARZENBERGER, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. CHABOT);

H. Res. 187. A resolution calling for the unconditional release of United States citizens and legal permanent resident aliens being held for political purposes by the Government of Iran; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DUFFY (for himself and Ms. JACKSON LEE);

H. Res. 188. A resolution expressing support for designation of July as National Sarcoma Awareness Month; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. MARSHALL (for himself and Mr. MCGOVERN);

H. Res. 189. A resolution recognizing the importance of sustained United States leadership in protecting progress against maternal and child malnutrition and supporting United States Agency for International Development’s commitment to global nutrition through its multi-sectoral nutrition strategy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Appropriations, for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PALLONE (for himself, Mr. BLIRAKIS, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SPEIER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. ESQUIVO, Mr. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. MCGovern, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. COSTA, and Mr. CARBAJAL);

H. Res. 190. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives supporting visits and communication between the United States and the Republic of Artsakh at all levels of civil society and government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. MCCONTOCK, Mr. WHERES of Texas, Mr. LOUERDELIRIK, Mr. BAHN, Mr. FLIESCHMANN, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. GROTNAM, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. GIANFORTE, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. LIUETKEMEYER, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee, and Mr. HUDDSON);

H. Res. 191. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives relating to protecting freedom of speech, thought, and expression at institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. THOMPSON of Mississippi (for himself and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama);

H. Res. 192. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Homeland Security in the One Hundred Sixteenth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. YARMUTH;

H. Res. 193. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on the Budget in the One Hundred Sixteenth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY

STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. PAPPAS:

H.R. 1578.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sec. 8, Clause 1, of the United States Constitution states that “Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States.” (Page H373)

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 1580.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress)

By Mr. BEYER:
H.R. 1606.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. CARP:WRIGHT:
H.R. 1607.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 (relating to the power of Congress to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.)

By Mr. CLAY:
H.R. 1608.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

H.R. 1609.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

H.R. 1610.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

H.R. 1611.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:
H.R. 1612.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. KATKO:
H.R. 1614.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. KELLY of Mississippi:
H.R. 1615.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution, which provides Congress with the authority to enact legislation necessary and proper to effectuate its purposes in taxing and spending.
by Mr. KINZINGER:
H.R. 1616.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the US Constitution
By Mr. KRISHNA MOOTHI:
H.R. 1617.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
United States Constitution, Article I, Section 8
By Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire:
H.R. 1618.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Mrs. LEE of Nevada:
H.R. 1619.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the US Constitution—regulating commerce with foreign nations, and among the Several States, and with the Indian nations.
By Mrs. LURIA:
H.R. 1620.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section 8
By Mr. McCINTOCK:
H.R. 1621.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Mr. PANETTA:
H.R. 1622.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, clause 18
By Ms. PORTER:
H.R. 1623.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 4 and Article I, Section 8
By Ms. PORTER:
H.R. 1624.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 4 and Article I, Section 8
By Mr. RICE of South Carolina:
H.R. 1625.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Section I, Article 8. The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.
By Mr. RUIZ:
H.R. 1626.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution, to provide for the general welfare and make all laws necessary and proper to carry out the powers of Congress.
By Mr. SCHIFF:
H.R. 1627.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The Abuse of Pardon Prevention Act is constitutionally authorized under Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.
By Mr. STEUH:
H.R. 1628.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 1: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.
2: To borrow Money on the credit of the United States;
3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;
4: To establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States;
5: To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures;
6: To provide for the Punishment of counterfeiting the Securities and current Coin of the United States;
7: To establish Post Offices and post Roads;
8: To promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries;
9: To constitute Tribunals inferior to the supreme (ten Miles square) as may, by Cession of particular States, and the Acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.
By Mrs. TORRES of California:
H.R. 1629.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.
By Mr. VEASEY:
H.R. 1630.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8.
By Mrs. WAGNER:
H.R. 1631.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the Constitution.
By Mr. WELCH:
H.R. 1632.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Article 1, Section 8.
By Ms. WILSON of Florida:
H.R. 1633.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Section I, Article 8.
By Ms. WILSON of Florida:
H.R. 1634.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Section I, Article 8.
By Ms. WILSON of Florida:
H.R. 1635.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Section 1, Article 8.
By Mr. WILSON of Florida:
H.R. 1636.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8.
By Mr. WILSON of Florida:
H.R. 1637.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8.
ADDITIONAL SPONSORS
Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:
H.R. 83: Mr. Roy.
H.R. 96: Mr. Cox of California and Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL.
H.R. 127: Mr. MASSIE.
H.R. 141: Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. LOPFRIEN, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mr. KRISHNA MOOTHI.
H.R. 142: Ms. TLAIB.
H.R. 145: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.
H.R. 151: Mr. RICE of South Carolina.
H.R. 154: Mr. COLE.
H.R. 180: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 197: Ms. HAALAND.
H.R. 218: Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. CLINE, and Mr. CUDDY.
H.R. 219: Mr. WALKER.
H.R. 250: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. MOULTON, and Ms. OMAAR.
H.R. 273: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 295: Mr. WRIGHT.
H.R. 303: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CASE, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, and Mr. KRISHNA MOOTHI.
H.R. 305: Mr. BIGGS.
H.R. 307: Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania.
Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.

Mrs. AXNE, Mr. W ATKINS, and Mr. S WALWELL.

ALLRED, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. MCADAMS, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. S IRES, and Mrs. C RAIG.

Rico, Mr. C A´ RDENAS, Ms. B ASS, Mr. L EWIS, and Mrs. AXNE.

and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

KHANNA, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. M CNER-

H.R. 943: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 944: Mr. NORCROSS.

H.R. 945: Mr. KIND, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, and Mrs. AXNE.

H.R. 946: Mr. KIM.

H.R. 956: Mr. SmUCKER.

H.R. 962: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 973: Mr. QUILLEY, Ms. SLOTKIN, and Ms. Kuster of New Hampshire.

H.R. 992: Mr. BROWN of Maryland.

H.R. 1002: Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 1007: Ms. DELBENE, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. TURNER, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, and Mr. DeFAZIO.

H.R. 1019: Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. PALLONE, Mrs. AXNE, Mr. WATKINS, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 1042: Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL.

H.R. 1046: Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL.

H.R. 1094: Mr. SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 1109: Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL.

H.R. 1126: Mr. LAW.

H.R. 1131: Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ.

H.R. 1140: Miss R ICE of New York, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. CLEAVER, and Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 1146: Mr. NEAL.

H.R. 1155: Mr. Kim and Mr. DELGADO.

H.R. 1156: Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H.R. 1162: Mr. Waters.

H.R. 1163: Ms. STEFANIK.

H.R. 1171: Mr. ALLRED, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CLEAVER, and Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ.

H.R. 1184: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 1229: Mr. GRIJALVA and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 1224: Ms. Moore, Mr. Kind, Mr. KILMER, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. CASTRO of Texas.

H.R. 1226: Mr. KINZINGER.

H.R. 1232: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 1239: Mr. FOSTER, Mr. ROSE of New York, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. TITUS, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. DeFAZIO, Mr. T ED LIEU of California, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. CERDAÑAS, and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 1237: Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL and Mr. CARWICK.

H.R. 1249: Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ.

H.R. 1279: Mr. King of New York.

H.R. 1309: Ms. FUDGE and Ms. DEAN.

H.R. 1327: Mr. MAST, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. ALLRED, Mr. PEHLUMUTTER, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, and Mr. TRONE.

H.R. 1342: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.R. 1345: Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL.

H.R. 1351: Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ.

H.R. 1360: Mr. King of Iowa.

H.R. 1374: Mr. MOOLENAAR and Mr. PENCE.

H.R. 1377: Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. ROONEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1380: Ms. TITUS, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. TEPTON, and Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL.

H.R. 1389: Ms. Judy Chu of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Ms. McCOlLM, Ms. MOORE, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.

H.R. 1400: Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ.

H.R. 1407: Mr. Johnson of Louisiana, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. BREA.

H.R. 1411: Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 1415: Mr. MAST.

H.R. 1422: Mrs. TORRES of California, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mrs. CRAIG, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. Judy Chu of California, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. Bishop of Georgia, and Mr. DeFAZIO.

H.R. 1425: Mr. LipINSKI and Mr. CARRAJAL.

H.R. 1434: Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. MOOLENAA, and Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 1435: Mr. HARDER of California.

H.R. 1452: Mr. LAHOD, Mr. Smith of Nebraska, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 1469: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania and Mr. DIGG.

H.R. 1495: Mr. GISBS.

H.R. 1510: Mr. RASKIN.

H.R. 1534: Mr. King of New York and Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 1543: Mr. HAGEDORN.

H.R. 1560: Ms. SCANLON.

H.R. 1570: Mr. SCHNEIDER and Ms. MENG.

H.R. 1572: Mr. RASKIN, Ms. DEAN, and Mr. MAST.

H.R. 1576: Mr. CERDAÑAS.

H.R. 1578: Mr. COURTNEY.

H.J. Res. 2: Mr. NORCROSS.

H.J. Res. 30: Mr. BYRNE.

H.J. Res. 38: Mrs. DEMINGS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. CENSEROS, Mr. DANNY K. Davis of Illinois, and Mr. GOLDEN.

H.Con. Res. 15: Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL.

H. Con. Res. 20: Mr. Lucas, Ms. DEAN, and Mr. PENCE.

H. Res. 23: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H. Res. 33: Ms. POENTER, Mr. AMODEI, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. VAN DEREW, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. TURNER, and Mr. NORCROSS.

H. Res. 45: Mr. HARDER of California, Mrs. AXNE, Mr. GUEST, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. DUNN, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. ABRAM, and Mr. BOST.

H. Res. 60: Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. KATKO, and Mr. TIPTON.

H. Res. 107: Mr. BYRNE.

H. Res. 110: Mr. DUNN.

H. Res. 114: Ms. HILL of California.

H. Res. 138: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. TITUS, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. SHERES.

H. Res. 141: Mr. BARR, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. CLAY, Mr. HICK, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. NICHOLAS, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. MARGARET, and Mr. ROONEY of Florida.

H. Res. 149: Mr. HUDSON.

H. Res. 156: Mr. KINZINGER.

H. Res. 164: Mr. WOODALL.

H. Res. 171: Mrs. AXNE.

H. Res. 174: Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. COOK, Mr. GALLIKO, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H. Res. 177: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. MCADAMS.
The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

**PRAYER**

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

*Let us pray.*

Eternal Father, strong to save, empower our lawmakers to serve You today, to solve problems, to remove impediments, and to glorify You. Give them Your higher wisdom as they seek You, the source of their strength.

Lord, surround them with the shield of Your Divine favor so that no weapon formed against them will prosper.

 Almighty God, provide our Senators strength for the adventures of these hours, and may Your truth and love fill their hearts and find expression in their daily living.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

**RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER**

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TILLIS). The majority leader is recognized.

**MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—H.R. 1271 AND H.R. 1381**

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand there are two bills at the desk due a second reading en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the measures by title for the second time.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1271) to establish in the Department of Veterans Affairs a pilot program instituting a clinical observation program for pre-med students preparing to attend medical school.

A bill (H.R. 1381) to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to take actions necessary to ensure that certain individuals may update the burn pit registry with a registered individual's cause of death, and for other purposes.

**ANTI-SEMITISM**

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, before I begin, I spoke yesterday about the evil of anti-Semitism and the recent disturbing invocation of anti-Semitic stereotypes by a Member of the House Democratic Conference. I took for granted, as a result, that the House Democrats would at least—at least—make good on their plans to symbolically condemn anti-Semitism.

Even as I called for the House Democrats to do more and pass the substantive foreign policy legislation the Senate sent them weeks ago, I at least assumed a few pages of symbolism was not too much to ask for, but alas, I spoke too soon. The House has put off consideration of a resolution to condemn anti-Semitism. Apparently, even nonbinding symbolism—this is all they were going to do—is too controversial within their own caucus. Let me say that again. Apparently, within the Speaker’s new far-left Democratic majority, even a symbolic—symbolic—resolution condemning anti-Semitism seems to be a bridge too far.

Well, I expect I and other Members will have more to say on this subject, but for today I would let this speak for itself.

**JUDICIAL NOMINATIONS**

Mr. MCCONNELL. Now on another matter, already this week the Senate has confirmed two more well qualified judicial nominees. Soon, Allison Rushing and Chad Readler will take their respective seats on the Fourth and Sixth Circuit Courts of Appeals, and later today the Senate will vote on confirmation of Eric Murphy, also to the Sixth Circuit. Together, these nominees bring decades of legal experience, prestigious clerkships, and the recognition of their peers. They will be well equipped to do exactly that.

Now, my colleagues need no reminder of Senate Democrats’ historic obstruction of nominations over the past 2 years. Under this administration, 135 nominations have required a cloture vote—135 nominations have required a cloture vote—and five times more were required during the first 2 years than in the same period of the last six administrations combined—combined.

The final nomination we will consider this week captures what I am talking about perfectly. John Fleming was nominated by the President to serve as Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Economic Development on June 20 of last year. This is an Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. Fleming has an impressive record. When the Environment and Public Works Committee first considered his nomination last summer, a significant bipartisan majority voted to favorably report his nomination. This is an Assistant Secretary of Commerce out of committee on a bipartisan basis last summer, but partisan obstruction ran out the clock. The nomination was sent back to the President at the end of the Congress.

So earlier this year Mr. Fleming was resubmitted, returned to the same committee, and was favorably reported by the same bipartisan margin. But the obstruction still wasn’t finished. Here
on the floor, I had to file cloture to en-
sure he would get a vote. I am pleased
that cloture could be withdrawn yester-
day, and we will be happy to vote on
the confirmation today, just as hap-
pened last week on another nomin-[

ation, but I am sorry these cloture fil-
ings made for these unconvirtional and impressive
nominees. I am sorry the case studies
of pointless obstruction just keep on
piling up.

H.R. 1

Mr. MCCONNELL. Now on another
matter, this week Democrats in the
House are expected to pass sweeping
legislation I call the Democratic politi-
cian protection act. It aims to give
Washington, DC, vast new control over
elections, give tax dollars to political
campaigns, and give election lawyers
more opportunities to determine the
outcome of our elections.

I want to discuss how it would
open up the bipartisan Federal Elec-
tion Commission to a hostile partisan
takeover.

When Congress passed and amended
the Federal Election Campaign Act
after Watergate, the FEC was created
as a six-member body, with an even
number of commissioners and no more
than three from the same party. At
least four votes—four—would be re-
quired to take action—a built-in safe-
guard against one party seizing control
of the FEC.

Well, House Democrats want to get
rid of that. Their Democratic politi-
cian protection act would cut the FEC
to a five-member body with two mem-
bers from each party and a nominal
Independent who, interestingly enough,
would be handpicked by whoever the
sitting President was.

Now, people on both sides of the aisle
used to see right through these kinds of
tricks. Back in 1976 Senator Alan
Cranston—a California Democrat who
was, by the way, the No. 2 Democrat in
the Senate—warned about this. He
said: “The FEC has such potential for
abuse in our democratic society that the
President should not be given power
over the Commission.”

As recently as 2 years ago, an out-
going Democratic FEC commissioner—
one of the most active and liberal regu-
lators in the Commission’s history said:
“A problem with the 3-3 split at the com-
mission . . . it was established that way in order to ensure
that there was not going to be a par-
tisan effort to use investigations
against one political party or an-
other.”

But now—now—Democrats want to
scrap the neutrality and bring on the
partisan takeover. Democrats respond
by saying this fifth member would have
to be affiliated with neither the Repub-
lican nor Democratic Party. They
would have to be an Independent.

Give me a break. Give me a break.

One current commissioner is nomi-
nally an Independent, except the Wash-
ington Post reports this gentleman
“often votes with the Democrats,” and
he happens to be a longtime friend of
former Majority Leader Harry Reid. He
had actually previously worked as an
election lawyer for Senator Reid. This
is the Independent on the FEC now. He
had also worked as an election lawyer
for Senator Reid to help ensure he won
close elections. In fact, Senator Reid
repeatedly slipped and characterized
this gentleman as the Democratic
nominee several times here on the
floor.

This is our current Independent on
the FEC?

So I think we all know what kind of
Independent fifth commissioner a
Democratic President would select—
one who would join with other Demo-
crats and champion the campaigns of
the left, while bringing waves of inves-
tigations, hearings, and subpoenas
against their political opponents and
punishing groups who dared to dis-
agree.

What is more, the Democratic Politi-
cian Protection Act would give the sit-
ting President the chance to name the
Chairperson of the FEC, abandoning
the current practice of rotating Chair-
men and women who would get broad
new powers, like the sole authority to
issue subpoenas and to compel testi-
mony and the ability to hire and fire
the general counsel with just two more
votes from just one party.

So much no to democracy. So much
pro to a five-member body that balances
the Democrats and Republicans.

Today I want to discuss how it would
give me a break. Give me a break.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY
NEW DEAL

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, for all
of the Senate’s vaunted traditions about
great debates, we very rarely practice
the actual art—the real back and forth,
the exchange of ideas. For weeks now, we have heard our Repub-
lican colleagues come to the floor and
rail against the Green New Deal, as
the leader just did. Democrats have simply
been trying to get a few honest answers
out of the Republican leadership about
their position on climate change so
that we might have a real debate.

Yesterday, as Republican after Re-
publican lined up to give speeches
against taking bold action on climate
change, several Democrats tried to
steer the conversation in a more posi-
tive direction by asking our Repub-
lican colleagues simple questions—and
I ask this again of every Republican,
particularly of Leader MCCONNELL: Do
you, Leader MCCONNELL, and our Re-
publican friends believe climate change is real? Yes or no? Do you believe
that climate change is caused by human ac-
tivity? Yes or no? Most importantly,
do you believe Congress should do
something about it? Yes or no? If our colleagues believe it is a prob-
lem and agree to that, what is their
plan to deal with climate change? We
know they don’t like the Green New
Deal. They have made that clear. It
doesn’t forward the debate. But what is
their plan?

We might have ruffled some feathers
on the other side. I think my col-
leagues just wanted to give speeches on
the Green New Deal and then leave the
floor. It is a sad state of affairs when
even a little deliberative debate, is some-
thing unsettling here in the Senate. But I have to give credit to
the few Republicans who did engage us.
A few days ago, they did believe in climate change and offered some examples of minor legislation where our parties could work together to begin tackling this crisis. I give them credit for that. But here is the problem: When is Leader McConnell going to schedule time for consideration of this and other climate change legislation? We Democrats are ready to work. Will Leader McConnell bring his own Members’ clean energy legislation to the floor?

Others say that climate change is happening, but the free market could take care of it through “innovation.” With all due respect, that doesn’t mean much. Most of us would agree we live in an incredible time of innovation and technology, yet we continue to pour even more carbon into the atmosphere than in previous years, not less. Left alone, the market has proved incapable of curing climate change for the simple reason of what economists call externalities. You run a coal plant; you make the profits from selling the electricity that the coal plant produces, but you don’t pay the price for the carbon you put in the air. So it is not going to happen through the free market alone because of what even Adam Smith recognized: There are externalities that have to be captured, and it is government’s job to at least make sure they are captured.

Another block of Republicans took a different tack. A few of our Republican colleagues yesterday thought climate change was real but only because the climate has always been changing and all flora and fauna contribute to it. “What are we to do,” they say, as they throw up their hands and look to the sky, “than volcanoes?”

Unbelievable. What an amazing ca-nard that is. Those who said it—and there were a few right here yesterday—would get an F in middle school Earth science with that kind of reasoning. We all know—at least we all ought to know—that activity, particularly the burning of fossil fuels, has pushed the amount of carbon in our atmosphere to record levels, trapping more heat than ever before and changing the climate in ways not seen before in our history.

Maybe denying or misleading about climate change is considered acceptable in the modern Republican Party, where it has come to be expected, and we wonder why that is so. Some say it is because people don’t believe in science. Some argue it is because they just are stuck in the status quo. And some argue it is because there is a lot of oil money cascading into the Republican Party, when you read about all these multimillionaire and billionaire new oil magnates who send tons of money there. Some argue that. You can’t prove which one is true, but we do know it leads to terrible, terrible in- 

action.

So I would like to see my colleagues who don’t admit the severity of climate change go talk to the farmers in Iowa dealing with drought, the fisher-

men in Alaska and North Carolina, the homeowners in Florida and the Mountain West. See if denying recent climate change works there. It sure doesn’t work on the south coast of Long Island, where we had Sandy, which made believers out of many who were skeptical in the past.

Nonetheless, we made some progress yesterday. At the very least, my friends on the other side know they will not be able to execute their standard playbook. Democrats are not going to sit around on the floor and yell about socialism as they have the past two decades. We are going to make Republicans answer core questions about real change. That is what America wants.

One of the reasons all of these scare tactics didn’t work in 2018 and the House is now Democratic and we kept most of our seats, even in very red States—I suspect many of my more reasonable colleagues would prefer to sell them that we could do a lot more—there is the realization that Leader McConnell is so adept at playing and is playing once again with this cynical Green New Deal ploy.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, on another matter, voting rights, today marks the 54th anniversary of Bloody Sunday, the protest march in Selma, AL, that led ultimately to the passage of the Voting Rights Act.

It was one of the most noble acts in American history. The courage of those who marched across that bridge, including our colleague, John Lewis, will be remembered centuries from now. It is a reminder that one thread of the American story is about how, despite our founding, our democratic principles, there has been a long march toward achieving the franchise. We have to work on democracy principles in the beginning. It was brand new. It was great, but remember, in 1789, in almost every State, the only people who could vote were White, male, Protestant property owners. I would imagine that probably would leave out even a majority in this Chamber who would be able to vote.

We have to keep improving that democracy. No one says it should be limited. We all know there is still work to be done, that there are democratic things, we are proud of, that we didn’t get in 1789. There is work to be done in 1789. We have to move forward. We have to make voting more available and easier because the right to vote, without barriers, is what our soldiers, for centuries, have died for and what the people on that bridge marched for. That march is still not over. In the wake of the disaster that was the Supreme Court’s Shelby decision, 19 States rushed to pass discriminatory voter restrictions.

In North Carolina, the Republican State legislature drew up laws that “targeted African Americans with almost surgical precision.” How despicable. How despicable that the Republican legislature did that. Those are not my words; those are the court’s words after looking at the evidence.

Fifty million Americans are now not registered to vote. Even though we don’t talk about it enough, we have a population larger than two States living in Washington, DC, without full congressional representation. We Democrats are ready to work.

Again, Leader McConnell gets up, and he talks about all of these negativity, exaggerations, spin—a little bit like Donald Trump. Why doesn’t Leader McConnell put some legislation on the floor? Today, on the anniversary of Bloody Sunday, I want to mention things we could do right now to bolster voting rights: one, undo the damage of the Shelby County decision by restoring the formula for preclearance; two, automatic voter registration; three, DC statehood.

Anyone who has been observing the floor of the Senate will have noticed by now that Majority Leader McConnell is so adept at playing and is playing once again with this cynical Green New Deal ploy. Leader McConnell, we are proud that we want more people to vote. Why are you ashamed of it? Why do you run away from it?

Leader McConnell, we are proud that we want to get the influence of big, special interest money out of politics. Why do you say that is partisan? It is the wrong thing to do, and 90 percent of all Americans, Democratic and Republican, don’t like to see Big Money cascading into politics. Argue the merits, Leader.

When you think doing those things are democratic things, we are proud, and the Republican Party should be proud, and that they don’t do them and have to call them names. To say that allowing more Americans to vote and getting Big Money out of politics is bad for Republicans and good for Democrats, that says a lot right there. It is a dark day—a dark day—for the Republican Party if their leader in the Senate has to argue against more Americans voting because it would hurt their party at the polls. Maybe we should go back to the old days and say that they like to see only White, male, Protestant property owners could vote. Come on. This idea that having more people vote is a Democratic power grab, when it is part of the fundamental root of our democracy—it is an act of desperation by the Republican leader.

I don’t think it is a coincidence that the Republican leader has pledged to bring up his version of the Green New Deal for a vote but not H.R. 1. He is happy to have his words against it himself but he knows voting rights are a hard thing to argue about.

If he wants to try to bring it up on the floor, we welcome it. We welcome a
discussion. Make no mistake, Democrats are going to fight to make the ballot access easier, challenge all attempts to disenfranchise American citizens, and get the influence of big special interest money out of politics.

CHINA

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, finally, on China, news reports continue to suggest that President Trump is close to striking an agreement with Beijing that, unfortunately for America and for American workers, would fall far right of expectations.

Earlier this week, the New York Times reported that China is drafting new laws on foreign investments to transfer technology and know-how as the cost of doing business.

If China forces American businesses to transfer technology and know-how, it would be the inverse of what the President set out to achieve.

The President was right to target China. The President was right to impose tariffs on China. The President will have taken defeat out of the jaws of an almost victory if he now backs off for the sake of a photo op or some brief chance in what he purchases from China, but now that China is at the negotiating table, China forces American wealth and American workers, while China is stealing our wealth and jobs from our workers every single day.

If President Trump accepts a short-term purchase of American goods in exchange for a reduction in our tariffs without structural reform to China's predatory trade practices, shame on him. If he thinks that photo op will help him; it will not. If he thinks a temporary little bump in China buying more soybeans or more steel products will help; it will not. He will lose because one of the best things he has done—something I, many other Democrats, and many other Americans have praised him for—will be gone. I have publicly given the President credit when he has taken on China.

As I said, Americans have lost millions—trillions—of dollars of wealth and millions of jobs to Chinese IP theft. President Trump has been right to challenge China on those issues. His tariffs have brought China to the negotiating table, but now that China is at the table, President Trump must not walk away without achieving what he set out to achieve.

In short, to cut an unacceptable deal—a weak deal, a photo-op deal—at this stage would be to squander the historic moment to put American businesses, workers, and inventors on a level playing field at long last, and it would be viewed as a capitulation by the President on one of his signature issues. It would be the inverse of what he did on North Korea.

I yield the floor.

S1720

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant bill clerk read the nomination of Eric E. Murphy, of Ohio, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit.

MEDICARE

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I am sure everyone remembers the Democrats' ObamaCare promise: "If you like your health care plan, you can keep it." That promise was named PolitiFacts' "Lie of the Year" in 2013 after it became clear that millions of Americans would, in fact, be able to keep their healthcare plans. There are no worries about being deceived on the question of keeping your insurance this time around because Democrats are loudly and proudly announcing their intention of getting rid of private insurance with their Medicare for All plan.

At a CNN townhall in February, the junior Senator from Vermont was asked: "Will these people be able to keep their health insurance plans, their private plans through their employers, if there is a Medicare for All program that you endorse?"

The answer of the Senator from Vermont was no.

Another Democratic candidate for President, the junior Senator from New York, was recently asked: "Should ending private insurance, as we know it, be a Democratic . . . goal? And do you think it is an urgent goal?"

Her response: "Oh yeah, it is a goal . . . an urgent goal."

If you like your health insurance, you definitely will not be able to keep it. In fact, the employer-sponsored insurance that you have today would be illegal under the Democrats' plan. In the minds of Democrats, Americans are supposed to be enthusiastic about Medicare for All because it would give them free healthcare. The problem, of course, is it will not really be free. Americans are still paying for healthcare; it will just be in the form of much higher taxes.

A left-leaning think tank modeled a version of the Medicare for All plan proposed by the junior Senator from Vermont and found that it would cost a staggering $32 trillion over 10 years. To put that in perspective, the entire Federal budget for 2019 is less than $5 trillion. That is Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, defense spending, education spending, law enforcement, infrastructure—all. In other words, Democrats are talking about increasing Federal spending by more than 60 percent each year just for healthcare. One Medicare expert estimates that doubling the amount of individual and corporate income tax collected would not be enough to cover the cost of Medicare for All.

I don't know about my Democratic colleagues, but I don't know a lot of working families who could afford to have their tax bill literally double. Of course, this is assuming that the cost of the program would be limited to $32 trillion. The Medicare for All proposal that the House Democrats released last week could substantially exceed the $32 trillion estimate because, unlike the Vermont Senator's plan, it includes funding for long-term care, a notoriously expensive part of the healthcare system.

Democrats' last attempt to have the government fund long-term care fell apart before it was even implemented because the program was not financially viable.

It is not just the cost of Medicare for All that is completely unrealistic; the timeline for implementation is as well. House Democrats' proposal would put every American on Medicare for All within 2 years. We had 3½ years to get ObamaCare up and running, and they couldn't even build a working website in that amount of time. The ObamaCare exchanges were intended only to cover a tiny fraction of the number of people who would be covered under Medicare for All. The idea that the Federal Government could smoothly transition all Americans to an Government-run healthcare program in 2 years is absolutely ludicrous. Making the attempt would cause Americans an incredible amount of pain. Every aspect of this proposal would cause Americans an incredible amount of pain.

There are the heavy taxes that would be required to even partially pay for
this program and the bureaucracy and inefficiency that would come with any government attempt to take over healthcare.

Then there is the rationing of care that would inevitably come along. Democrats are promising that these would be plans with generous coverage, but what happens when Democrats don’t have the money to pay for that coverage? Well, they can raise taxes higher, of course.

Yet they will also undoubtedly turn to the rationing of care that we have seen in other countries with socialized medicine. The majority leader noted on the floor last week that Britain’s National Health Service canceled 25,000 surgeries in the first quarter of last year alone.

I could go on. I could talk about the long wait times Americans would experience under Medicare for All. I could talk about the fact that the Democrats’ proposal would end the prohibition on government funding for abortion, meaning that your tax dollars would go toward ending the lives of preborn babies, whether you want them to or not.

I can talk about the threat that Medicare for All represents for seniors because, make no mistake, this program would do away with Medicare as we know it and the promises that have been made to seniors in this country. Seniors would receive care under the new plan, but it would not be the plan they signed up for, and there is no guarantee that they would receive the benefits the Democrats are promising.

If I went on about all the ways that Medicare for All is a bad idea, none of my colleagues would have a chance to speak for the rest of the day or probably tomorrow, for that matter, either. Suffice it to say that Medicare for All would be a very bad deal for the American people.

Let us hope that our colleagues across the aisle halt their mad rush toward socialism before the American people get stuck with this government-run nightmare.

I yield the floor.

"The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia."

NOMINATION OF JOHN FLEMING

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam President, I rise today in support of Dr. John Fleming’s nomination to be the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Economic Development, otherwise known as the Administrator of the Economic Development Administration, or EDA.

I view this as an opportunity not only to speak about the qualifications of a former colleague of mine—whom I served in the House together—but also to highlight the EDA’s work in my home State of West Virginia.

The EDA did not always play an active role in West Virginia, which is really odd when you consider that we have no shortage of economic development and infrastructure needs and challenges in our State. Yet, at my insistence and through the collaboration of my staff, we have turned a corner. Today, we are beginning to see real investments that will make a lasting difference in West Virginia.

To highlight the insignificant amount West Virginia received before I became over yeos prior to my swearing in—2013 and 2014—the State received a total of $200,000 from EDA outside of normal planning grants. These were mostly for technical assistance.

When I went to the Senate and realized this, I made it a top priority of mine to ensure that West Virginia secured more Federal dollars to develop our economy and create new opportunities. I made it clear to EDA at the time that the status quo was absolutely unacceptable.

I am glad to say we are now achieving results, as evidenced by the close to $30 million that EDA has invested in West Virginia since 2015. By bringing everyone to the table and working with our local economic development officials, we were able to foster a renewed focus on West Virginia needs to the benefit of these local projects.

In addition to EDA’s bringing on a State representative, which was crucial to ensure that we focus just on our State, to directly interface with our communities—we are ensuring dollars will go toward projects that will contribute to the future of West Virginia.

At a time when my State and other parts of the country are seeking to reorient their economies toward industries of the future—like technology and advanced manufacturing—these are the kinds of projects that the Federal Government should be prioritizing.

Let me give you a few examples. Just last month, I joined local officials in Greenbrier County to announce $1.5 million in EDA funding to bring potable water to 50 homes and a new business that will employ over 200 people. Keep in mind, these are projects that are collaborative projects. It is not just solely Federal dollars that go into it. There are city, county, and private dollars as well.

In November of last year, EDA announced that it would invest $1 million in the city of Bluefield for the Exit 1 project, a 15-acre development that will serve as a catalyst for business growth and create almost 250 jobs. And 1 year ago, EDA invested close to $5 million in just 1 day to make infrastructure improvements at three separate sites across the State. This funding will promote job growth and retention of jobs in these three counties through added efficiencies in essential infrastructure.

One of these projects I will talk about is in northern West Virginia, where I am originally from, and it will be to rehabilitate the Wheeling Corrugating steel plant complex in Brooke County, all the way near the top of the northern panhandle. This project will, at a minimum, create 95 new jobs, retain 45 jobs, and attract private capital beyond an initial investment of more than $1 million. This isn’t funding for a conference of stakeholders or another study just to sit on a shelf and collect dust. These are real dollars going toward real projects. Our local leaders know what they need, and more often than not, the local development officials tell me they have been “studied to death.”

I am happy to say that through our efforts, local and State officials are getting the help they have been asking for. Dr. Fleming and I spoke at length about these efforts when he visited my office and during his nomination hearing before the EPW Committee. He assured me of his commitment to follow Congress’s intent to continue the programs under EDA, as evidenced by the increased in funding EDA received through the appropriations process.

As a successful businessman and former Member of Congress from Louisiana—and as he has made clear in his conversations with me and through his testimony—I trust that Dr. Fleming understands the needs of communities like those in West Virginia. I look forward to working with him after he is confirmed, and I invite him, as I have to all my colleagues, to come to my home State to see the great work that is being done with the investments that the EDA has chosen to make in West Virginia.

When the Federal Government serves as a willing partner for all parts of the country, regardless of whether they are urban or rural, we can promote economic growth and opportunities for all Americans. As chair of the EPW Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee and as a member of the Appropriations and Commerce Committees, I will continue to advocate for programs that contribute not just to a brighter future for my State of West Virginia but also for the entire country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

"The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia."

NOMINATION OF JOHN FLEMING

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, since day one of the Trump administration, the Republicans have done everything they can to undermine the rightwing base by undermining women’s access to the healthcare they need and the healthcare providers they trust.

They have moved to roll back requirements that insurance companies include birth control as an essential health benefit, which would mean millions of women would go back to paying extra for birth control on top of their coverage. They have held votes on extreme abortion bans that would go well beyond the laws the doctor. They have jammed the courts, even the Supreme Court, with partisans who have made clear they share
the extreme and frightening goal of overturning Roe v. Wade and of taking away a woman’s constitutional right to safe, legal abortion in the United States of America.

Most recently, the Trump administration released a dangerous rule that would jeopardize access to affordable reproductive healthcare for the millions of men and women who depend on Title X, our Nation’s family planning program, which historically has had bipartisan support. If this rule goes into effect, providers at Title X centers that receive Title X funding will be blocked—gagged—from even telling patients about where and how to get a safe, legal abortion as part of a discussion of reproductive healthcare options.

The rule would also impose new, medically unnecessary requirements that would make it impossible for Planned Parenthood centers, which serve 41 percent of the Title X patients, to continue to participate. Four million people—disproportionately young people, low-income women, and women of color—go to Title X-funded centers, including to Planned Parenthood centers, for birth control, for lifesaving cancer screenings, for STD tests, and more each year, and this rule puts the care they depend on in jeopardy.

The Republicans here in the Capitol may have no idea what it would mean for patients to lose access to the providers they trust and the affordable care they need, but that is not because those patients and their doctors and their communities have not been speaking up—they have been. People across the country—women and men, doctors, city and county health officials, religious groups, advocates—told this administration as it was developing this rule that they did not want to see providers at Title X barred from giving them medically sound information or have patients be denied access to providers they trust at Planned Parenthood because the Republicans think they know better.

The final rule the Trump administration released shows it ignored those who personally know how much it matters to have unbiased, quality care at Title X centers, including at Planned Parenthood. The Republicans might have ignored those voices, but we Democrats are not going to. So I am releasing a memo today that will highlight statements that were submitted in strong opposition to this rule by people from across the country. I want to make absolutely sure that the Republicans have every opportunity to hear what patients and providers have to say. I want to give a few examples.

One patient called her visit to a Planned Parenthood to get a Pap smear a “lifesaver.”

Another wrote: “Young people like me rely on Title X for access to family planning services at the provider of our choice.”

A mother and sister from Nevada told the Trump administration:

I too have sisters and four daughters. We are capable, adept, and able to make decisions for ourselves. We want to make informed decisions. . . . Withholding information is misconduct and manipulation.

County health officials and healthcare providers repeatedly urged the administration that this rule would “interfere in the doctor-patient relationship” and was “an infringement on the ethical principles that medical providers adhere to” with potentially “irreversible” impacts in struggling communities.

Since it, apparently, needs to be said on the Senate floor, I would like to remind my colleagues that what these patients, healthcare providers, and community leaders are saying about the importance of a woman’s ability to make her own healthcare decisions is not controversial. People in this country overwhelmingly agree that women should be able to get birth control. They agree that no matter how much money you make or where you live, you should be able to get a cancer screening that could save your life and, yes, that women should be able to exercise their constitutional right to safe, legal abortion.

I challenge the Republicans today to read the memo I am releasing. Listen to the women and men whom this rule hurts and from the people who are working to help them get the care they need. Let me remind states in standing up against this dangerous, unethical step backward because, right now, it is pretty clear, once again, that the Republicans want to make women’s health a political battlefield instead of a serious priority.

Let me be clear. The Democrats are going to keep standing up for a woman’s right to the care that is right for her. We are going to continue to stand up for women’s access to affordable reproductive healthcare, women’s constitutionally protected rights, and against those who want to put politicians in the doctor’s office, where they do not ever belong. If that is a fight the Republicans want to have, we are ready and so are people across the country, like the brave ones who spoke up against this very harmful rule.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceed to call the roll.

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to talk about what I believe is a real crisis at the southern border. I think there is even a case to be made that we have the Democrats at the northern border, but I want to focus on what the narrative here in the country has been over the past couple of months, weeks, or really years since I have been here—sworn in in 2015. I think it is very important. We all know that we have the Executive order from the President or the emergency declaration. He clearly believes there is a crisis at the border so much so that he was willing to invoke an authority Congress granted beginning in 1976—the National Emergencies Act—and then amended throughout the 1980s. He believes he has the authority to declare an emergency so that he can get resources down to the southern border as quickly as possible.

It is no secret that I disagree with the method the President is using to provide funding down at the southern border, but make no mistake about it—I do believe there is a crisis at the border, and I take exception to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who say the President is manufacturing a crisis.

I serve on the Judiciary Committee. I have since 2015. Yesterday, we got a briefing from Homeland Security that was truly startling in terms of the statistics on the number of illegal crossings—a record number of crossings; severalfold; in one case, 10 times—over the past few months. I believe one of the reasons we are seeing the increase in illegal crossings is that those who are coming from countries other than Mexico, who are the majority of illegal crossings today—believe that if they get across the border, there is a very low chance they will be returned to their country of origin.

Speaker Pelosi said it is a manufactured crisis. It is not a manufactured crisis. Take a look at the data. It is a real crisis. The majority leader said the same thing. I think it is a crisis on several levels. One has to do with the number of people coming across the border today.

There is something that is very important that I think was missed by many people in the committee hearing this morning. There were of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle whom I work with—in fact, I worked with Senator Durbin on a solution for the DACA population. I am not necessarily considered a hawk on all things immigration. But I will tell you that when I hear the senior Senator from Illinois say that everyone who is coming across the border is fleeing a dangerous situation in their country of origin, that doesn’t necessarily reconcile with the fact that 8 out of 10 claims of asylum are adjudicated not to be valid. Eighty percent of ten claims for asylum are adjudicated not to be valid. And I don’t hear anybody on the other side of the aisle saying that we should change the standard for an asylum claim. So for someone to say that everyone coming from these countries is fleeing a fear of some sort of harm by staying in their country or maybe staying in Mexico with things not being as well—those are not true.

If you take a look at the severalfold increase in illegal crossings, 80 percent
of them are deemed invalid in terms of a threat to life or liberty from their country of origin based on our standard for asylum. I am not making this up; this is a matter of court records. These cases are being adjudicated by officials who were appointed by Democrats and Republicans, so it is not as though we have someone down there setting a different standard for asylum. Eight out of ten asylum claims for people crossing the southern border are deemed invalid.

But now what is happening is that we are spending so much time adjudicating, detaining, and processing this influx of illegal crossings that we are creating a more dangerous situation because bad actors are getting through. Our resources are being spent trying to process this influx of crossings that we have to stop. How do you stop it? You stop it by preventing future flows. You stop it by finding the border point of a family who crosses from Mexico being different from a family who crosses from Ecuador, El Salvador, or any other Latin America country. You treat them the same. You respect them. You try to give them an opportunity to make their case, but you also send a clear message that if you can't come through the normal asylum process, which means you show up and you lawfully request that your asylum claim be heard, then you cross the border and you put yourself and your children at risk.

We have a crisis at the border. I spent a week—in fact, Senator CORNYN will be speaking here for me. Senator CORNYN invited some of us to spend a week down on the southern border, and it was very revealing to see what is going on there—seeing crossings happen right before us, seeing cane along the Rio Grande that prevents border security. One of the ones that I think every American should get behind is that the American should get behind is that the Grande River that prevents border security. Crossing the border illegally there is a person who is responsible for moving people through the plazas, ultimately to cross the border illegally. In one instance, we had a human trafficker—a human smuggler—who apparently took a lot of the money that should have been passed back to the cartels for the passage of these folks and then passed it on to the other side of the border who were murdered—men, women, and children. They never got to the United States.

The sad fact is, statistically speaking, after they had spent virtually all of their money, if they had gotten across the border, 8 out of 10 of them probably wouldn’t have had a valid claim to asylum. We have to figure out a way to help these countries. The President is acting on. It is a real crisis. Human lives are at stake. So don’t try to come to the United States and enjoy our liberties and enjoy our economic blessings. Crossing the border illegally is not the way to do it.

That is why I have consistently supported any measure to secure the border. There is no recommendation that President Trump has made that I haven’t supported. I supported a package last year that was nearly $25 billion for border security and concrete structure to secure the border—to build all-weather roads, to build walls where necessary, or structures, to invest in technology, and to provide more personnel to secure the border. But now what is happening is that we have no earthly idea of the thousands of people—men, women and children—who die trying to cross the border and can’t pay a toll at the appropriate time or they get caught in a conflict between the cartels along the plazas of the northern border, but I know thousands of people have died. Over the last 20 years, nearly 10,000 bodies have been recovered on American soil, we recover worse if we don’t figure out how to secure the border. Because our resources are being spent trying to process this influx of illegal crossings that we have to stop. How do you stop it? You stop it by preventing future flows. You stop it by finding the border point of a family who crosses from Mexico being different from a family who crosses from Ecuador, El Salvador, or any other Latin America country. You treat them the same. You respect them. You try to give them an opportunity to make their case, but you also send a clear message that if you can't come through the normal asylum process, which means you show up and you lawfully request that your asylum claim be heard, then you cross the border and you put yourself and your children at risk.

The crisis has several layers to it. One of the ones that I think every American should get behind is that the crisis is occurring because our resources are being diluted by trying to police these borders and apprehending people, 8 out of 10 of whom will ultimately have to have their asylum claim. While we are tracking them down, the cartels are smuggling millions of doses of poison across our border that are killing people every year. These are the deaths that have been reported and they are reported, and they are reported, and they are reported, and they are reported, and we know thousands of people have died. We have deaths of immigrants. Every year on American soil, we recover nearly 300 bodies of people who paid hundreds or thousands of dollars to the cartels so that they could pass through the plazas at the southern border. There is no way you can cross the southern border without paying a fee to the cartels to get across, and the cartels literally control the border. In fact, we were told yesterday in the committee that it will cost you $500 to put your foot in the Rio Grande River, and if you don’t, you are probably going to die before you get into Mexico.

We have a crisis at the border. I spent a week—in fact, Senator CORNYN will be speaking here for me. Senator CORNYN invited some of us to spend a week down on the southern border, and it was very revealing to see what is going on there—seeing crossings happen right before us, seeing cane along the Rio Grande that prevents border security. One of the ones that I think every American should get behind is that the Grande River that prevents border security. Crossing the border illegally there is a person who is responsible for moving people through the plazas, ultimately to cross the border illegally. In one instance, we had a human trafficker—a human smuggler—who apparently took a lot of the money that should have been passed back to the cartels for the passage of these folks and then passed it on to the other side of the border who were murdered—men, women, and children. They never got to the United States.

The sad fact is, statistically speaking, after they had spent virtually all of their money, if they had gotten across the border, 8 out of 10 of them probably wouldn’t have had a valid claim to asylum. We have to figure out a way to help these countries. The President is acting on. It is a real crisis. Human lives are at stake. So don’t try to come to the United States and enjoy our liberties and enjoy our economic blessings. Crossing the border illegally is not the way to do it.

That is why I have consistently supported any measure to secure the border. There is no recommendation that President Trump has made that I haven’t supported. I supported a package last year that was nearly $25 billion for border security and concrete structure to secure the border—to build all-weather roads, to build walls where necessary, or structures, to invest in technology, and to provide more personnel to secure the border. But now what is happening is that we
With that, I yield the floor, and, again, I thank Senator CORNYN for all the great work he has done on this issue and for his leadership. I am glad to follow him into any issue that, hopefully, will get us to secure the border.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, at the risk of sounding like the mutual admi-
rati 0 n society, let me express my ap-
preciation to the Senator from North Carolina, who gave an outstanding presentation, talking about the crisis that exists at our southern border. I really can’t improve on it, but I will try.

Fortunately, Senator TILLIS is one of those rare Senators who actually has traveled down to the border at my invitation. As he said, he rode horseback as we tried to find our way through the carrizo cane, which obscures visibility for the Border Patrol, and he saw it for himself. I appreciate his bringing the benefit of that experience here to the floor and adding to this important de-
bate.

I was struck by a hashtag I saw being used in the House of Representatives. It was “FakeEmergency.”

Well, let’s mention two sets of par-
ents. For the 7- and 8-year-old boy and girl who recently died in CBP custody at the border who made their way from Guatemala, I don’t think this is a fake emergency for them. As Customs and Border Protection Commissioner McAleenan said, many of these immi-
gants who come all the way from countries like Guatemala suffer from exposure, including dehydration. Many of them are physically or sexually assau-
taulted. Then, there is the danger of in-
fec tious diseases, because many have not been vaccinated for common child-
hood diseases that American citizens wouldn’t have to worry about.

Unfortunately, they are a commodity to the criminal organizations that transport people for roughly $5,000 per person. The cartels—the criminal organi-
zations—are commodity agnostic. They will just as soon usher a migrant from Central America up here who wants to join a family member and per-
haps find a job. They will just as soon usher a migrant who died from drug overdose just last year, according to the Centers for Disease Control, a sub-
stantial portion was from the opioids. In other words, that came from Mex-
ico—whether they be pills, fentanyl, or heroin—which is perhaps the cheapest form of opioid.

The Senator from North Carolina and I serve on the Judiciary Committee, and we heard at length from the Com-
mis sioner McAleenan of Customs and Border Protection. The picture he painted was pretty bleak, but it bears repetition. Unfortunately, around here it is hard to know when people are lis-
tening. Sometimes you have to say the same thing over and over and over be-
fore it begins to penetrate people’s con-
sciousness. But this is important. So we need to emphasize this.

Many migrants make this arduous journey for days, weeks, or sometimes months, traveling without food or water. When they arrive, they are often sick and require extensive medical treatment. Of course, there is, as I indi-
cated a moment ago, the horrific sto-
ries of physical and sexual abuse. The percentage of women and girls who are sexually abused en route from their homes in Central America is revolving, to use a word.

The Border Patrol spends a vast amo-
qu at time dealing with the human needs of children. In other words, these are law enforcement offi-
cers who are basically trying to supply diapers and juice boxes to children who are coming with their families and overwhelming our capacity at the bor-
der. We have to remember that the fact that the Border Patrol is tied up with this sort of processing of asylum seek-
ers, the drugs come into the country. That is part of the cartel’s plan. They have studied our laws. They know who are the vulnerable. They know what they can do to distract law enforcement officers so that drugs and human trafficking can get through the border.

Despite all of this and despite the facts that the Senator from North Carolina detailed, we still hear our friends on the other side refusing to en-
gage or offer any solutions whatsoever. As a matter of fact, one of our col-
leagues on the Judiciary Committee yesterday said, ‘Well, we need to preserve the two things that are the biggest obsta-
cles to getting to a solution. We need to preserve those. In essence, what she was saying is that we need the Border Patrol not to secure our border. We need the Border Patrol to just wave people on through, like a traffic cop.

As long as we have these gaps in our asylum laws where we treat people from noncontiguous countries dif-
ferently than we do from Mexico or Central America, or even beyond the border, Texas and Arizona for years before their asylum claim can be finally adjudicated by an immigra-
tion judge, the criminal organizations are winning. They have won because they can successfully place a person in the United States, notwithstanding our laws, by overwhelming our resources at the border and in our interior.

I have talked about the need to in-
crease border security many times on the floor, and I know I risk sounding like a broken record, but as long as we are spending the body-sending out hashtags on social media calling this a fake emergency—when President Obama himself, in 2014, called this a humanitar-
inian crisis—it is going to be necessary. I am afraid, to keep telling the story and talk about what is nec-
3 essary in order to bring security to our southwest border.

My State has 1,200 miles of common border with Mexico, and my relationship with Mexico is very important because they are one of our main trading part-
ners. There are a lot of good and impor-
tant things that come back and forth across the border in terms of people le-
veling the border and in terms of commerce and trade. I have seen one estimate that about 5 million American jobs depend on trade with Mexico. It is not just Texas, either. But the toll that the current status of our immigration laws has on the lives of immigrants crossing our border is real, and the strain it puts on our ability to engage in legitimate trade and com-
merce to flow freely through our ports is real as well. All of these need to be addressed and without delay.

Let me talk a little bit about the records that have been broken. We saw last month alone that 76,000 people illegally crossed the border and were apprehended by U.S. Customs and the Border Patrol—76,000 people. According to Commissioner McAleenan, the Border Patrol needs to see 600,000 to maybe 650,000 during the next calendar year. This is an 11-
year high and averages more than 2,000 people a day. This is not a record we want to be proud of.

We have seen a growing number of family units. The reason why the cartels and criminal organizations bring family units is because they know what our law requires in terms of sepa-
rating the children from the adults and then placing the children with a spon-
sor in the United States, only to have them raise their asylum claim in front of an immigration judge years hence. As I said, many simply don’t show up for that, and so game over.

We have seen a growing number of family units coming across the border, a 338-percent increase in 2018. The car-
tels have studied our laws. They are advertising down in Central America, saying: If you want to come to the United States, all you have to do is come as a family unit. We have studied American law, we know where the gaps are, and we are going to exploit them.

Already Border Patrol has apprehi-
sed more family units than in all of last year. As Secretary Nielsen said yesterday, they are feeling the strain. Our local offi-
cials—the mayors, the county judge—and our medical facilities are just not designed for this massive influx of hu-
manity. In the Rio Grande Valley, fami-
ly unit apprehensions have increased 209 percent since this time last year. Here is a staggering figure: In El Paso, TX, it is a 1,689-percent increase.

As Secretary Nielsen said yesterday, testifying in front of the House, our border is at the breaking point. Our ca-
pacity to deal with this influx of hu-
manity is creating a genuine crisis. These are not just percentage points or numbers; they illustrate the human
misery and the challenges of the dedicated law enforcement personnel along the border and also the folks who work trying to deal with the children, whether it is providing them medical care or trying to find them a safe place to live in the United States. This is not a manufactured crisis. This is a real crisis.

In a normal political environment, these numbers would raise the alarm bells, and we would take action—we would actually do something about it—but we are living in an abnormal political climate, to be sure.

Back in 2006 and 2008, Republicans and Democrats voted on something called the Secure Fence Act. It wasn’t particularly partisan or political. This year, the Speaker of the House, Nancy Pelosi, called physical barriers “immoral.” The Democratic leader of the Senate, the Senator from New York, said not one penny was going to be appropriated for any physical barriers along the border.

For those who would argue this is a fake crisis, I would ask them to check with the Texans who live across the border and deal with this every day.

I recently got an email from a friend of mine who has a ranch outside of San Antonio, my hometown. He said he and his wife basically have to arm themselves, and they have to take precautions against people coming across their land because they don’t know whether it is going to be some hungry immigrant who is just simply looking to find their way to San Antonio or to Houston and then north or whether it is going to be people wearing backpacks carrying fentanyl and heroin. They just don’t know, so they have to prepare. They basically have to lock their doors, and they are captives in their own house.

So what has changed since we talked about this back in 2006? What has changed?

My question is more of a rhetorical one because we know Democrats will stop at nothing to prevent President Trump from delivering on his promise to provide border security, even if it means turning their backs on something they have historically supported.

As you might imagine, I have made a point to spend a lot of time in communities along the border. I have talked to the experts—our Border Patrol agents, sheriff’s deputies, mayors, and countless others—on how to best deal with this security and humanitarian crisis. These are the people who know best. They are the experts. They know how best to secure the border.

They will be the first to tell you that when it comes to border security, one size does not fit all. I have mentioned before my friend Judge Eddie Trevino from Cameron County. I was in a meeting with Senator Cruz—my colleague from Texas—local stakeholders, elected officials, with Customs and Border Protection and Border Patrol. What Judge Trevino told us then was: Look, if it is the experts, the Border Patrol agents, telling us what we need, we are all in, but if it is people from Washington, DC, trying to micro-manage the border, who don’t know anything about it, then count us as skeptical. What we have heard from the experts is that border security is a combination of three things: barriers in hard-to-control places, people, and technology.

While a physical barrier may work best in an urban or high-traffic area, it doesn’t make any sense in places like Big Bend National Park. Anybody who has been out west to Texas knows the cliffs over the Rio Grande River, in parts, can rise to 30 feet. It doesn’t make much sense to put a physical barrier there.

The determination of what is needed and where it is needed should not be a top-down Federal mandate. It should come from the experts who know the threats and the challenges along every mile of the border and whom we entrust on a daily basis to secure it. We should continue to listen to our vibrant border communities, which are the economic engine of the region, and ensure that we can maintain the flow of legitimate trade and travel also through these areas.

Implementing a solution that would allow our law enforcement experts to work with the Federal Government on the right combination of technology, people, and physical barriers is what we ought to be focusing our attention on.

I would add just a footnote to that on dealing with this problem of people abusing our laws on asylum. Again, the cartels have figured this out. I have worked with my friend Henry Cuello, who is perhaps one of the last remaining Blue Dog Democrats in the House of Representatives. He represents Laredo, TX. We actually introduced a bill called the HUMANE Act, which would establish parity of treatment of immigrants coming from non-contiguous countries like Central America. Unfortunately, we weren’t able to get that passed.

We could fix this pretty quickly, but it requires our Democratic friends to drop their Trump derangement syndrome and come to the negotiating table in support of something they have historically been for during this time of need.

The crisis is staring us in the face, and it demands action. I can only hope our colleagues across the aisle will answer that call.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Scott of Florida). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. Fischer). Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF ERIC E. MURPHY

March 7, 2019

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S1725

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, judges are making decisions around the country right now on voting rights, on civil rights, on LGBT rights, on women’s rights, on healthcare, on sentencing and on criminal law. Several times over the last couple of years, this body has said no even though almost every Republican in this body—all with good, government-paid health insurance, all with good salaries, all well dressed, all of the above—has tried to repeal the Affordable Care Act or take away Medicaid or take away consumer protections so that people who have preexisting conditions would have their insurance canceled. They all stood on that.

Do you know what? Because millions and millions were affected, enough people in this country said no and pushed back and stopped the Republican majority from taking away the protections for preexisting conditions, and they stopped insurance from canceling people’s insurance who got too sick and too expensive and who could never get insurance in the first place.

So do you know what those in the Republican majority did? They went through the courts. They voted for and supported Supreme Court Justices and district judges and circuit judges who have put their thumbs on the scales of justice and have picked corporations over workers, chosen Wall Street over consumers, and chosen insurance companies over sick people. Over and over again, this body tried to do it, but democracy rose up and said: No, you aren’t going to take our health insurance. No, you aren’t going to let the insurance companies run everything. No, you aren’t going to let Wall Street run everything. No, you aren’t going to do it.

Do you know what? Because they couldn’t do it through Democratic participation and because they couldn’t do it by going down to Mitch McConnell’s office, who is the Republican leader—they couldn’t walk down the hall, all of their lobbyists, and stop that from happening—they decided to try doing it through the Federal judiciary. Remember what I said. They have put their thumbs on the scales of justice. They have chosen Wall Street over consumers. They have chosen insurance companies over people. That is what this vote is about. That is what this judge is all about today.

This body confirmed a judge yesterday who would limit rights for a generation. These are judges who are almost all inexperienced. These are lawyers who are in their thirties or early forties. They are not who we used to pick. President Obama used to do this; President Bush often did this; and President Bush, Sr., used to do this. This was all of the above—“pre忤” would be the word. But President Bush, Sr., would use—wise, prudent lawyers who believed in public service and didn’t believe in some far-right agenda
whereby they would put their thumbs on the scales of justice and hurt workers and hurt consumers. They picked middle-of-the-road, thoughtful, prudent judges who actually believed in civil rights—shocking—who actually believed gay people should have a chance in this country, and who actually believed workers should get a fair shot.

Do you know what? Because they have picked judges who have put their thumbs on the scales of justice, we see the rich are getting richer and richer, and we see the middle class in New Nebraska getting squeezed over and over and over again.

We see what has happened to this country. We see lobbyists going down the hall to Senator McConnell's office, who is the Republican leader, writing tax bills. Do you know what that tax law does that President Trump signed? Do you know what it does? It says, if a company in Lordstown is off, which General Motors has done this week—4,500 people have lost their jobs—General Motors will pay a tax rate of 21 percent. Do you know what? Under the Trump tax law, they can move south of the border and pay a tax rate of 10½ percent.

In other words, they get a 50-percent off coupon. Companies that shut down production in Omaha or in Manchester or in Cleveland and move overseas get a 50-percent off coupon on their taxes. That is why these fights are about. These fights are about the special interests that run this Senate, the companies that outsorce, and the drug companies and Wall Street, Heck, the White House looks like a retreat for Wall Street.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is expired.

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I ask for an additional 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROWN. This issue today we are about to vote on is about Eric Murphy. It is about confirming a very young, very inexperienced lawyer in Cleveland whose claim to fame is that he argued against marriage equality in the landmark Obergefell v. Hodges case. It is why Jim Obergefell has spoken out.

He said, he actually argued that marriage equality would be disruptive—disruptive—to our nation. Telling people who love each other that they can marry is disruptive to our nation? Who does that harm? Why would it matter? A couple in Atlanta or Decatur or a couple in Sioux Falls or Topeka or Omaha or Lincoln or Manchester or Laconia or Cleveland or Mansfield—why would it matter? Why would it be disruptive?

This gentleman whom we are about to—Iraqis, Iranians, Republicans, except maybe one courageous one, will vote for him because that is how we do it nowadays. You can't win through the democratic process; you win through the back door of the judiciary. That is what they are going to do. They are going to vote for a man who said it is disruptive to allow people who love each other to marry. He will make decisions on the rights of LGBTQ couples. Senator Murphy is beating up to claim they support people regardless of their orientation. He has moved to restrict access to contraceptives for women. We are going to have women Republicans vote for somebody like that? He has defended Big Tobacco, as if there is any defense for addicting our children to tobacco.

We have had huge public health victories, but let's go back. Let's go back on voting rights. Let's go back on supporting public health. Let's go back on equal rights for people. Let's go back on civil rights. Is that what we are going to do today?

But maybe most despicable, on this day today 54 years ago, in Mr. Figures' Story, my great uncle, my wife has visited this bridge five times, crossed it since then—54 years ago, John Lewis, my colleague down the hall—you know, just on the other side of the special interest majority leader's office down the hall. John Lewis—I think he was 25 years old at that point—got his head beat in by Alabama State troopers. Do you know why? Because he wanted people to register to vote. He wanted people to have their full rights. That happened 54 years ago today—the day we are going to vote on Mr. Murphy.

Mr. Murphy defended Ohio's voter purge, taking registered voters off the rolls. He led the efforts to take away Golden Week in Ohio, passed by a Republican legislature on a bipartisan basis. He defended restrictive voter ID and provisional ballot rules.

This weekend, Connie and I walked across the Edmund Pettus Bridge. We saw foot soldiers who had been beaten up 54 years ago when they were trying to cross this bridge. We listened to their stories. These men and women were beaten. Many of them were 15, 16, 18, 20 years old. They did that so that in the future, they and their children would have the right to vote.

But judges around this country, judges supported by this majority—none of whom think for themselves when it comes to voting on these nominations—all the way up to the Supreme Court, they are dismantling these rights.

I can't imagine my Republican colleagues who came here from Georgia and Kansas and Nebraska and Montana—and I think he is going to vote right—I just can't imagine they came here thinking: I am going to take the oath of office—right in that corner—and do you know one of the things I am going to do? I am going to vote to take away workers' rights. I am going to vote for judges who put their thumbs on the scales of justice and choose corpora-

tions that outsource jobs over workers. I am going to choose big health insurance companies, with their multimillion-dollar salaries for executives, and hurt sick people.

I can't believe that any of you came. So please vote no on Murphy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. ISAKSON. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 60 seconds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ISAKSON. Madam President, I just want to say to the gentleman from Ohio that I have been to the Edmund Pettus Bridge. I went there with John Lewis. John Lewis is a great American. I supported title V and the Civil Rights Act. So I vote no on Murphy. I don't believe your remarks and your candidness, but all of us should not castigate all the rest of us and throw us in groups because all of us are free thinkers, independent thinkers, and are committed to the betterment of the United States of America and seeing to it that everybody has a vote who deserves a vote, and I will always fight for that.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 30 seconds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I appreciate Senator Isakson's work as the leader of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, his bipartisan work to advance the causes of veterans in our country.

I was in Columbia, SC, last week, and a veteran who had attempted suicide seven times told us that veterans are more than paintings on the wall, and Senator Isakson embodies that as somebody who advocates for those veterans. I thank him for that.

Isakson. I thank the gentleman.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all postcloture time is expired.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Murphy nomination?

Mr. SCHATZ. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Georgia (Mr. Perdue).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Alabama (Mr. Jones) is necessarily absent.
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 46, as follows:

[Roll Call Vote No. 39 Ex.]

YEAS—52

Alexander Fischer Portman
Barrazao Gardner Risch
Blackburn Graham Roberts
Blumenthal Grassley Romney
Boozman Hawley Rounds
Braun Hoeven Rubio
Burr Hyde-Smith Smith
Capito Inhofe Sasheen
Cantzy Isakson Scott (FL)
Collins Johnson Scott (SC)
Cortez Kennedy Sullivan
Cotton Lankford Thune
Cranes Lee T_Idle
Crako McConnell Tillis
Cruz McSally Toney
Daines Moran Wicker
Enzi Markowski Young

Ernst Paul

NAYS—46

Baldwin Hassan Sanders
Bennet Hirono Schatz
Blumenthal Hirono Schumer
Boozman Kaine Shaheen
Brown Kildee Sinema
Cantwell Klobuchar Smith
Carper Manchin Stabenow
Casey Markey Tester
Coons Murkowski Udall
Cortez-Mastio Merkley Van Hollen
Duckworth Murphy Warner
Durbin Murray Warren
Feinstein Peters Whitehouse
Gillibrand Reed Wyden
Harriss Rosen

NOT VOTING—2

Jones Perdue

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the next nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John Fleming, of Louisiana, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Economic Development.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time until 1:45 p.m. is equally divided.

The Senator from Iowa.

SHOOTING OF BIJAN GAISAR

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I want to speak to my colleagues about two things. One will take less than 1 minute, and the other will take about 5 or 6 minutes. The first one deals with why I can't get answers for citizens of the United States for the murder of a son.

In 2017, the U.S. Park Police fatally shot Bijan Ghaisar, after a minor traffic accident led to a police chase in Virginia. Since then, his family has been looking for answers, but they have only encountered silence. The FBI took over the investigation but has not shared any findings or even an update with the family. So last December, I asked the FBI where things stand. Even this Senator got silence from the FBI.

Investigations into the use of deadly force should be handled in a manner that reinforces accountability and public confidence in law enforcement. The FBI's silent treatment is concerning. The Ghaisar family, Congress, this Senator, and the public shouldn't have to wait years to get an answer from the FBI.

Mr. President, on the subject of taxes, we are now in our sixth week of the tax filing season. Over 50 million Americans file their tax returns. As in previous years, the IRS is moving forward in the filing season at a pace very consistent with previous years. In some aspects, they are exceeding benchmarks set by last year's filing season. This has been one of the most scrutinized filing seasons I can remember. I can only imagine. In some ways, that is understandable.

As I have alluded to, this is the first filing season after our Tax Code received its largest overhaul in three decades. After the massive tax bill we passed, you would expect some difficulties. The filing season began shortly after our government experienced the longest shutdown in history. So the longest shutdown in history, added to the fact that we have a new tax bill, makes this tax filing season very different. Despite these factors, this filing season has run relatively smoothly.

Consistent with previous years, the IRS has processed over 95 percent of the returns the Agency received, and 80 percent of those returns were sent a refund. Based on data covering returns filed through February 22 of this year, over $121 billion in refunds have been returned to the American taxpayers, with an average refund of $3,143. This is up slightly over the 2018 filing season. As I pointed out many times, obsessing over the average size of refunds makes this tax filing season very different. Despite these factors, this filing season has run relatively smoothly.

Consistent with previous years, the IRS has processed over 95 percent of the returns the Agency received, and 80 percent of those returns were sent a refund. Based on data covering returns filed through February 22 of this year, over $121 billion in refunds have been returned to the American taxpayers, with an average refund of $3,143. This is up slightly over the 2018 filing season. As I pointed out many times, obsessing over the average size of refunds makes this tax filing season very different. Despite these factors, this filing season has run relatively smoothly.

As I pointed out many times, obsessing over the average size of refunds is simply wrongheaded and misleading. A week-to-week focus on the size of tax refunds makes no sense, given how wildly refunds can vary early in the filing season.

Recent filing season data makes this very clear. Within a week, the average size of refunds went from being down 17 percent to being a little over 1 percent higher than last year so far this filing season.

We have over 5 weeks of filing season to go. I expect there will continue to be variations in the data. Most importantly, the size of the tax refund is a stupid barometer of how taxpayers are faring this season compared to last—indeed, in other words, whether they had a tax increase or a tax decrease as a result of the tax bill of December 2017. A refund merely represents the extent to which a taxpayer has overpaid their taxes during the course of the year. It absolutely provides no insight into whether a taxpayer's tax burden has gone up or, for that matter, down.

I hope the relative silence in the media about the filing season data released at the end of last week indicates that media and Members of Congress who have complained about it finally come to understand all of this—that a refund up or down has nothing to do with whether to do increase or decrease. Any further swings up or down will not generate sensational headlines that only confuse and misinform taxpayers. Those headlines have misled the American people.

I hope this is the end of this issue. The best thing to do is to put to rest accusations of some of my Democratic colleagues that the IRS sought to manipulate withholding tables to goose paychecks in 2018, because nothing could be further from the truth.

The primary objective of the IRS in updating withholding tables was for a very sound reason of making sure that they are as accurate as possible. A report by the Government Accountability Office released today indicates that there is not a single indication in the GAO report to suggest otherwise.

The IRS followed the same process and procedures in updating withholding tables this year as it has in the previous years. The report documents the extensive outreach that Treasury and the IRS conducted to inform taxpayers of the changes and to suggest that taxpayers check their withholding.

Their outreach included updating and creating pages on their website using IRS email listservs and social media campaigns and sharing withholding materials with partners, including tax-related groups, large employers, employer associations, and organizations representing small businesses. So you see, they went to great lengths to alert the public to observe changes in the tax tables.

However, no withholding table has been perfect. Common sense dictates that. Every wage earner may be affected a little differently under the new law based on his or her personal circumstances. Because of personal circumstances, if there are 157 million tax filings, then, there could be 157 million different answers.

The IRS continues to consider whether future improvements to the withholding structure may be necessary. I support these efforts and will monitor the outcome as chairman of the tax-writing Finance Committee. If I amuned.

If the tables had not been updated, my guess is that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle would be singing a different tune. Instead of criticizing efforts to ensure that withholding tables more accurately reflect the new law, they would be claiming that we were trying to back-load the tax benefits, tricking taxpayers into believing their tax cut was larger than it was through oversized refunds.

So, I hope this may have been the right thing to do politically, but it would have been wrong, as a matter of principle or tax policy, and, quite
frankly, an organization like the IRS, usually far removed from politics, would not be involved in a political scheme like that.

One exception to that is how the IRS, under Ms. Lerner, treated conservative organizations during the 2010, 2011, and 2012 tax years.

The excess tax withheld from paychecks throughout the course of the year doesn't belong to the government. That is common sense. That belongs to the taxpayers, whom it rightfully belongs to. The government shouldn't intentionally withhold more than necessary.

I am proud of the work my colleagues did to update the Tax Code last Congress. We delivered meaningful tax relief to middle-income taxpayers and to job creators. This has contributed to strong economic growth benefitting all Americans, hopefully, for years to come.

The Treasury Department and the IRS has done good work to implement the law in a timely fashion. They will continue that good work to ensure that Americans receive their refunds as quickly as possible.

As we progress toward the end of the filing season, however, the data being reported will fluctuate as taxpayers across a range of circumstances submit their returns. I hope that every time there is movement in the data, our friends across the aisle, and, more importantly, the misleading media will keep in mind two important facts that I mentioned earlier. First, tracking refund data on a weekly basis makes no sense, given how widely the data can vary. Second, and lastly, the focus on the size of the refunds is wrongheaded since it provides no indication as to whether a taxpayer's tax bill has gone up or down between 2018 filings and 2019 filings.

Most everyone was oddly silent when the last batch of good data was released. So maybe we will not hear any more of this misleading information from the media. I hope we can have a more responsible and accurate discussion in the weeks ahead.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

BACKGROUND CHECKS

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I urge the Senate to take up legislation to require universal and complete background checks for individuals seeking to purchase a gun. I am pleased that the Senate to act.

The Senate should follow the lead of the House, which recently passed the legislation to expand criminal background checks. In the Senate, I cosponsored S. 42, the Background Check Expansion Act. This bill, which passed the House, would expand Federal background check requirements to include the sale or transfer of all firearms by private sellers, junkyards, and gun shows. Private sellers, just as licensed dealers, are required to conduct under the existing Brady Law.

The bill requires background checks for sales or transfers of all firearms from one party to another, even if the seller is not a federally licensed dealer. This requirement extends to all unlicensed sellers, whether they do business online, at gun shows, or out of their home.

According to the Brady Campaign, in any given year in the United States, more than 120,000 Americans are shot in murders, assaults, suicides and suicide attempts, unintentional shootings, or police actions. Of these, 35,000 result in death. Over 17,000 of those injured or killed are children and teens. On average, 34 people in America are murdered on account of gun violence every single day.

Mass shootings often shine the spotlight on the United States and its position as a global outlier. The number of firearms available to American civilians is estimated to be at around 310 million, according to the National Institute of Justice. According to the Small Arms Survey, the exact number of civilian-owned firearms is impossible to pinpoint because of a variety of factors, including arms that go unregistered, the illegal trade, and global conflict. However, estimates indicate that Americans own nearly half of the 660 million civilian-owned guns in the world today. Half of the United States. Our Nation is well armed.

Americans own the most guns per person in the world, with about 4 in 10 saying they either own a gun or live in a home with guns, according to the 2017 Pew Center study, and 48 percent of Americans say they grew up in a House with guns. According to the survey, a majority, 66 percent, of U.S. gun owners own multiple firearms.

The No. 2 country for the world’s largest gun-owning population per capita is Yemen, a country that is in the throes of a years-long civil conflict,

In Maryland we saw tragedies that occurred in the Capital Gazette office in Annapolis. We, as a nation, must act to stem the tide of bloodshed and the hatred that drives it. We cannot allow such massacres to become routine in our society.

We have the ability to end the tragic cycle of violence, but it will require us to come together in full urgency and honesty. I know we can protect innocent Americans from further senseless gun violence while still protecting the constitutional right for hunting and self-defense. Through common-sense gun safety reforms that would make background checks more efficient and close loopholes, I am confident we can do just that.

Let me start with a little history, as provided by the Brady Campaign. The Gun Control Act of 1968 established a framework for legally prohibiting certain categories of people from possessing firearms. The list of prohibited persons has grown over the years and now includes categories such as felons, fugitives, domestic abusers, and those found by the court or other tribunal to be seriously mentally ill.

Only in 1993, with the passage of the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act, did Congress provide the public with a presale process for checking whether a prospective firearm purchaser is legally able to purchase the firearm.

Since the Brady Law took effect, it has blocked more than 3 million prohibited gun sales and processed over 278 million purchase requests. When someone goes to a federally licensed dealer to buy a gun, the retailer contacts the FBI to run a background check. The FBI checks the National Instant Criminal Background Check System to see if they are a convicted felon, fugitive, domestic abuser, or other prohibited purchaser.

If the system reveals that the buyer is legally barred from owning a gun, then, the sale is denied. Simply put, the Brady Law prevents guns from getting into the hands of dangerous individuals.

The Brady Law has blocked more than 3 million gun sales to prohibited buyers, helping to save countless lives, but the law doesn't apply to all gun sales. Instead, only Federal firearm licensees approved by the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives are required to conduct background checks on gun sales. The Brady Act background check requirement applies only to licensed dealers, allowing transactions conducted by private, unlicensed sellers to be completed without any check. Private, unlicensed sellers need not conduct any check under current law.

However, the Brady Law was enacted before the rise of the internet. America has changed, and our Nation’s gun laws need to catch up. Today, unlicensed gun sales made online and unregulated and unchecked contributed to one out of every five gun sales. That is simply wrong. Those sales can avoid the background check.

Passing legislation to expand background checks to nearly every gun sale, including those conducted online at gun shows and through private sellers, should be the top priority in Congress for common-sense gun safety legislation to save lives.

It is long past time to expand life-saving Brady background checks to every gun sale. The public agrees. A 2018 study showed that 97 percent of Americans support expanding background checks—97 percent. We don't get any higher than that.

We have the ability to end the tragic cycle of violence, but it will require us to come together in full urgency and honesty. I know we can protect innocent Americans from further senseless gun violence while still protecting the constitutional right for hunting and self-defense. Through common-sense gun safety reforms that would make background checks more efficient and close loopholes, I am confident we can do just that.

Let me start with a little history, as provided by the Brady Campaign. The Gun Control Act of 1968 established a framework for legally prohibiting certain categories of people from possessing firearms. The list of prohibited persons has grown over the years and now includes categories such as felons, fugitives, domestic abusers, and those found by the court or other tribunal to be seriously mentally ill.

Only in 1993, with the passage of the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act, did Congress provide the public with a presale process for checking whether a prospective firearm purchaser is legally able to purchase the firearm.

Since the Brady Law took effect, it has blocked more than 3 million prohibited gun sales and processed over 278 million purchase requests. When someone goes to a federally licensed dealer to buy a gun, the retailer contacts the FBI to run a background check. The FBI checks the National Instant Criminal Background Check System to see if they are a convicted felon, fugitive, domestic abuser, or other prohibited purchaser.

If the system reveals that the buyer is legally barred from owning a gun, then, the sale is denied. Simply put, the Brady Law prevents guns from getting into the hands of dangerous individuals.

The Brady Law has blocked more than 3 million gun sales to prohibited buyers, helping to save countless lives, but the law doesn't apply to all gun sales. Instead, only Federal firearm licensees approved by the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives are required to conduct background checks on gun sales. The Brady Act background check requirement applies only to licensed dealers, allowing transactions conducted by private, unlicensed sellers to be completed without any check. Private, unlicensed sellers need not conduct any check under current law.

However, the Brady Law was enacted before the rise of the internet. America has changed, and our Nation’s gun laws need to catch up. Today, unlicensed gun sales made online and unregulated and unchecked contributed to one out of every five gun sales. That is simply wrong. Those sales can avoid the background check.

Passing legislation to expand background checks to nearly every gun sale, including those conducted online at gun shows and through private sellers, should be the top priority in Congress for common-sense gun safety legislation to save lives.

It is long past time to expand life-saving Brady background checks to every gun sale. The public agrees. A 2018 study showed that 97 percent of Americans support expanding background checks—97 percent. We don't get any higher than that.

The Senate should follow the lead of the House, which recently passed the legislation to expand criminal background checks. In the Senate, I cosponsored S. 42, the Background Check Expansion Act. This bill, which passed the House, would expand Federal background check requirements to include the sale or transfer of all firearms by private sellers, junkyards, and gun shows. Private sellers, just as licensed dealers, are required to conduct under the existing Brady Law.

The bill requires background checks for sales or transfers of all firearms from one party to another, even if the seller is not a federally licensed dealer. This requirement extends to all unlicensed sellers, whether they do business online, at gun shows, or out of their home.

According to the Brady Campaign, in any given year in the United States, more than 120,000 Americans are shot in murders, assaults, suicides and suicide attempts, unintentional shootings, or police actions. Of these, 35,000 result in death. Over 17,000 of those injured or killed are children and teens. On average, 34 people in America are murdered on account of gun violence every single day.

Mass shootings often shine the spotlight on the United States and its position as a global outlier. The number of firearms available to American civilians is estimated to be at around 310 million, according to the National Institute of Justice. According to the Small Arms Survey, the exact number of civilian-owned firearms is impossible to pinpoint because of a variety of factors, including arms that go unregistered, the illegal trade, and global conflict. However, estimates indicate that Americans own nearly half of the 660 million civilian-owned guns in the world today. Half of the United States. Our Nation is well armed.

Americans own the most guns per person in the world, with about 4 in 10 saying they either own a gun or live in a home with guns, according to the 2017 Pew Center study, and 48 percent of Americans say they grew up in a House with guns. According to the survey, a majority, 66 percent, of U.S. gun owners own multiple firearms.

The No. 2 country for the world's largest gun-owning population per capita is Yemen, a country that is in the throes of a years-long civil conflict,
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and they trail significantly behind us. They have 54 guns per 100; we are at 88 guns owned per 100.

When it comes to gun massacres, the United States is an anomaly. There are more public mass shootings in America than any other developed country. The United States makes up less than 5 percent of the world’s population but holds 31 percent of global mass shooters. In Australia, for example, four mass shootings occurred between 1987 and 1996. They decided to do something about that so they passed sensible gun safety legislation. Australia has not had a mass shooting since then.

Gun homicide rates are about 25 times higher in the United States than other developed countries. According to the recent study of the American Journal of Medicine, the United States has one of the highest rates of death by firearm in the developed world, according to the World Health Organization data. The calculations based on the OECD data from 2010 showed that Americans are 51 times more likely to be killed by gunfire than people in the United Kingdom. We need to do something about this. We can’t sit idly.

Congress should act today to close the so-called Charleston loophole. The Senate should once again follow the House’s lead here. A particularly tragic example of the consequences of this loophole was the racist hate crime murder of nine people at the Emanuel African Methodist Episcopal Church in Charleston, SC, that occurred in 2015. In that tragedy, the shooter was legally allowed to possess a firearm due to drug charges but still was able to acquire his gun from a licensed dealer who made the decision to transfer, after the current 3-business day period expired, despite not having received a definitive response from the background check system.

Unfortunately, the sale to the shooter after 3 days is what is known as the default proceed sale, and this was not an isolated incident. Since 1994, gun sellers proceeded with between 3,000 and 4,000 such sales every year simply because the information has not gotten back on the background check.

I would note that in most cases, a licensed gun dealer receives notification from the system about a prospective buyer within a few minutes. In less than 5 percent of the cases, the examination may require additional time to complete the background check if the information the transferee provided is incomplete, inaccurate, or otherwise defective. Under current law, a licensed gun dealer conducting a background check on a prospective purchaser may sell the firearm to the purchaser after 3 business days, even if they have not received a reply in regard to the background check. This is wrong, and Congress should change the rule as the House has done.

I agree gun laws alone cannot solve the problem, but gun laws will make a difference. Yes, there is no single answer, but we should be united in our willingness to do what we can to save lives.

I agree with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that we must devote more resources to mental health priorities to identify young people who may be about to cause harm to themselves or others. Let’s attack this problem from multiple directions. We cannot raise our hands in the air and give up because there is no one law that can solve the problem.

Sitting on sidelines is not an option when our children are being killed—sometimes by other children—and surrendering to the false logic that the problem is too big to address falls well short of what the American people deserve. We were sent to our Nation’s capital to make tough decisions and to do the right thing.

The American public is letting their voices be heard on this issue. Thoughts and prayers might console the grieving for a moment, but action speaks louder and will have lasting impact.

From my hometown of Baltimore to many towns across America that have had their names in the headlines because of gun-related tragedies or mass shootings, people are calling on Congress to act.

What we are proposing are logical next steps to address the deadly problem that has been festering in this country far too long. Too many lives have been lost. It’s time to do the right thing in the Senate and immediately take up legislation to require universal and completed background checks for individuals seeking to purchase a gun.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

NOMINATION OF JOHN FLEMING

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I rise in support of the nomination of John Fleming to serve as Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Economic Development.

The Assistant Secretary serves as the Administrator of the Economic Development Administration, the EDA. It is the only Federal Agency focused exclusively on economic development. It works directly with communities in regions to help them build capacity for economic development based on local business conditions as well as needs.

As a physician, entrepreneur, businessman, military veteran, and former Member of Congress, Dr. Fleming is incredibly well qualified to lead the EDA. Dr. Fleming has launched several companies, which today employ over 500 people in Louisiana. Dr. Fleming’s nomination has drawn praise from many in the political, educational, and economic development leaders in his home State of Louisiana.

Don Pierson, the Secretary of Louisiana Economic Development, wrote:

‘‘Dr. Fleming has been instrumental in the development and execution of projects, which have taken root in Northwest Louisianna and spread across the United States. He goes on to say:

His experience in public policy, business and his military background serve as the right attributes for leading economic development efforts.’’

The Environment and Public Works Committee reported Dr. Fleming’s nomination favorably to the Senate with a substantial bipartisan majority, and we have done it twice, first on October 1, 2018, during the 115th Congress, and then next on February 5 of this year after he was renominated this Congress. Under normal circumstances, Dr. Fleming would have been confirmed and in office last fall. Instead, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have blocked his nomination ever since it was first placed on the Senate Executive Calendar more than 155 days ago. Now, we had to file cloture and go through repeated delays on a well-qualified nominee who was twice reported by a substantial majority of the Environment and Public Works Committee.

Dr. Fleming’s treatment by our colleagues on the other side of the aisle is similar to the obstruction of John Ryder, whom we finally confirmed last week to serve as a member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority. He had waited an unconscionable 388 days for a vote on the Senate floor.

In a column last Friday, the Wall Street Journal’s Kimberley Strassel noted that 388 days is “100 days longer than it takes a new human being to come into the world.” She continued:

“Even at the last, Democrats were stringing out the process, refusing unanimous consent to a floor vote, requiring Republicans to file for cloture, which entails more delay.

Then she points out that “after all that, [Mr. Ryder] was confirmed—by a voice vote with no audible dissent.”’’

Let’s not delay any longer. Let’s stop this spectacle of obstructing well-qualified nominees solely for obstruction’s sake. I urge my colleagues to vote with me in support of the nomination of John Fleming to serve as Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Economic Development and Administrator of the EDA.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, before I rise to speak on behalf of the nomination of Dr. John Fleming to be Assistant Secretary for Economic Development, I think it is important for me to remind my Republican friends that the pot calls the kettle black once again.

Whatever harm or abuse has been done to this nominee or other nominees by committees happens to one of the most distinguished judges in America, Merrick Garland, who was nominated, literally, a year before the end of the last President’s administration. He never got a hearing, never got a vote, no committee—none of that. There are no clean hands.

Mr. President, I am pleased to rise in support of the nomination of John
Fleming to be our Assistant Secretary for Economic Development at the Department of Commerce. In that role, Dr. Fleming would oversee the Economic Development Administration—call it the EDA. In my home State, we benefited a great deal from EDA in recent years. We are grateful for the EDA provides money used to leverage other moneys for economic development purposes. If I had more time, I would be able to give you some good examples.

When Dr. Fleming was a Member of the House of Representatives, he voted repeatedly to eliminate the Economic Development Administration. That is why I initially held deep reservations about him. When Dr. Fleming and I met before his hearing last year, he assured most of my concerns.

As the senior Democrat on the Environment and Public Works Committee in the Senate, I will work to ensure that EDA programs are protected and promoted, and I hope Dr. Fleming will be leading in those efforts. Today I will be leading the efforts to get him confirmed for his post and put him to work.

The last thing I would say, if I have a few more seconds—I think I may. One of the things I do is customer calls, and I suspect the Presiding Officer does this back in his home State of Indiana. I do them often. I visit businesses large and small. I ask three questions: How are you doing? How are we doing? What can we do to help?

One of the questions I asked once while visiting a large auto dealership was, how are you doing? He said: Well, you know, we sell plenty of vehicles, but we have a hard time attracting and getting people to work as technicians to maintain the vehicles we sell.

I asked: Maybe you need to pay them more money.

He said: No, we start people at about $50,000 and pay them up to $80,000, $90,000 a year.

I said: You are still having a hard time attracting people?

He said: Yes, we are.

We worked with EDA to get a Federal grant to create a center for automotive excellence in the middle of Delaware, in the Delmarva Peninsula. They are working with Delaware Technical and Community College, and a year from now they expect to open that Center for Automotive Excellence and provide the workforce that is needed not just in Delaware by our auto dealers but by companies that have large trucks and similar kinds of employers throughout the Delmarva Peninsula, in the Eastern Shore of Maryland, Virginia, and throughout the State of Delaware. That is the kind of thing EDA can do to help.

We are excited about this prospect and looking forward to meeting our workforce needs and grateful for the assistance of this Federal Agency, which Dr. Fleming has been nominated to head. I hope he will have that opportunity. We will vote in just a few minutes.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be discharged.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PAUL. We yield back all time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. I am happy to yield back. I think we have 1 1/2 minutes left. I am happy to yield it back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

Mr. PAUL. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Fleming nomination?

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 67, nays 30, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 40 Ex.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAS—67</th>
<th>NAYS—30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td>Ernst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrasse</td>
<td>Feinstein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackburn</td>
<td>Fischer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blunt</td>
<td>Gardner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boozman</td>
<td>Graham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braun</td>
<td>Grasley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burr</td>
<td>Hansen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capito</td>
<td>Hawley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardin</td>
<td>Hoeven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carper</td>
<td>Hyde-Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casey</td>
<td>Inhofe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassidy</td>
<td>Isakson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collins</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coons</td>
<td>Kennedy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornyn</td>
<td>King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotton</td>
<td>Lankford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crapo</td>
<td>Lee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruz</td>
<td>Leahy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daines</td>
<td>Murkowski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duckworth</td>
<td>Murphy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernst</td>
<td>Portman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fischer</td>
<td>Portman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardner</td>
<td>Portman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graham</td>
<td>Portman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grasley</td>
<td>Portman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hansen</td>
<td>Portman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawley</td>
<td>Portman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoeven</td>
<td>Portman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyde-Smith</td>
<td>Portman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inhofe</td>
<td>Portman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isakson</td>
<td>Portman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>Portman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy</td>
<td>Portman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td>Portman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lankford</td>
<td>Portman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>Portman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leahy</td>
<td>Portman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murkowski</td>
<td>Portman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murphy</td>
<td>Portman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Portman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAYs—30</td>
<td>NAYs—30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldwin</td>
<td>Cantwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennet</td>
<td>Durbin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blumenthal</td>
<td>Gillibrand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booker</td>
<td>Harris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Heinrich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menendez</td>
<td>Schatz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markey</td>
<td>Sinema</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray</td>
<td>Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peters</td>
<td>Stabenow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanders</td>
<td>Tester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>Moran</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas are 67, the nays are 30.

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The majority leader is recognized.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 19.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to proceed.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Paul B. Matey, of New Jersey, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Paul B. Matey, of New Jersey, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit.


LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.
EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 107.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is agreed to by the motion. The motion was agreed to. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Neomi J. Rao, of the District of Columbia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia Circuit.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Neomi J. Rao, of the District of Columbia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia Circuit.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum calls for the cloture motions be waived. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 98.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 98.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of William Beach, of Kansas, to be Commissioner of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor, for a term of four years.

The bill clerk read the nomination of General Thomas, to be United States Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia Circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of William Beach, of Kansas, to be Commissioner of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor, for a term of four years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of William Beach, of Kansas, to be Commissioner of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor, for a term of four years.
youth programs, scholarship assistance, and grassroots efforts. The American Legion’s membership is robust and active, and they have been well-served by Matthew.

Matthew has been a tireless legislative advocate for American Legion members and the veteran community as a whole. In his role overseeing the American Legion’s legislative efforts, Matthew has been instrumental in improving VA healthcare and benefits for our more than 22 million veterans, including the million Legionnaires around the world.

Matthew served in the U.S. Army from 2008 to 2012. He served as a military police officer and concluded his military career as a member of the Arizona Army National Guard Honor Guard, memorializing our fallen soldiers by providing military funeral honors.

Following his military service, Matthew attended Grand Canyon University and served as a staff sergeant in the Reserve Officer Training Corps, ROTC, at Arizona State University. He graduated from Marymount University in Arlington, VA, with a B.S. in criminal justice. He established his passion for public service by working for two different Members of Congress, as well as working on the 2012 election cycle.

Matthew’s career with the American Legion began in 2015, when he started as an assistant legislative director focused on employment and education in their Washington, DC, headquarters. In January 2017, Matthew began his tenure as the director of the American Legion’s national legislative division. In that role, Matthew has been the American Legion’s chief advocate before Congress, the White House, and the Department of Veterans’ Affairs. Matthew has helped lead an organization that has always been at the forefront of advocating for veterans and securing the resources, healthcare, and benefits veterans have earned.

As ranking member of the Senate Veterans’ Affairs Committee, it has been a joy to work with Matthew and the American Legion on important legislation like the Veterans Appeals Improvement and Modernization Act, the VA Accountability and Whistleblower Protection Act, the Harry W. Colmery Veterans Educational Assistance Act—also known as the Forever G.I. Bill—several recent and subsequent overhauls of the VA’s healthcare system, and the current implementation of the VA MISSION Act. All the while, I have been impressed with Matthew’s charisma, kindness, and humor.

These bipartisan bills, all of which were signed into law, serve as examples of Matthew’s advocacy on behalf of all veterans.

It is my honor to recognize Matthew’s outstanding military service and continued service to our servicemembers, veterans, and their families. As Matthew begins a new chapter, I have no doubt that he will continue to be a voice for those in need.

To Matthew, on behalf of myself and a grateful nation, I extend my greatest appreciation to you for your enduring bravery, service, sacrifice, and advocacy.

REMEMBERING JACK COGHLII

- Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, today I speak in memory of an Alaska pioneer, a pillar of the community of Nenana, signer of the Alaska Constitution, legendary Alaska legislator and our 6th Lieutenant Governor, Jack Coghill, who died in February at the age of 93.

Long before statehood, the name Coghill was synonymous with the town of Nenana. Jack’s father, William A. Coghill, Sr., emigrated from Scotland to Canada and then to Alaska in March 1907. He landed in Valdez, hiked to the interior over the course of 10 days, and went to work delivering the Fairbanks Daily News-Miner.

In 1916, Bill relocated about 60 miles down the road to Nenana, which was at the time a boom town. It was home to the Alaska Engineering Commission, which was building the railroad, a bridge, and a large dock. Along with a partner, Bill converted an existing business into Coghill’s Store, which continues to exist today.

In the 1930s, alongside his brothers, Bill, Jr., and Bob, began learning the business from the ground up. They were hauling freight, stocking shelves, assisting customers, and delivering the public service.

In 1944, Jack joined the Army in World War II. He was a staff sergeant with the U.S. Army Alaska Command, fighting in the Aleutians. Following the war, Jack moved home to Nenana. When Bill, Sr., died in 1947, Jack and his brothers and their mother, took over the store. Later the business included a movie theatre, fuel distribution, and a roadhouse.

Public service was an important part of Jack Coghill’s life since the late 1940s. He served on the Nenana School Board, and he was mayor of Nenana for 23 years. He was elected to the Alaska Territorial Legislature in 1952 and re-elected in 1956. At age 30, he was selected as one of 55 delegates to the Alaska Constitutional Convention. Jack participated in the drafting of the Alaska Constitution in 1956 and was the third individual to sign it. Post-statehood, he served in the Alaska House of Representatives and the Alaskan Senate. In 1990, of the 6th Lieutenant Governor on a ticket with Wally Hickel. Unable to stay away from service, Jack returned to the Nenana City Council when his term as Lieutenant Governor concluded. Until his death, the generations looked to Jack for advice.

Jack and his wife Frances were parents to six children. Next to family, Jack characterized his service on the Alaska Constitutional Convention as his greatest achievement. Of course, that was far from Jack’s only recognition. He held an honorary doctorate from the University of Alaska and was elected to Junior Achievement’s Small Business Hall of Fame.

One of Jack’s six children is John Coghill, a friend whom I served with in the Alaska Legislature and who serves as a member of the Alaska State Senate today. John remembers his father as a “firm believer in utilizing Alaska’s natural resources to build a strong economy and provide good paying jobs for Alaska . . . He had the same passion for Alaska, even at 92.”

With the passing of Jack Coghill, only one of the signers of the Alaska Constitution, Victor Fischer, remains alive today. While it is sad to part with a pillar of Alaska’s history, an individual who was instrumental in Alaska’s growth from its frontier, territorial days to today’s modern State, we were blessed to have his leadership for so many years.

It is an honor to share just a brief glimpse of the story of Jack Coghill with my colleagues here in the U.S. Senate.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bills were read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 1271. An act to establish in the Department of Veterans Affairs a pilot program instituting a clinical observation program for pre-med students preparing to attend medical school.

H.R. 1381. An act to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to take actions necessary to ensure that certain individuals may update the burn pit registry with a registered individual’s cause of death, and for other purposes.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 729. A bill to prohibit the use of funds to Federal agencies to establish a panel, task force, advisory committee, or other effort to challenge the scientific consensus on climate change, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communication was laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and was referred as indicated:

EC–529. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “OMB Final Sequestration Report to the President and Congress for Fiscal Year 2019”; to the Special Committee on Aging; Agri- culture, Nutrition, and Forestry Appropriations; Armed Services; Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs; the Budget; Commerce, Science, and Transportation; Energy and Natural Resources; Environment and Public Works; Select Committee on Ethics; Finance; Foreign Relations; Health, Education,
Labor, and Pensions; Homeland Security and
Governmental Affairs; Indian Affairs; Select
Committee on Intelligence; the Judiciary;
Rules and Administration; Small Business
and Entrepreneurship; and Veterans’ Affairs.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF
COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:
By Mr. INHOFE for the Committee on
Armed Services.
*William Bookless, of California, to be
Principal Deputy Administrator, National
Security Administration.
*Veronica Daigle, of Virginia, to be an
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.
*Thomas McCaffery, of California, to be
an Assistant Secretary of Defense.
Lisa M. Schenck, of Virginia, to be a
Judge of the United States Court of Military
Commission Review.
By Ms. MURKOWSKI for the Committee on
Energy and Natural Resources.
*Lawrence V. Zeman, of New York, to be Di-
rector of the Advanced Research Projects
Agency-Energy, Department of Energy.
*Rita Baranwal, of Pennsylvania, to be an
Assistant Secretary of Energy (Nuclear En-
ergy).
*William Cooper, of Maryland, to be Gen-
eral Counsel of the Department of Energy.
*Chad Eden, of Virginia, to be Direct-
or of the Office of Science, Department of
Energy.
By Mr. GRAHAM for the Committee on the
Judiciary.
Joseph F. Bianco, of New York, to be United
States Circuit Judge for the Second Circuit.
Michael H. Park, of New York, to be United
States Circuit Judge for the Second Circuit.
Greg Girard Guidry, of Louisiana, to be United
States District Judge for the Eastern District of
Louisiana.
Michael T. Libardi, of Arizona, to be United
States District Judge for the District of
Arizona.
Peter D. Weite, of North Dakota, to be United
States District Judge for the District of
North Dakota.
*Nomination was reported with rec-
ommendation that it be confirmed sub-
ject to the nominee’s commitment to respond to requests to appear and tes-
tify before any duly constituted com-
mittee of the Senate. (Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommenda-
tion that they be confirmed.)

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:
By Mr. HOEVEN, from the Committee on
Indian Affairs, without amendment.
S. 199. A bill to provide for the transfer of cer-
tain Federal land in the State of Min-
esota for the benefit of the Leech Lake
Band of Ojibwe (Rept. No. 116-13).
S. 216. A bill to provide for equitable com-
ensation to the Spokane Tribe of Indians of
the Spokane Reservation for the use of tribal
land for the production of hydropower by the
Grand Coulee Dam, and for other purposes
(Rept. No. 116-4).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND
JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolu-
tions were introduced, read the first
and second times by unanimous con-
sent, and referred as indicated:
By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and
Ms. BALDWIN):
S. 691. A bill to amend title XVIII of the
Social Security Act to enhance prescription
drug affordability by expanding access to as-
sistance with out-of-pocket costs under
Medicare Part D for low-income seniors and
individuals with disabilities; to the Com-
mittee on Finance.
By Mr. TOOMEY (for himself, Ms. KLO-
BUCHAR, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. CASBY, Mr. CRapo,
Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON,
Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. ROSEN, Mrs. SHAHREH,
Ms. SINEMA, Ms. SMITH, Mr. TILLIS,
Mr. YOUNG, Mr. WICKER, Mr. RUBIO,
Mrs. HYDEN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. GARDNER, and Mr. BLUNT):
S. 692. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue
Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on
medical devices, to the Committee on Fi-
ance.
By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. COT-
TON, Mr. THUNE, and Ms. SINEMA):
S. 693. A bill to repeal Sec. 36, United
States Code, to require that the POW/MIA
flag be displayed on all days that the flag of
the United States is displayed on certain
Federal property; to the Committee on the
Judiciary.
By Mr. LEE:
S. 694. A bill to repeal the Joint Resolution
restraining the President from taking any action
that would constitute a vio-
lation of the Intermediate-Range Nuclear
Forces Treaty for the duration of the six-
month withdrawal period from the INF Tre-
aty, and for other purposes; to the Com-
mittee on Foreign Relations.
By Mr. TOOMEY (for himself, Mr. KAI-
NE, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mrs. SHAHREH):
S. 695. A bill to amend the Elementary and
Secondary Education Act of 1965 to allow
parents of eligible military dependent chil-
dren to establish Military Education Savings
Accounts, and for other purposes; to the Com-
mittee on Finance.
By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself and
Ms. CAPITO):
S. 696. A bill to designate the same indi-
vidual serving as the Chief Nurse Officer of the
Public Health Service and the National
Nurse for Public Health; to the Committee on
By Mr. RYAN:
S. 697. A bill to reform sentencing, prisons,
re-entry of prisoners, and law enforcement prac-
tices, and for other purposes; to the Com-
mittee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and
Mr. RUBIO):
S. 698. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue
Code of 1986 to provide equitable treat-
ment for residents of Puerto Rico with re-
spect to the refundable portion of the child
tax credit and to provide the same treatment
to families in Puerto Rico with one or two
children that is currently provided to is-
lan families with three or more children; to
the Committee on Finance.
By Ms. HASSAN (for herself and Ms.
ERNST):
S. 699. A bill to establish an interagency
committee on the development of green alert
systems that would be activated when a vet-
eran goes missing, and for other purposes; to
the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.
By Mr. THUNE:
S. 700. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue
Code of 1986 to provide a safe harbor for
determinations of worker classification, to
require increased reporting, and for other
purposes; to the Committee on Finance.
By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mrs.
CAPITO):
S. 701. A bill to amend the Federal Water
Pollution Control Act to reauthorize the
Chesapeake Bay Program, and for other
purposes; to the Committee on Environment and
Public Works.
By Mr. KING (for himself, Ms. COLLINS,
Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. WARREN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. CASEY):
S. 702. A bill to amend the Older Americans
Act of 1965 to establish an initiative, carried
out by the Assistant Secretary for Aging, to
coordinate Federal efforts and programs for
home modifications enabling older individ-
uals and individuals with disabilities to live
independently and safely in a home environ-
ment, and for other purposes; to the Com-
mittee on Health, Education, Labor, and
Pensions.
By Ms. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. WARD,
Mr. CASEY, Mr. RUBIO, and Mrs. SHAHREH):
S. 703. A bill to amend title 10, United
States Code, to address health, safety, and
environmental hazards at private military
housing units, to prohibit the payment by members of the Armed Forces of deposits or other fees relating to such housing units, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.
By Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON,
Mr. CARDIN, Mr. RUBIO, and Mrs. SHAHREH):
S. 704. A bill to prioritize the efforts of and
enhance coordination among United States agencies to encourage countries in Central and
Eastern Europe to diversify their energy sources and supply routes, increase Europe’s energy security, and help the United States reach its global energy security goals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.
By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Ms.
WARREN, Mr. MARKET, Mr. SANDERS,
Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. SMITH, and Ms.
HARRIS):
S. 705. A bill to prohibit the use of funds to take any action that would constitute a vio-
lation of the Intermediate-Range Nuclear
Forces Treaty for the duration of the six-
month withdrawal period from the INF Tre-
aty, and for other purposes; to the Com-
mittee on Foreign Relations.
By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. BROWN,
and Mr. CASEY):
S. 706. A bill to amend the Higher Edu-
cation Act of 1965 to require institutions of
higher education to disclose hazing inci-
dents, and for other purposes; to the Com-
mittee on Health, Education, Labor, and
Pensions.
By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mrs.
SHAHREH, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr.
CARDIN, Ms. HASSAN, Mrs. GILLIB-
RAND, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WYDEN,
Mr. MARKET, Mr. BALDWIN, Mr. VAN HOL-
LEN, Mr. LEARY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms.
KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms.
SMITH, Mr. BROWN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE,
Mr. REED, Mr. COONS, Mr. DURBIN,
Ms. HARRIS, Mr. HINO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. MURPHY, Mr.
BOOKER, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. ROSEN,
Mr. KAIN, Ms. STABNOW, and Mr.
SCHATZ):
S. 707. A bill to amend the Foreign Assist-
ance Act of 1961 to include in the Annual
Country Reports on Human Rights Practices a section on reproductive rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.
By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself and Mr.
BOOKER):
S. 708. A bill to amend the Animal Welfare
Act to limit experimentation on cats; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.
By Mr. CASEY (for himself and Ms.
COLLINS):
S. 709. A bill to establish an interactive dashboard to allow the public to review information on the price and utilization of prescription drugs purchased by Federal programs; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. TOOMEY:

S. 710. A bill to exempt firefighters and police officers from certain Government Pension Offset and Windfall Elimination Provisions under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mr. MORA, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. SULLIVAN, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. CASIDY, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. TILLIS, and Mr. SANDERS):

S. 711. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand eligibility for mental health services from the Department of Veterans Affairs to include members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. RURO, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. COONS):

S. 712. A bill to provide assistance for United States citizens and nationals taken hostage or unlawfully or wrongfully detained abroad, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. B. MATHAIH (for himself and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 713. A bill to improve highway-rail grade crossing safety, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Mr. RURO):

S. 714. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the percentage depletion allowance for certain hardrock mining, and to provide for a deduction for mine expansion; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Mr. ALEXANDER):

S. 715. A bill to improve the productivity and energy efficiency of the manufacturing sector by directing the Secretary of Energy, in coordination with the National Academies and other appropriate Federal agencies, to develop a national smart manufacturing plan and to provide assistance to small- and medium-sized manufacturers in implementing smart manufacturing programs; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. DURBin, Mr. KAINe, Mr. MURkowSKI, Mr. MERCkLEY, and Mr. MERkLEY):

S. 716. A bill to impose sanctions under the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act to combat corruption, money laundering, and impunity in Guatemala, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MERCkLEY (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. TESTER, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. DURBin, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. MARKET, Ms. KLOBuchar, Mr. CANTWELL, Mr. W HITEHOUSE, Mr. ROB- NOR, Mr. S ULLIVAN, Mr. S ANDERS, Mr. KING, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. KAINe, Mr. DURBin, Ms. SMITH, Ms. KLOBuchar, Mr. LANKFORD, Ms. MCCsALLY, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MORAN, Ms. W HITEHOUSE, Mr. ROBERT, Mr. KING, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. UDALL, Mr. REED, Mr. BALDWIN, Ms. SHAHEEN, Mr. DUCKworth, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. KAINe, Mr. TESTER, Ms. ROSEn, and Ms. HASSAN):

S. 722. A bill to increase the number of judgeships for the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and certain district courts of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself, Ms. MURkowSKI, Mr. DAINeS, and Ms. MCCsALLY):

S. 723. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to establish additional regulations for the monitoring, control, and identification of controlled substances used in illegal drug trafficking; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GILLBRAND (for herself and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 724. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to ensure the safety of food and cosmetics; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. COONS (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. MERCkLEY, Mr. RURO, and Mr. YOUNg):

S. 727. A bill to combat international extremism by addressing global fragility and violence and stabilizing conflict-affected areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Ms. HARRIS (for herself, Mr. SCHuMER, Mr. MARKET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. COHEN, Mr. HIROnO, Mr. HOOVEN, Mr. CANTWELL, Mr. KAINe, Mr. KLOBuchar, Mr. LANKFORD, Ms. MCCsALLY, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURRAY, Ms. ROsEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHuMER, Mr. SHaHEEn, Mr. SMith, Mr. TESTER, Mr. W HITEHOUSE, and Mr. WYDEn):

S. 730. A bill to prevent gun trafficking; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MERCkLEY (for himself and Ms. MURkowSKI):

S. 731. A bill to amend the Anti-Border Security, Trade, and Infrastructure Protection Act of 2015 to address the national amber alert and Amber Alert System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. SCHuTZ (for himself and Ms. MURkowSKI):

S. 732. A bill to amend the PROTECT Act to expand the national AMBER Alert system to territories of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. MORA, Mr. CARPER, Mr. MURkowSKI, Ms. SMITH, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. JONES, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. KING, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. U DALL, Mr. REED, Mr. BALDWIN, Ms. SHAHEEN, Mr. DUCKWORTH, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. KAINe, Mr. TESTER, Ms. ROSEn, and Ms. HASSAN):

S. Res. 99. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that Congress should take appropriate measures that the United States Postal Service remains an independent establishment of the Federal Government and is not subject to privatization; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. MURkowSKI (for herself, Mr. U DALL, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CANTWELL, Mr. DAINeS, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. HEINHICH, Mr. HIROnO, Mr. HOOVEN, Mr. CANTWELL, Mr. KAINe, Mr. KLOBuchar, Mr. LANKFORD, Ms. MCCsALLY, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURRAY, Ms. ROsEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHuMER, Mr. SHaHEEn, Mr. SMith, Mr. TESTER, Mr. W HITEHOUSE, and Mr. WYDEn):

S. Res. 100. A resolution recognizing the heritage, culture, and contributions of American Indian, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian women in the United States; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mrs. GILLBRAND (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. MURPHY, and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. Res. 101. A resolution supporting the goals of International Women's Day; considered and agreed to.
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from North Dakota (Mr. Hoeven), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. Whitehouse), the Senator from Florida (Mr. Rubio) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. Durbin) were added as cosponsors of S. 472, a bill to deter criminal robocalls and improve enforcement of section 227(b) of the Communications Act of 1934, and for other purposes.

S. 178

At the request of Mr. Rubio, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. Sasse) was added as a cosponsor of S. 472, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coverage of marriage and family therapist services and mental health counselor services under part B of the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 340

At the request of Mr. Leahy, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. Rounds) and the Senator from Arizona (Ms. Sinema) were added as cosponsors of S. 340, a bill to promote competition in the market for drugs and biological products by facilitating the timely entry of lower-cost generic and biosimilar versions of those drugs and biological products.

S. 472

At the request of Mr. Wyden, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. Rubio), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. Klobuchar), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. Scott) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. Casey) were added as cosponsors of S. 472, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform taxation of alcoholic beverages.

S. 477

At the request of Mr. Menendez, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. Rubio), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. Klobuchar), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. Scott) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. Casey) were added as cosponsors of S. 477, at the request of Mr. Markley, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. Bennet) was added as a cosponsor of S. 472, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to ensure that revenue collected from passengers as aviation security fees are used to help finance the costs of aviation security screening by repealing a requirement that a portion of such fees be credited as offsetting receipts and deposited in the general fund of the Treasury.

S. 479

At the request of Mr. Toomey, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Kaine) was added as a cosponsor of S. 479, a bill to revise section 48 of title 18, United States Code, and for other purposes.

S. 594

At the request of Ms. Sinema, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. Hyde-Smith) was added as a cosponsor of S. 360, United States Code, to authorize The American Legion to determine the requirements for membership in The American Legion, and for other purposes.

S. 599

At the request of Mr. Murphy, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. Murkowski), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. Jones), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. Van Hollen) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. Baldwin) were added as cosponsors of S. 599, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the United States Coast Guard.

S. 621

At the request of Mr. Brown, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. Hassan) was added as a cosponsor of S. 521, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to repeal the Government pension offset and windfall elimination provisions.

S. 668

At the request of Mr. Kaine, the names of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. Jones) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. Sullivan) were added as cosponsors of S. J. Res. 4, a joint resolution requiring the advice and consent of the Senate or an Act of Congress to suspend, terminate, or withdraw the United States from the North Atlantic Treaty and authorizing related litigation, and for other purposes.

S. J. Res. 4

At the request of Mr. Risch, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. Johnson), the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. Blackburn) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. Isakson) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. Rubio) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 96, a resolution commending the Government of Canada for upholding the rule of law and expressing concern over actions by the Government of the People’s Republic of China in response to a request from the United States Government to the Government of Canada for the extradition of a Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd. executive.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. THUNE:

S. 700. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a safe harbor for determinations of worker classification, to require increased reporting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

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

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

S. 650

At the request of Mr. Udall, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. Schatz) was added as a cosponsor of S. 650, a bill to assist entrepreneurs, support development of the creative economy, and encourage international cultural exchange, and for other purposes.

S. 668

At the request of Mr. Brown, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. Duckworth) was added as a cosponsor of S. 668, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to waive coinsurance under Medicare for colorectal cancer screening tests, regardless of whether therapeutic intervention is required during the screening.

S. J. Res. 4

At the request of Mr. Baldwin, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. Casey) was added as a cosponsor of S. 668, a bill to protect the rights of passengers with disabilities in air transportation, and for other purposes.

S. J. Res. 4

At the request of Mr. Risch, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. Johnson), the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. Blackburn), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. Isakson) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. Rubio) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 96, a resolution commending the Government of Canada for upholding the rule of law and expressing concern over actions by the Government of the People’s Republic of China in response to a request from the United States Government to the Government of Canada for the extradition of a Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd. executive.

S. 650

At the request of Mr. Risch, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. Johnson), the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. Blackburn), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. Isakson) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. Rubio) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 96, a resolution commending the Government of Canada for upholding the rule of law and expressing concern over actions by the Government of the People’s Republic of China in response to a request from the United States Government to the Government of Canada for the extradition of a Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd. executive.

S. 668

At the request of Mr. Brown, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. Duckworth) was added as a cosponsor of S. 668, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to waive coinsurance under Medicare for colorectal cancer screening tests, regardless of whether therapeutic intervention is required during the screening.

S. J. Res. 4

At the request of Mr. Baldwin, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. Casey) was added as a cosponsor of S. 668, a bill to protect the rights of passengers with disabilities in air transportation, and for other purposes.
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"(B) substantially all the compensation for such service is directly related to sales of goods or services rather than to the number of hours worked.

"(C) PLACE OF BUSINESS OR OWN EQUIPMENT REQUIREMENT.—The requirement of this subsection is met with respect to any service if the service provider

"(1) has a principal place of business,

"(2) does not provide the service primarily in the service recipient’s place of business,

"(3) pays a fee for use of the service recipient’s or payor’s place of business, or

"(4) provides the service primarily using equipment owned by a service provider.

"(D) WRITTEN CONTRACT REQUIREMENT.—The requirements of this subsection are met with respect to any service if such service is performed pursuant to a written contract between the service provider and the service recipient or payor, whichever is applicable, which meets the following requirements:

"(1) The contract includes each of the following:

"(A) The service provider’s name, taxpayer identification number, and address.

"(B) A statement that the service provider will not be treated as an employee with respect to the services provided pursuant to the contract.

"(D) A statement that the service recipient or payor withholds upon and reports to the Internal Revenue Service the compensation payable pursuant to the contract.

"(E) A statement that the contract is intended to be considered a contract described in this subsection.

The service recipient or payor will not be treated as an employee with respect to the services provided pursuant to such a contract if the contract satisfies such requirements.

"(E) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection, or (A) any payor shall not be treated as an employer, and

"(B) compensation paid or received for such service shall not be treated as paid or received with respect to employee.

"(C) EFFECT OF RECLASSIFICATION ON SERVICE PROVIDERS.—For purposes of this title, a service provider shall be treated as an employer, and

"(D) WRITING CONTRACT REQUIREMENT.—The written contract described in subsection (c) with respect to the services provided pursuant to the contract.

"(E) NOTICE DATE.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘notice date’ means the 30th day after the date on which the aggregate payments made by the service recipient or payor to the service provider exceed $1,000 for the year covered by the contract (or renewal).
apply any other provision of this title, section 530 of the Revenue Act of 1978, or any common law rules for determining whether an individual is an employee, or
(2) any provision for the application of any provision of law described in paragraph (1).

(i) Definitions.—For purposes of this section—
(1) service provider.—
(A) in general.—The term ‘service provider’ means any qualified person who performs services for another person.
(B) qualified person.—The term ‘qualified person’ means—
(A) any person, including the service recipient, who pays the service provider for performing such service, or
(B) a marketplace platform, as defined in section 6050W(d)(3)(C).

(ii) regulations.—Notwithstanding section 530(d) of the Revenue Act of 1978, the Secretary shall issue such regulations as the Secretary determines are necessary to carry out the purposes of this section.

(b) voluntary withholding agreements and classification.—Section 3402(p) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

‘‘(4) worker classification.—Agreements under paragraph (3) shall not be taken into account in determining whether any party to such agreement is an employee or an employer for purposes of this title.’’.

(c) withholding by payor in case of certain persons classified as not employees.—The Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

‘‘(i) in general.—For purposes of this chapter and so much of subtitle P as relates to this title, any compensation paid pursuant to a contract described in section 7706(d) shall be treated as if it were a payment of wages by an employer to an employee.

(ii) Federal withholding.—Except as otherwise provided under subsection (1), the amount to be deducted and withheld pursuant to paragraph (1) with respect to compensation paid during any calendar year shall be an amount equal to 5 percent of so much of the amount of such compensation as does not exceed $20,000.’’.

(d) direct sellers of promotional products.—Subsection (b) of section 3508 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—
(1) in paragraph (2)(A)—
(A) in clause (ii), by striking ‘‘or’’ at the end,
(B) in clause (iii), by adding ‘‘or’’ at the end, and
(C) by inserting after clause (iii) the following new clause:

(iv) in the trade or business of selling, or soliciting the sale of, promotional products from other than a retail permanent establishment,’’.

(ii) redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4), and
(iii) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

‘‘(3) any other product.—For purposes of paragraph (2)(A)(iv), the term ‘promotional product’ means a tangible item with permanently marked promotional words, symbols, or art of the purchaser.’’.

(e) reporting.—

(1) information at source.—Section 6041 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—
(A) in subsection (a)—
(i) in the heading, by striking ‘‘$600’’ and inserting ‘‘$1,000’’, and
(ii) by striking ‘‘$600 or more in any taxable year’’ and inserting ‘‘$1,000 or more in any taxable year’’, and
(B) by adding at the end the following new subsection—

‘‘(B) special rules for certain persons classified as not employees.—

(A) in general.—In the case of any service recipient or payor required to make a return under subsection (a) with respect to compensation to which section 7706(a) applies—

(i) each such return shall include—

(1) a statement identifying the person who is required to be included on such return,
(2) the aggregate amount deducted and withheld under section 3402(s) with respect to such compensation, and
(3) an indication of whether a copy of the contract described in section 7706(d) is on file with the service recipient or payor, and

(B) the statement required to be furnished under subsection (d) shall include the information contained in a statement furnished under subsection (a) with respect to the service provider to whom such statement is furnished.

(2) definitions.—Terms used in this subsection which are also used in section 7706 shall have the same meaning as when used in such section.’’.

(2) returns regarding payments of remuneration for services and direct sales.—Section 6041A of such Code is amended—

(A) in paragraph (2) of subsection (a), by striking ‘‘$600’’ and inserting ‘‘$1,000’’, and
(B) by adding at the end the following new subsection—

‘‘(G) special rules for certain persons classified as not employees.—Rules similar to the rules of subsection (b) of section 6041 shall apply for purposes of this section.’’.

(3) returns relating to payments made in settlement of third party network transactions.—Section 6050W of such Code is amended—

(A) in subsection (d), by adding paragraph (3) to read as follows—

‘‘(3) third party network payment.—

‘‘(A) in general.—The term ‘third party network payment’ means any agreement or arrangement—

(i) which involves the establishment of accounts with a central organization or marketplace platform by a substantial number of persons

(1) are unrelated to such organization or platform,
(2) provide goods or services, and
(3) have agreed to settle transactions for the provision of such goods or services pursuant to such agreement or arrangement,

(ii) which provides for standards and mechanisms for settling such transactions, and

(iii) which guarantees persons providing goods or services pursuant to such agreement or arrangement payment in the case of a third party settlement organization.

(B) other third party settlement organizations.—In the case of a third party settlement organization other than a marketplace platform—

(i) the rules of subparagraph (A) shall apply in the case of information required to be reported, or which would otherwise be reported, under subsection (a)(2) with respect to such transactions exceeds $5,000, or

(ii) the aggregate number of transactions exceeds 50.

(C) marketplace platforms.—In the case of a marketplace platform as defined in subsection (d)(3)(C) through which substantially all the participating payees are primarily engaged in the sale of goods, such marketplace platform shall be required to report any information under subsection (a) with respect to third party network transactions of such payee only if—

(i) the amount which would otherwise be reported under subsection (a)(2) with respect to such transactions exceeds $1,000, or

(ii) the determination of whether a particular payee is primarily engaged in the sale of goods, and

(iii) any election to report which would otherwise be reported under subsection (a)(2) with respect to such transactions or the aggregate number of such transactions, and

(C) in subsection (3) of section 7436(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

‘‘(1) petition.—A pleading may be filed under this section only by—

(A) the person for whom the services are performed, including the service recipient or the payor, or

(B) any service provider which the Secretary has determined should have been treated as an employee.''
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All terms used in this paragraph which are also used in section 7706 have the meanings given such terms in section 7706(1).

(g) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“Sec. 7706. Determination of worker classification.

(h) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraphs (2), (3), and (4), the amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply to services performed after December 31, 2019 (and to payments made for such services after such date).

(2) GRACE PERIOD TO BEGIN WITHHOLDING.—A contract shall not be treated as failing to meet the requirements of section 7706(d)(1)(C) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (as added by this section), and a service recipient or payor shall not be treated as failing to meet any such requirement, with respect to compensation paid to a service provider before the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(3) REPORTING.—Except as provided in paragraph (4), the amendments made by subsection (b) shall apply to returns of payments due after the date for which is after the date which is 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(4) EXCEPTION FOR DE MINIMIS PAYMENTS BY THIRD PARTY SETTLEMENT ORGANIZATIONS.—The amendments made by subsection (c)(3)(B) shall apply to payments made after December 31, 2019.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. COONS, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. SCHATZ, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 719. A bill to reform the use of solitary confinement and other forms of restrictive housing in the Bureau of Prisons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD. There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEC. 2. SOLITARY CONFINEMENT REFORMS.

Sec. 1. Short Title.

This Act may be cited as the “Solitary Confinement Reform Act”.

Sec. 2. Solitary Confinement Reforms.

(a) Amendment.—Chapter 303 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 4051. Solitary confinement

(a) Definitions.—In this section—

(1) ADMINISTRATIVE MAXIMUM FACILITY.—The term ‘administrative maximum facility’ means a maximum-security facility, including the Administrative Maximum facility in Florence, Colorado, designed to house inmates who present an ongoing significant and serious threat to other inmates, staff, and the public.

(2) ADMINISTRATIVE SEGREGATION.—The term ‘administrative segregation’ means a nonpunitive form of solitary confinement that removes an individual from the general population and isolates the inmate, other inmates, staff, or the public.

(A) INVESTIGATIVE, PROTECTIVE, OR PREVENTIVE REASONS RESULTING IN SUBSTANTIAL AND IMMEDIATE IMMEDIATE THREAT; OR

(B) WHEN THERE ARE REASONS, INCLUDING A PENDING TRANSFER, PENDING CLASSIFICATION, OR OTHER TEMPORARY ADMINISTRATIVE MATTER.

(3) APPROPRIATE LEVEL OF CARE.—The term ‘appropriate level of care’ means the appropriate treatment setting for mental health care that an inmate with mental illness or mental disorder of thought or mood that significantly impairs judgment, behavior, capacity to recognize reality, or ability to cope with the ordinary demands of life.

(4) DIRECTOR.—The term ‘Director’ means the Director of the Bureau of Prisons.

(5) DISCIPLINARY HEARING OFFICER.—The term ‘disciplinary hearing officer’ means an employee of the Bureau of Prisons who is responsible for conducting disciplinary hearings for violations of the terms of a sanction, as described in section 541.8 of title 28, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor thereto.

(6) DISCIPLINARY SEGREGATION.—The term ‘disciplinary segregation’ means a punitive form of solitary confinement imposed only by a Disciplinary Hearing Officer as a sanction for committing a significant and serious disciplinary infraction.

(7) INTELLIGENCE DISABILITY.—The term ‘intelligence disability’ means a significant mental impairment caused by significant limitations in both intellectual functioning and in adaptive behavior.

(8) MULTIDISCIPLINARY STAFF COMMITTEE.—The term ‘multidisciplinary staff committee’ means a committee—

(A) made up of staff at the facility where an inmate resides who are responsible for reviewing the initial classification of the inmate in solitary confinement and any extensions of time in solitary confinement; and

(B) which shall include—

(i) not less than 1 licensed mental health professional; and

(ii) not less than 1 medical professional; and

(iii) not less than 1 member of the leadership of the facility.

(9) ONGOING SIGNIFICANT AND SERIOUS THREAT.—The term ‘ongoing significant and serious threat’ means an ongoing set of circumstances that require the highest level of security and staff supervision for an inmate who, by the behavior of the inmate—

(A) has been identified as assaultive, predatory, violent, or a serious escape risk; and

(B) poses a great risk to other inmates, staff, and the public.

(10) PROTECTION CASE.—The term ‘protection case’ means an inmate who, by the request of the inmate or through a staff determination, requires protection, as described by section 541.23(c)(3) of title 28, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor thereto.

(11) SERIOUS MENTAL ILLNESS.—The term ‘serious mental illness’ means a substantial disorder of thought or mood that significantly impairs judgment, behavior, capacity to recognize reality, or ability to cope with the ordinary demands of life.

(12) SIGNIFICANT AND SERIOUS DISCIPLINARY INFRACTIONS.—The term ‘significant and serious disciplinary infraction’ means—

(A) an act of violence that either—

(i) resulted in or was likely to result in serious injury or death to another; or

(ii) occurred in connection with any act of nonconsensual sex; or

(B) an escape, attempted escape, or conspiracy to escape from within a security perimeter or custody, or both; or

(C) possession of weapons, possession of illegal narcotics with intent to distribute, or illegal gambling that poses a substantial threat to the safety of the inmate, other inmates, staff, or the public.

(13) SOLITARY CONFINEMENT.—The term ‘solitary confinement’ means confinement characterized by substantial isolation in a cell, alone or with other inmates, including administrative segregation, disciplinary segregation, and confinement in any facility designated by the Bureau of Prisons as a special housing unit, special management unit, or administrative segregation unit.

(14) SPECIAL ADMINISTRATIVE MEASURES.—The term ‘special administrative measures’ means reasonably necessary measures used to—

(A) prevent disclosure of classified information upon written certification to the Attorney General by the head of an element of the intelligence community (as specified or designated under section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4))) that the unauthorized disclosure of such information would pose a threat to national security and that there is a danger that the inmate will disclose such information, as described by section 501.2 of title 28, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor thereto;

(B) protect persons against the risk of death or serious bodily injury, upon written notification to the Director by the Attorney General or, at the Attorney General’s direction, by the head of a Federal law enforcement agency, or the head of an element of the intelligence community (as specified or designated under section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4))), that there is a substantial risk that the committal of an inmate to the custody of another person with other persons could result in death or serious bodily injury to persons, or substantial damage to property that would entail the risk of death or serious bodily injury to persons, as described by section 501.3 of title 28, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor thereto.

(15) SPECIAL HOUSING UNIT.—The term ‘special housing unit’ means a housing unit in an institution of the Bureau of Prisons in which inmates are separated from the general inmate population for disciplinary or administrative reasons, as described in section 541.21 of title 28, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor thereto.

(16) SPECIAL MANAGEMENT UNIT.—The term ‘special management unit’ means a nonpunitive housing program with multiple, step-down phases for inmates whose history, behavior, or situation warrants enhanced management approaches in order to ensure the safety of other inmates in the facility, inmates, staff, and the public.

(17) SUBSTANTIAL AND IMMEDIATE THREAT.—The term ‘substantial and immediate threat’ means any set of temporary and unforeseen circumstances that require action in order to prevent a threat to the safety of an inmate, other inmates, staff, or the public.

(18) USE OF SOLITARY CONFINEMENT.—The term ‘use of solitary confinement’ means the confinement of a Federal inmate in solitary confinement within the Bureau of Prisons or any facility that contracts with the Bureau of Prisons to provide housing for inmates in custody shall be limited to situations in which such confinement—

(A) is limited to the briefest term and the least restrictive conditions practicable, including not less than 4 hours of out-of-cell time every day, unless the inmate poses a substantial and immediate threat;

(B) is consistent with the rationale for placement and with the progress achieved by the inmate;

(C) allows the inmate to participate in meaningful educational programs, activities, and privileges as consistent with those available in the general population as practicable, either individually or in a classroom setting;

(D) allows the inmate to have meaningful interaction with others, such as other inmates, visitors, clergy, or licensed
mental health professionals, as practicable; and
(E) complies with the provisions of this section.
(2) TRANSMISSIONAL PROCESS FOR INMATES IN SOLITARY CONFINEMENT.—
(A) INMATES WITH UPCOMING RELEASE DATES.—The Director shall establish—
(i) that an inmate with an anticipated release date of 180 days or less is not housed in solitary confinement, unless—
(II) the inmate poses a substantial and immediate threat; and
(ii) a transitional process for each inmate with an anticipated release date of 180 days or less who is held in solitary confinement under clause (I)(II), which shall include—
(I) substantial re-socialization programming in a group setting;
(II) regular mental health counseling to assist with the transition; and
(III) re-entry planning services offered to inmates in solitary confinement.
(B) INMATES IN LONG-TERM SOLITARY CONFINEMENT.—The Director shall establish a transitional process for each inmate who has been housed in confinement for more than 30 days and who will transition into a general population unit, which shall include—
(i) substantial re-socialization programming in a group setting; and
(ii) regular mental health counseling to assist with the transition.
(C) PROTECTIVE CUSTODY UNITS.—The Director—
(A) shall establish within the Federal prison system the initial general population protective custody units that provide sheltered general population housing to protect inmates from harm that may otherwise be exposed to in a typical general population housing unit;
(B) shall establish policies to ensure that an inmate who is considered a protection case shall, upon request of the inmate, be placed in a general population protective custody unit;
(C) shall create an adequate number of general population protective custody units to—
(i) accommodate the requests of inmates who are considered to be protection cases; and
(ii) ensure that inmates who are considered to be protection cases are placed in facilities close to their homes as practicable; and
(D) may not place an inmate who is considered to be a protection case in solitary confinement due to the status of the inmate as a protection case unless—
(i) the inmate requests to be placed in solitary confinement, in which case, at the request of the inmate, shall be transferred to a general population protective custody unit or, if appropriate, a different general population unit; or
(ii) such confinement is limited to—
(I) not more than 5 days of administrative segregation; and
(II) is necessary to protect the inmate during processing for transfer to a general population protective custody unit or a different general population unit.
(4) VULNERABLE POPULATIONS.—The Bureau of Prisons shall not place an inmate in solitary confinement if—
(A) the inmate has a serious mental illness, has been found guilty of a serious and serious disciplinary infraction of which the inmate was found guilty by a Disciplinary Hearing Officer and alternative sanctions would not adequately regulate the behavior of the inmate; and
(B) the inmate has an intellectual disability, has a mental health condition, or a physical disability that contracts with the Bureau of Prisons shall not place an inmate in solitary confinement unless—
(i) the inmate poses a substantial and immediate threat; and
(ii) all other options to de-escalate the situation have been exhausted, including less restrictive conditions practicable, including access to medical and mental health treatment;
(iii) such confinement is limited to the briefest term and the least restrictive conditions practicable, including access to medical and mental health treatment;
(iv) such confinement is reviewed by a multidisciplinary staff committee for appropriateness every 24 hours; and
(v) as soon as practicable, but not later than 5 days after such confinement begins, the inmate shall be reviewed to determine whether confinement is necessary to—
(I) a general population unit;
(II) a protective custody unit described in paragraph (7);
(III) a mental health treatment program as described in subsection (c)(2);
(iv) such confinement is reviewed by a multidisciplinary staff committee, in consultation with the inmate, unless the inmate poses a significant and serious disciplinary infraction; or
(v) as soon as practicable, but not later than 5 days after such confinement begins, the inmate shall be reviewed to determine whether confinement is necessary to—
(I) the inmate is a human being with an anticipated release date of 180 days or less who will transition into a general population housing unit;
(II) house an inmate who poses an ongoing significant and serious threat to the safety of other inmates, staff, or the public; or
(III) house an inmate who poses an ongoing serious and serious disciplinary infraction of which the inmate was found guilty by a Disciplinary Hearing Officer and alternative sanctions would not adequately regulate the behavior of the inmate.
(5) SPECIAL HOUSING UNITS.—The Director shall—
(A) limit administrative segregation—
(i) to situations in which such segregation is necessary to—
(I) control a substantial and immediate threat that cannot be addressed through alternative housing; or
(II) temporarily house an inmate pending transfer, parole classification, or pending resolution of another temporary administrative matter; and
(ii) to a duration of not more than 15 consecutive days and not more than 20 days in a 60-day period, unless—
(I) the inmate requests to remain in administrative segregation under paragraph (3)(D)(i); (II) in order to address the continued existence of a substantial and immediate threat, a multidisciplinary staff committee approves a temporary extension, which—
(aa) may not be longer than 15 days; and
(bb) shall be reviewed by the multidisciplinary staff committee every 3 days during the period of the extension, in order to confirm the continued existence of the substantial and immediate threat;
(B) limit disciplinary segregation—
(i) to situations in which such segregation is necessary to punish an inmate who has been found guilty of a significant and serious disciplinary infraction by a Disciplinary Hearing Officer and alternative sanctions would not adequately regulate the behavior of the inmate; and
(ii) to a duration of not more than 30 consecutive days, or 40 days during a 60-day period, unless a multidisciplinary staff committee, in consultation with the Disciplinary Hearing Officer who presided over the inmate’s disciplinary hearing, determines that the significant and serious disciplinary infraction of which the inmate was found guilty by a Disciplinary Hearing Officer and alternative sanctions would not adequately regulate the behavior of the inmate.
(C) ensure that any time spent in administrative segregation during an investigation into an alleged offense is credited as time served for a disciplinary segregation sentence;
(D) ensure that concurrent sentences are imposed for disciplinary violations arising from the same episode; and
(E) ensure that an inmate may be released from disciplinary segregation for good behavior before completing the term of the administrative segregation if the inmate poses a substantial and immediate threat to the safety of other inmates, staff, or the public.
(6) SPECIAL MANAGEMENT UNITS.—The Director shall—
(A) limit segregation in a special management unit to situations in which such segregation is necessary to—
(i) control a substantial and immediate threat; and
(ii) house an inmate who poses an ongoing serious and serious disciplinary infraction of which the inmate was found guilty by a Disciplinary Hearing Officer and alternative sanctions would not adequately regulate the behavior of the inmate.
(B) evaluate whether further reductions to the minimum and maximum number of months an inmate may spend in a special management unit are appropriate on an annual basis; and
(C) ensure that each inmate understands the status of the inmate in the special management unit program and how the inmate may progress through the program; and
(D) further reduce the minimum and maximum number of months an inmate may spend in a special management unit to—
(i) 60 days in a special housing unit if the inmate has never before been found guilty of a similar significant and serious disciplinary infraction; or
(ii) more than 60 days in a special housing unit if the inmate has previously been found guilty of a similar significant and serious disciplinary infraction.
(7) ADMINISTRATIVE MAXIMUM FACILITIES.—
The Director shall—
(A) limit segregation in an administrative maximum facility to situations in which such segregation is necessary to—
(i) limit segregation in a special management unit to situations in which such segregation is necessary to—
(I) situations in which such segregation is necessary to—
(ii) house an inmate who poses an ongoing significant and serious threat to the safety of other inmates, staff, or the public that cannot be addressed through alternative housing; and
(B) issue final approval of referral of any inmate who poses an ongoing significant and serious threat to the safety of other inmates, staff, or the public that cannot be addressed through alternative housing.
(8) RIGHT TO REVIEW PLACEMENT IN SOLITARY CONFINEMENT.—The Director shall ensure that each inmate placed in solitary confinement has access to—
(A) written notice thoroughly detailing the basis for placement or continued placement in solitary confinement not later than 6 hours after the beginning of such placement, including—
(i) thorough documentation explaining why such confinement is permissible and necessary under paragraph (1); and
(ii) a statement of the particular behavior by which the inmate was found guilty of at a disciplinary hearing; and
(iii) a description of the special management unit program and how the inmate may progress through the program; and
(D) review the placement of each inmate in solitary confinement in the United States Penitentiary Administrative Maximum in Florence, Colorado, at least every 60 days, as determined by the Attorney General.
under paragraph (1) to justify increased restrictive conditions in solitary confinement, thorough documentation explaining why such an exception applied; and

(2) PRISONS STAFF.—

(I) a weekly basis for inmates in special housing units;

(ii) on a monthly basis for inmates in special management units; and

(iii) on a monthly basis for inmates at an administrative maximum facility; and

(C) a process to appeal the initial placement or continued placement of the inmate in solitary confinement;

(D) prompt and timely written notice of the appeal procedures; and

(E) copies of all documents, files, and records relating to the inmate’s placement in solitary confinement, unless such documents contain contraband, classified information, or sensitive security-related information.

(1) MENTAL HEALTH CARE FOR INMATES IN SOLITARY CONFINEMENT.—

(1) MENTAL HEALTH SCREENING.—Not later than 3 days after an inmate in the custody of the Bureau of Prisons or any facility that contracts with the Bureau of Prisons to provide housing for inmates in Federal custody is placed in solitary confinement, the inmate shall receive a comprehensive, face-to-face mental health evaluation by a licensed mental health professional in a confidential setting.

(2) MENTAL HEALTH TREATMENT PROGRAM.—An inmate diagnosed with a serious mental illness after an evaluation required under paragraph (1) shall be placed in solitary confinement, and shall receive (A) shall not be placed in solitary confinement in accordance with subsection (b)(4); and

(B) may be diverted to a mental health treatment program within the Bureau of Prisons that provides an appropriate level of care to address the inmate’s mental health needs.

(2) MENTAL HEALTH CARE FOR INMATES IN SOLITARY CONFINEMENT.—

(1) MENTAL HEALTH SCREENING.—Not later than 3 days after an inmate in the custody of the Bureau of Prisons or any facility that contracts with the Bureau of Prisons to provide housing for inmates in Federal custody is placed in solitary confinement, the inmate shall receive a comprehensive, face-to-face mental health evaluation by a licensed mental health professional in a confidential setting.

(2) MENTAL HEALTH TREATMENT PROGRAM.—An inmate diagnosed with a serious mental illness after an evaluation required under paragraph (1) shall be placed in solitary confinement, and shall receive

(A) shall not be placed in solitary confinement in accordance with subsection (b)(4); and

(B) may be diverted to a mental health treatment program within the Bureau of Prisons that provides an appropriate level of care to address the inmate’s mental health needs.

(3) CONTINUING EVALUATIONS.—After each 14-calendar-day period an inmate is held in continuous placement in solitary confinement:

(A) a licensed mental health professional shall conduct a comprehensive, face-to-face, out-of-cell mental health evaluation of the inmate in a confidential setting; and

(B) the Director shall adjust the placement of the inmate in accordance with this subsection.

(4) REQUIREMENT.—The Director shall operate mental health treatment programs in order to ensure that inmates of all security levels with serious mental illness have access to the appropriate level of care.

(d) TRAINING FOR BUREAU OF PRISONS STAFF.—

(1) TRAINING.—All employees of the Bureau of Prisons or any facility that contracts with the Bureau of Prisons to provide housing for inmates in Federal custody who interact with inmates on a regular basis shall be required to complete training in—

(A) the recognition of symptoms of mental illness;

(B) the potential risks and side effects of psychiatric medications;

(C) de-escalation techniques for safely managing individuals with mental illness;

(D) consequences of untreated mental illness;

(E) the long- and short-term psychological effects of solitary confinement; and

(F) communication techniques to divert inmates from situations that may lead to the inmate being placed in solitary confinement.

(2) NOTIFICATION TO MEDICAL STAFF.—An employee of the Bureau of Prisons shall immediately notify a member of the medical or mental health staff of an employee—

(A) observes an inmate with signs of mental illness, unless such employee has knowledge that the inmate’s signs of mental illness have been reviewed; and

(B) observes an inmate with signs of mental health crisis.

(3) CIVIL RIGHTS OMBUDSMAN.—

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Within the Bureau of Prisons, there shall be a position of the Civil Rights Ombudsman (referred to in this subsection as the “Ombudsman”) and an Office of the Civil Rights Ombudsman.

(b) APPOINTMENT.—The Ombudsman shall be appointed by the Attorney General and shall report directly to the Director. The Ombudsman shall have a background in corrections and civil rights and shall have expertise on the effects of prolonged solitary confinement.

(c) REPORTING.—The Director shall ensure that each Bureau of Prisons facility or any facility that contracts with the Bureau of Prisons provides multiple internal ways for inmates and others to promptly report civil rights violations and violations of this section to the Ombudsman, including—

(A) not less than 2 procedures for inmates and others to report civil rights violations and violations of this section to the Ombudsman, including—

(i) notice prominently posted in the living space of the facility; and

(ii) notice to inmates with disabilities in accessible formats; and

(B) the potential risks and side effects of expanded and reduced use of solitary confinement; and

(C) refer all possible violations of law to the Attorney General or any other officer or employee of the Department of Justice.

(d) CIVIL RIGHTS COMPLAINTS.—

(1) REVIEW.—The Ombudsman shall—

(A) review all complaints the Ombudsman receives;

(B) investigate all complaints that allege a civil rights violation or violation of this section;

(C) refer all possible violations of law to the Department of Justice; and

(D) refer to the Director allegations of misconduct involving Bureau of Prisons staff;

(E) identify areas in which the Bureau of Prisons can improve the Bureau’s policies and practices to ensure that the civil rights of inmates are protected;

(F) identify areas in which the Bureau of Prisons can improve the Bureau’s policies and practices to ensure the use of solitary confinement; and

(G) propose changes to the policies and practices of the Bureau of Prisons to mitigate problems and address issues the Ombudsman identifies.

(2) ACCESS.—The Ombudsman shall have unrestricted access to Bureau of Prisons facilities and any facility that contracts with the Bureau of Prisons and shall be able to speak privately with inmates and staff.

(3) ANNUAL REPORTS.—

(A) OBJECTIVES.—Not later than December 31 of each year, the Ombudsman shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report on the activities of the Office of the Ombudsman for the fiscal year ending in such calendar year.

(B) CONTENTS.—Each report submitted under subparagraph (A)—

(i) contain full and substantive analysis, in addition to statistical information; and

(ii) contain any recommendations for improvements to the activities of the Office of the Ombudsman.

(7) REGULAR MEETINGS WITH THE DIRECTOR OF THE BUREAU OF PRISONS.—

(A) MEETINGS.—The Ombudsman shall meet regularly with the Director to discuss the Ombudsman’s activities on the activities of the Office of the Ombudsman for the fiscal year ending in such calendar year.

(B) CONTENTS.—Each report submitted under paragraph (6) shall include the following:

(i) contain full and substantive analysis, in addition to statistical information; and

(ii) contain any recommendations for improvements to the activities of the Office of the Ombudsman.

(8) REGULAR MEETINGS WITH THE DIRECTOR OF THE BUREAU OF PRISONS.—

(A) MEETINGS.—The Ombudsman shall meet regularly with the Director to discuss the Ombudsman’s activities on the activities of the Office of the Ombudsman for the fiscal year ending in such calendar year.

(B) CONTENTS.—Each report submitted under paragraph (6) shall include the following:

(i) contain full and substantive analysis, in addition to statistical information; and

(ii) contain any recommendations for improvements to the activities of the Office of the Ombudsman.

(9) ANNUAL REPORTS.—

(A) OBJECTIVES.—Not later than December 31 of each year, the Ombudsman shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report on the activities of the Office of the Ombudsman for the fiscal year ending in such calendar year.

(B) CONTENTS.—Each report submitted under subparagraph (A)—

(i) contain full and substantive analysis, in addition to statistical information; and

(ii) contain any recommendations for improvements to the activities of the Office of the Ombudsman.
rights violations and the solitary confinement policies and practices of the Bureau of Prisons. 

(9) RESPONSIBILITIES OF BUREAU OF PRISONS.—No later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Bureau of Prisons shall:

(1) assemble a team of licensed mental health professionals, which may include licensed mental health professionals who are not employed by the Bureau of Prisons, to conduct a comprehensive mental health re-evaluation for each inmate held in solitary confinement for more than 30 days as of the date of enactment of this Act, including a confidential, face-to-face, appropriate interview by a licensed mental health professional; and

(2) adjust the placement of each inmate in accordance with section 405(a) of title 18, United States Code, as added by section 2.

SEC. 4. DIRECTOR OF BUREAU OF PRISONS.

Section 4041 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting “(a) IN GENERAL.—” before the “The Bureau of Prisons shall”;

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) OMUSDMAN.—The Director of the Bureau of Prisons shall:

“(1) meet regularly with the Ombudsman appointed under section 4051(e) to identify how the Bureau of Prisons can address complaints of civil rights violations and reduce the use of solitary confinement and correct problems in the solitary confinement policies and practices;

“(2) conduct a prompt and thorough investigation of each referral from the Ombudsman under section 4051(e)(5)(D), after such an investigation, by the appropriate unit, including the Office of the Inspector General, or the Bureau of Prisons, or any combination of such offices, or any other entity, or a partnership of entities, that has demonstrated expertise in the fields of—

“(A) providing consultation to Federal, State, and local correctional officers; and

“(B) the number of inmates in solitary confinement who, after a stay of 5 or more days in solitary confinement, were released directly from solitary confinement to the public during the reporting period;

“(C) the number of inmates hospitalized during the reporting period, including as compared with the average daily cost of housing an inmate in the general population; and

“(D) statistics for inmate assaults on correctional officers and staff of the Bureau of Prisons, inmate-on-inmate assaults, and staff-on-inmate use of force incidents in the various forms of solitary confinement described in subparagraph (A) and statistics for such assaults in the general population; and

“(3) establish procedures requiring a formal response by the Bureau of Prisons to any recommendation of the Ombudsman in the annual report submitted under section 4051(e)(6) not later than 90 days after the date on which the report is submitted to Congress.”

SEC. 5. DATA TRACKING OF USE OF SOLITARY CONFINEMENT.

Section 4047 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(g) PRISON SOLITARY CONFINEMENT ASSESSMENTS.

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than March 31 of each year, the Director of the Bureau of Prisons shall prepare and transmit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives an annual assessment of the use of solitary confinement by the Bureau of Prisons, as defined in section 4051(a).

“(2) CONTENTS.—Each assessment submitted under paragraph (1) shall include—

“(A) a statistical analysis of the Bureau of Prisons, including any changes in policies and regulations, for determining which inmates are placed in each form of solitary confinement, or housing in which an inmate is separated from the general population in use during the reporting period, and a detailed description of each form of solitary confinement, such as maximum and high security facilities, including the United States Penitentiary Administrative Maximum in Florence, Colorado, and all Communication Management Units;

“(B) the number of inmates in the custody of the Bureau of Prisons who are housed in each type of solitary confinement for any period and the percentage of all inmates who have spent at least some time in each form of solitary confinement during the reporting period;

“(C) the demographics of all inmates housed in each type of solitary confinement described in subparagraph (A), including race, ethnicity, religion, age, and gender;

“(D) the policies and regulations of the Bureau of Prisons, including any changes in policies and regulations, for subsequent review or appeal of the placement of an inmate into solitary confinement;

“(E) the number of reviews and challenges to each type of solitary confinement placement described in subparagraph (A) conducted during the reporting period and the number of reviews or appeals that directly resulted in a change of placement;

“(F) the general conditions and restrictions for each type of solitary confinement described in subparagraph (A), including the number of hours spent in ‘isolation,’ or restraint, for each; and the percentage of time these conditions involve single-inmate housing;

“(G) the mean and median length of stay in each form of solitary confinement described in subparagraph (A), based on all individuals released from solitary confinement during the reporting period, including those who have been released immediately to maximum and high security facilities, special housing units, special management units, the Administrative Maximum facilities, including the United States Penitentiary Administrative Maximum in Florence, Colorado, Communication Management Units, and any maximum length of stay during the reporting period;

“(H) the number of inmates who, after a stay of 5 or more days in solitary confinement, were released directly from solitary confinement to the public during the reporting period;

“(I) the cost for each form of solitary confinement described in subparagraph (A) in use during the reporting period, including as compared with the average daily cost of housing an inmate in the general population; and

“(J) statistics for inmate assaults on correctional officers and staff of the Bureau of Prisons, inmate-on-inmate assaults, and staff-on-inmate use of force incidents in the various forms of solitary confinement described in subparagraph (A) and statistics for such assaults in the general population; and

“(K) the policies for mental health screening, mental health treatment, and subsequent screening, assessment, and follow-up of all inmates, including any update to the policies, and any additional screening, treatment, and monitoring for inmates in solitary confinement; and

“(L) the number of mental health staff that conducted mental health assessments for the Bureau of Prisons during the reporting period, a description of the different positions in the mental health staff of the Bureau of Prisons, and the number of part- and full-time psychologists and psychiatrists employed by the Bureau of Prisons during the reporting period;

“(M) data on mental health and medical indicators for all inmates in solitary confinement, including—

“(i) the number of inmates requiring medication for mental health conditions;

“(ii) the number diagnosed with an intellectual disability;

“(iii) the number diagnosed with serious mental illness;

“(iv) the number of suicides; and

“(v) the number of inmates with physical disabilities, including blind, deaf, and mobility-impaired inmates; and

“(vi) the number of instances of force feeding of inmates; and

“(vii) any other relevant data.”

SEC. 6. NATIONAL RESOURCE CENTER ON SOLITARY CONFINEMENT REDUCTION AND REFORM.

(a) DEFINITION OF ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—In this section, the term “eligible entity” means an entity, or a partnership of entities, that has demonstrated expertise in the fields of—

(1) solitary confinement, including the reduction and reform of its use; and

(2) providing technical assistance to correctional agencies on how to reduce and reform solitary confinement.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Bureau of Justice Assistance shall enter into a cooperative agreement, on a competitive basis, with an eligible entity for the purpose of establishing a coordinating center for State, local, and Federal corrections systems, which shall conduct activities such as—

(1) provide on-site technical assistance and consultation to Federal, State, and local corrections agencies to safely reduce the use of solitary confinement;

(2) act as a clearinghouse for research, data, and information on the safe reduction of solitary confinement in prisons and other custodial settings, including facilitating the exchange of information between Federal, State, and local agencies on how to reduce and reform solitary confinement and work with other Federal, State, and local agencies to participate in training, consultation, and other forms of assistance and partnership with these learning sites;

(4) conduct evaluations of jurisdictions that have decreased their use of solitary confinement to determine the use of solitary confinement and work with other Federal, State, and local agencies to develop an assessment tool for State and local jurisdictions to assess their own use of solitary confinement and identify strategies to reduce its use; and

(5) conduct public webinars to highlight new and promising practices.
(c) ADMINISTRATION.—The program under this section shall be administered by the Bureau of Justice Assistance.

(d) REPORT.—On an annual basis, the coordinating center shall report to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives on its activities and any changes in solitary confinement policy at the Federal, State, or local level that have resulted from its activities.

(e) DURATION.—The Bureau of Justice Assistance shall enter into a cooperative agreement under this section for 5 years.

SEC. 7. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There is authorized to be appropriated—
(1) to the Director of the Bureau of Prisons such sums as may be necessary to carry out sections 2, 3, 4, and 5, and the amendments made by such sections; and
(2) to the Bureau of Justice Assistance such sums as may be necessary to carry out section 6.

SEC. 8. NOTICE AND COMMENT REQUIREMENT.

The Director of the Bureau of Prisons shall prescribe rules, in accordance with section 553 of title 5, United States Code, to carry out this Act and the amendments made by this Act.

SEC. 9. EFFECTIVE DATE.

Except as otherwise provided, this Act and the amendments made by this Act shall take effect 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

By Mr. Kaine (for himself and Mr. Warner): S. 725. A bill to change the address of the postal facility designated in honor of Captain Humayun Khan; considered and passed.

S. 725

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

SECTION 1. CAPTAIN HUMAYUN KHAN POST OFFICE.

Section 1(a) of Public Law 115-347 (132 Stat. 5994) is amended by striking “190 McCormick Road” and inserting “2150 Wise Street.”

By Mrs. Feinstein (for herself and Ms. Collins):

S. 726 is amended to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to ensure the safety of cosmetics; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

Mrs. Feinstein. Mr. President, I am introducing bipartisan legislation with Senator Collins today to improve safety standards on products that affect every single American household. Most people assume that the personal care products they use every day, whether shampoo or shaving cream, lotion or make-up, hair dye or deodorant, have up-to-date Federal oversight.

In reality, however, the Food and Drug Administration’s authority to do so is outdated. In fact, even though research continues to better inform us on the safety of ingredients used in products that we absorb through our bodies, skin and even our nails, regulation of these ingredients has not kept up and little has changed over the past eight decades on how we have not kept up and little has changed through our bodies, skin and even our sores.

The sores is sorely outdated. In fact, even deodorant, have up-to-date Federal oversight.

Most people assume that the personal care products they use every day, whether shampoo or shaving cream, lotion or make-up, hair dye or deodorant, have up-to-date Federal oversight.

In reality, however, the Food and Drug Administration’s authority to do so is outdated. In fact, even though research continues to better inform us on the safety of ingredients used in products that we absorb through our bodies, skin and even our nails, regulation of these ingredients has not kept up and little has changed over the past eight decades on how we have not kept up and little has changed through our bodies, skin and even our sores.

The sores is sorely outdated. In fact, even deodorant, have up-to-date Federal oversight.

Over the past several years, Senator Collins and I have worked with a wide group of stakeholders that represent both industry and consumer groups. Together, we have drafted the Personal Care Products Safety Act with the support of many companies, health expert organizations to put commonsense measures in place.

One of the most critical components of this legislation is a process for the FDA to review the safety of ingredients in personal care products. The FDA has little authority if an ingredient, require specific screening protocol to ensure dangerous contaminants aren’t present, or require warning labels when needed to alert consumers. If an ingredient is simply unsafe for use under any conditions, the FDA can require that it be banned from use in all personal care products.

Just this week, the FDA announced finding asbestos in several different types of make-up marketed to children and teens at the popular store, Claire’s. This is a serious concern that highlights the need for Congress to move quickly to give FDA the tools they need.

Under our bill, the FDA could implement new screening protocols for contaminants like asbestos. Companies would be required to register, so it would be easier to know where products were coming from. FDA would have mandatory recall authority for personal care products like they do for food, and companies would finally be required to report adverse health events.

The Personal Care Products Safety Act is the result of many diverse groups working together with the common goal of modernizing the Federal oversight system to ensure the safest products possible are on the market. These stakeholders include small and large companies, doctors, consumer advocates, patient, scientists, and the Food and Drug Administration.

This legislation recognizes the needs of businesses of all sizes to support their growth while not sacrificing high safety standards that will keep consumers safe and raise the bar for industry standards. Many companies are taking voluntary steps to do the right thing, but it is time for this to be a uniform requirement.

Another shocking example of concern is tioctamide, also called methylene glycol when in liquid form. It is used in the popular hair straightening treatment called a Brazilian blowout. During this beauty treatment, formaldehyde is released into the air and can cause shortness of breath, headaches, and dizziness in the short-term. Exposure to formaldehyde long-term has even been linked to cancer.

I am also greatly concerned about safety of salon professionals who are exposed daily to a variety of chemicals. In addition to reviewing the safety of chemicals they may be exposed to, this legislation ensures that the salon products they use are properly labeled with ingredients and warnings.

This bill will require the Food and Drug Administration to evaluate at least five ingredients per year for safety and use in personal care products. In addition to reviewing the latest scientific and medical studies, the agency will consider how prevalent the ingredient is, the likelihood to exposure, adverse event reports, and information from public comments.

Public input will be critical to the review process. There will be opportunities for companies, scientists, consumer groups, medical professionals, and members of the public to weigh in on only the safety of particular ingredients but also which ingredients should be a priority for review.

After review, the Food and Drug Administration may deem an ingredient safe, unsafe, or safe under certain uses or unregulated. The agency will also have the authority to require warning labels as needed for certain ingredients and limit the amount of an ingredient that may be used in personal care products. For example, some ingredients may be safe for use by adults or when used by professionals in a salon or spa setting.

The Personal Care Products Safety Act will also require companies to provide the Food and Drug Administration with a list of their products’ ingredients and attest to their safety.

The bill recognizes the unique nature of the American handmade cosmetic industry and meets their needs to encourage growth and innovation. This legislation provides flexibility for small businesses, particularly those making low-risk products. And this bill would not increase taxpayer obligations because it is paid for by user fees for the cosmetic industry.

I am pleased to have the support of a broad coalition, including Environmental Working Group, Endocrine Society, National Alliance for Hispanic Health, National Women’s Health Network, American Autoimmune Related Diseases Association, March of Dimes, Handmade Cosmetic Alliance, and the following companies that together represent over 90 brands of products: The Estee Lauder Companies, Procter and Gamble, Revlon, Unilever, L’Oreal, Johnson and Johnson, Beautycounter, Makes 3 Organics, SkinOwl, Silk Therapeutics, and S.W. Basics.

I want to thank Senator Collins for her support and hard work on this important legislation. I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting this much needed legislation to modernize our outdated regulatory system for personal care products, and I hope the Senate will pass this long overdue legislation this year.

By Mr. Schumer (for himself, Mr. Carper, Mr. Reed, Mr. Van Hollen, Mr. Whitehouse, Mr. Markey, Mr. Schatz, Ms. Smith, Mr. Blumenthal, Mrs. Shaheen, Mr. Booker, Ms. Stabenow, Ms. Klobuchar, Ms.
HASSAN, Mr. MERRILY, and Mrs. FRANKSTEIN:

S. 729. A bill to prohibit the use of funds to Federal agencies to establish a panel, task force, advisory committee, or other effort to challenge the scientific consensus on climate change, and for other purposes; read the first time.

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

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

S. 729

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

SECTION 1. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS TO CHALLENGE SCIENTIFIC CONSENSUS ON CLIMATE CHANGE.

No amounts appropriated or otherwise made available to a Federal agency (as defined in section 104 of the Solid Waste Disposal Act, 42 U.S.C. 6903) and including the Executive Office of the President) may be used to establish or operate a panel, task force, other advisory committee, or other effort intended or designed to challenge the scientific consensus on climate change, as presented in the assessment required under section 106 of the Global Change Research Act of 1990 (15 U.S.C. 2936).

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 99—EXPRESSION OF THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHOULD TAKE ALL APPROPRIATE MEASURES TO ENSURE THAT THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE REMAINS AN INDEPENDENT ESTABLISHMENT OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND IS NOT SUBJECT TO PRIVATIZATION

Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. Moran, Mr. CARPER, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Ms. SMITH, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. JONES, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. KING, Mr. UDALL, Mr. REED, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. HAINES, Mr. TESTER, Ms. ROSEN, and Ms. HASSAN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs:

S. Res. 99

Whereas Congress has the authority to establish post offices and post roads under clause 7 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution of the United States;

Whereas the United States Postal Service is a self-sustaining, independent establishment that relies on revenue derived from the sale of postal services and products, not on taxpayer funds;

Whereas more than 503,000 career employees work for the United States Postal Service, including more than 165,000 military veterans;

Whereas the United States Postal Service is at the center of the mailing industry, which generates $1,400,000,000,000 annually and employs approximately 7,500,000 individuals in the United States;

Whereas the United States Postal Service serves the needs of approximately 157,000,000 business and residential customers not fewer than 6 days per week, maintains an affordable and universal network and connects the rural, suburban, and urban communities of the United States;

Whereas the United States Postal Service is considered a cornerstone agency of the Federal Government in nonpartisan opinion polls;

Whereas the United States Postal Service is the second largest employer of veterans in the United States;

Whereas the employees of the United States Postal Service—

(1) are dedicated public servants who do more than process and deliver the mail of the people of the United States; and

(2) serve as the eyes and ears of the communities of the United States and often respond first in situations involving health, safety, and crime in those communities; and

Whereas the privatization of the United States Postal Service would—

(1) result in higher prices and reduced services for the customers of the United States Postal Service, especially in rural communities;

(2) jeopardize the booming e-commerce sector; and

(3) cripple a major part of the critical infrastructure of the United States; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that Congress should take all appropriate measures to ensure that the United States Postal Service remains an independent establishment of the Federal Government and is not subject to privatization, in whole or in part.

SENATE RESOLUTION 100—RECOGNIZING THE HERITAGE, CULTURE, AND CONTRIBUTIONS OF AMERICAN INDIAN, ALASKA NATIVE, AND NATIVE HAWAIIAN WOMEN IN THE UNITED STATES

Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. UDALL, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOHER, Ms. BOWTEN, Mr. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. DAINES, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. HENRICH, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. KNAKE, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LANKFORD, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. MERCER, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MURRAY, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. SMITH, Mr. TESTER, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs:

S. Res. 100

Whereas the United States celebrates Native Women's History Month every March to recognize and honor the achievements of women throughout the history of the United States;

Whereas an estimated 3,081,000 American Indian, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian women live in the United States;

Whereas American Indian, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian women have contributed to the economic development of Native Nations and the United States as a whole, including Elouise Cobell of the Blackfeet Tribe, a recipient of the Presidential Medal of Freedom, who—

(1) served as the treasurer of her Tribe;

(2) founded the first Tribal owned national bank; and

(3) led the fight against Federal mismanagement of funds held in trust for more than 500,000 Native Americans;

Whereas American Indian, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian women have contributed to important scientific advancements, including—

(1) Floy Agnes Lee of Santa Clara Pueblo, who—

(A) worked on the Manhattan Project during World War II; and

(B) pioneered research on radiolocation and cancer; and

(2) Native Hawaiian Isabella Kauakea Yau Yung Aiona Abbott, who—

(A) was the first woman on the biological staff of the United States Armed Forces; and

(B) was awarded the highest award in marine botany from the National Academy of Sciences, the Gilbert Morgan Smith medal, in 1997;

Whereas American Indian, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian women have achieved distinctions in the art of dance, including Maria Tall Chief of the Osage Nation the first major prima ballerina of the United States through work in many industries, including business, education, science, medicine, literature, fine arts, military service, and public service;
Whereas American Indian, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian women have regularly led efforts to preserve and maintain Native cultures and languages, including—

(1) Tewa linguist and teacher Esther Martinez, whose Tewa dictionary was credited with revitalizing the Tewa language; and

(2) Native Hawaiian scholar Mary Kawena Pukui, who published more than 50 academic works and was considered the most noted Hawaiian translator of the 20th century;

Whereas American Indian, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian women have excelled in athletic competition and created opportunities for other female athletes within their sport, including Reill Kapolkaeakahi Sunn who—

(1) ranked as longboard surfing champion of the world; and

(2) founded the Women's Professional Surfing Association in 1975, the first professional surfing tour for women;

Whereas American Indian, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian women have succeeded as judges and lawyers, including Eliza "Lyda" Conley, a Wyandot-American lawyer and the first Native woman admitted to argue a case before the United States Supreme Court in 1909; and

Whereas American Indian, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian women have paved the way for women in the law, including Native American Emma Kalikapilolono Beckley Nakunia who served as the first female judge in Hawaii;

Whereas American Indian, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian women have served as judicial legal advocates, including Eliza "Lyda" Conley, a Wyandot-American lawyer and the first Native woman admitted to argue a case before the United States Supreme Court in 1909; and

Whereas American Indian, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian women have served as prominent public servants, holding important positions in State governments, local governments, the Federal judicial branch, and the Federal executive branch;

Whereas American Indian and Alaska Native women have served as remarkable Tribal councilwomen, Tribal court judges, and Tribal leaders, including Wilma Mankiller, the first woman elected to serve as Principal Chief of the Cherokee Nation who fought for Tribal self-determination and improvement of the community infrastructure of her Tribe;

Whereas Native Hawaiian women have also led their People through notable acts of public service: Hawaiian Emma Kalikapilolono Beckley Nakunia who served as the first female judge in Hawaii; and

Whereas the United States should continue to invest in the future of American Indian, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian women to address the barriers they face, including access to justice, health care, and opportunities for educational and economic advancement; and

Whereas American Indian, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian women are the life givers and protectors, and the caretakers of Native peoples who have made precious contributions enriching the lives of all people of the United States; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) celebrates and honors the successes of American Indian, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian women and the contributions they have made and continue to make to the United States; and

(2) recognizes the importance of supporting equity, providing safety, and upholding the interests of American Indian, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian women.

S. RESOLUTION 101—SUPPORTING THE GOALS OF INTER-NATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY

Whereas, as of March 2019, there are approximately 3,700,000,000 women in the world; Whereas women and girls around the world—

(1) have fundamental human rights;

(2) play a critical role in providing and caring for their families;

(3) contribute substantially to food security, economic growth, and the prevention and resolution of conflict; and

(4) must be empowered to more fully participate in the political, social, and economic lives of their communities in order to accelerate the growth of healthier, more stable societies; Whereas the advancement and empowerment of women and girls around the world is a foreign policy priority for the United States; Whereas the National Security Strategy of the United States, published in December 2017—

(1) declares that "societies that empower women to participate fully in civic and economic life are more prosperous and peaceful";

(2) supports "efforts to advance women's equality, protect the rights of women and girls, and promote women and youth empowerment programs"; and

(3) recognizes that "governments that fail to treat women equally do not allow their societies to reach their potential";

Whereas, according to the United Nations National Action Plan on Women, Peace, and Security, revised in June 2016, states, "Deadly conflicts can be more effectively avoided, and peace can be more likely to last at least 15 years if women and women's groups play a role in peace negotiations when women and women's groups play a meaningful role in the negotiation process; Whereas, according to a study by the International Peace Institute, a peace agreement is 35 percent more likely to last at least 15 years if women participate in the development of the peace agreement; Whereas, on October 6, 2017, the Women, Peace, and Security Act of 2017 (22 U.S.C. 2152) was enacted into law, which includes requirements for a government-wide response to Prevent and Respond to Gender-Based Violence Globally; and

Whereas, on October 25, 2018, Ambassador Jonathan Cohen, United Nations Permanent Representative to the United Nations, stated in the United Nations Security
The United States believes strongly that countries with high rates of gender inequality are more likely to experience instability and deadly conflict. Our experience shows that women often have the best understanding of the needs of their communities.

Whereas women around the world face a variety of constraints that severely limit their ability to participate in primary education in most countries in 2015, more work remains to be done to achieve gender equality in primary and secondary education, and particularly in secondary education worldwide as gender gaps persist and widen by addressing:

That the Senate—

(1) to celebrate the economic, political, and social achievements of women in the past, present, and future; and

(2) to support activities that secure private property rights and land tenure for women in developing countries.

(3) to recognize the obstacles that women face in exercising their rights, determine their life outcomes, assume leadership roles, and influence decision making in households, communities, and societies; and

(4) to improve the access of women and girls to education, particularly higher education opportunities in business, finance, and management, and to enhance financial literacy and business development, management, and strategy skills.

Whereas, according to the World Health Organization, global maternal mortality decreased by approximately 44 percent between 1990 and 2015, yet approximately 830 women and girls continue to die from preventable causes relating to pregnancy or childbirth each day, and 99 percent of all maternal deaths occur in developing countries; and

Whereas closing the global gender gap in human rights; and

(5) to improve the access of women and girls to education, particularly higher education opportunities in business, finance, and management, and to enhance financial literacy and business development, management, and strategy skills.

Whereas, although the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees reports that women and girls comprise approximately 1/5 of the 68,500,000 refugees and internally displaced or stateless individuals in the world; and

Whereas, despite the achievements of individual female leaders—

(1) to affirm the importance of the role of women in peace and security, and support efforts to develop standards and capacity to reduce gender-based violence in the workplace and other places where women work; and

(2) to improve the capability of women and girls to exercise the rights described in subparagraph (A); and

(3) to support activities that secure private property rights and land tenure for women in developing countries.

(4) to recognize the obstacles that women face in exercising their rights, determine their life outcomes, assume leadership roles, and influence decision making in households, communities, and societies; and

(5) to improve the access of women and girls to education, particularly higher education opportunities in business, finance, and management, and to enhance financial literacy and business development, management, and strategy skills.

Whereas, according to the World Health Organization, global maternal mortality decreased by approximately 44 percent between 1990 and 2015, yet approximately 830 women and girls continue to die from preventable causes relating to pregnancy or childbirth each day, and 99 percent of all maternal deaths occur in developing countries; and

Whereas closing the global gender gap in...
Peter D. Welte, to be United States District Judge for the District of North Dakota.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS’ AFFAIRS

The Committee on Veterans’ Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 7, 2019, at 2 p.m., to conduct a joint hearing.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 7, 2019, at 2 p.m., to conduct a closed briefing.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

The Special Committee on Aging is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 7, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “Complex web of prescription drug prices, focusing on untangling the web and paths forward.”

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SECURITY

The Subcommittee on Security of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 7, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “China, focusing on challenges for United States commerce.”

SUBCOMMITTEE ON WESTERN HEMISPHERE, TRANSNATIONAL CRIME, CIVILIAN SECURITY, DEMOCRACY, HUMAN RIGHTS, AND GLOBAL WOMEN’S ISSUES

The Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere, Transnational Crime, Civilian Security, Democracy, Human Rights, and Global Women’s Issues of the Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 7, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “United States-Venezuela relations and the path to a democratic transition.”

PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS

The Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 7, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “Examining private sector data breaches.”

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRAUN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELF-INITIATION TRADE ENFORCEMENT ACT

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I know that American small businesses can outcompete anybody in the world; however, they deserve to have a level playing field. All too often, foreign countries engage in unfair trade practices—like dumping and countervailing duties—that make it harder for small and mid-sized businesses to compete in the global marketplace.

This is especially true in my home State of Michigan, where businesses, from family farms to auto part suppliers and other small manufacturers, face unfair competition from foreign competitors whose products are subsidized by their governments. Michigan’s cherry growers have experienced these unfair practices firsthand. In Traverse City, which is home of the National Cherry Festival, Michigan cherry growers struggled to sell their products after Turkey dumped artificially priced cherry juice into the American markets. As a result, many of Michigan’s cherry growers are facing dire financial situations.

Late last year, the Commerce Department revoked the duty-free status of cherry juice from Turkey, but Michigan cherry growers had to wait far too long for the government to step up. Small businesses and agricultural producers don’t have the resources to employ a team of international trade lawyers like larger corporations and other industries do. As a result, they are often defenseless against illegal trade practices that undercut American businesses and American workers.

We must use our expertise and strength to stand up for these small businesses and give them a fair fight.

Under current law, the Commerce Department has the authority to start their own investigations into so-called ‘unfair’ trade practices, but unfortunately they rarely do. That is why last week, I introduced bipartisan legislation with Senator BURR to address unfair trade practices.

The Self-Initiation Trade Enforcement Act will strengthen protections for small businesses and their workers by creating a permanent task force dedicated to proactively identifying illegal trade practices that unfairly target small businesses and small industries.

Last year, I attended a bipartisan trade policy meeting with President Trump and Commerce Secretary Ross, and I discussed this commonsense legislation with both of them. They both expressed their strong support. I will continue to work with the administration and my colleagues in Congress to get this legislation signed into law.

Michigan businesses deserve a fair chance to compete, and I will keep fighting to enforce fair trade rules and give Michigan’s small businesses a level playing field. I urge my colleagues to support the Self-Initiation Trade Enforcement Act to help small businesses and family farms across Michigan and the United States successfully compete and ultimately succeed.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CHANGING THE ADDRESS OF THE POSTAL FACILITY DESIGNATED IN HONOR OF CAPTAIN HUMAYUN KHAN

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 725, introduced earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 725) to change the address of the postal facility designated in honor of Captain Humayun Khan.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. McCONNELL. I further ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 725) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 725

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

SECTION 1. CAPTAIN HUMAYUN KHAN POST OFFICE.

Section 1(a) of Public Law 115–347 (132 Stat. 5054) is amended by striking “180 McCormick Road” and inserting “2150 Wise Street”.

SUPPORTING THE GOALS OF INTERNATIONAL WOMEN’S DAY

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 101, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 101) supporting the goals of International Women’s Day.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. McCONNELL. I know of no further debate on the measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

If there is no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 101) was agreed to.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the previous agreement to hold the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today’s RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 729

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand that S. 729, introduced earlier today by Senator SCHUMER, is at the desk, and I ask for its first reading. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The senior assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 729) to prohibit the use of funds to Federal agencies to establish a panel, task force, advisory committee, or other effort to challenge the scientific consensus on climate change, and for other purposes.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I now ask for a second reading and object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will receive its second reading on the next legislative day.

APPOINTMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the Democratic Leader, pursuant to Public Law 99–661, appoints the following individual to be a member of the Board of Trustees of the Barry Goldwater Scholarship and Excellence in Education Foundation: The Honorable KYRSTEN SINEMA of Arizona.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 3 p.m., Monday, March 11; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for use later in the day, morning business be closed, and the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Matey nomination; finally, that notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, the cloture motions filed during today’s session of the Senate ripen at 5:30 p.m., Monday, March 11.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, MARCH 11, 2019, AT 3 P.M.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 5:18 p.m. adjourned until Monday, March 11, 2019, at 3 p.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 7, 2019:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

JOHN FLEMING, OF LOUISIANA, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT.

THE JUDICIARY

ERIC E. MURPHY, OF OHIO, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT.
Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the American Welding Society on their 100th anniversary, and to commend them on their exemplary service not only to the welding industry but also to our community in South Florida.

The American Welding Society (AWS) was founded in 1919 when leaders in the welding industry joined forces to advance science, technology, and the application of welding on both a national and international scale. Initially, the AWS was composed of 286 members and had one section, located in Philadelphia, PA. Today, the AWS is headquartered in Miami, FL and offers services for over 70,000 members worldwide. In line with their mission to offer professional development, the AWS provides a number of certification programs for welders, including the Certified Welding Inspector program, which was established in 1976, and has since certified over 97,000 welding inspectors.

Hoping to have the privilege to work with the AWS on a number of occasions during my time in Congress, I know firsthand the level of commitment and dedication that the entire organization has for the industry and its members. In its one hundred years of activity, the AWS has continued to make monumental strides in assisting and advancing welders around the world. Notably, the organization has done an exceptional job in expanding the welding network through educational opportunities and research programs, which, in turn, has led to immense growth throughout the industry.

I am proud that a well-respected and committed organization like the AWS is not only headquartered in our great state, but also Florida’s 25th District. By celebrating its 100th anniversary and reaching this significant milestone, the AWS has proven that their mission of bettering the welding industry not only provides significant results, but is also essential for its continued growth.

Madam Speaker, I am honored to pay tribute to the American Welding Society for its significant contributions to the industry and I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing this remarkable organization for its dedicated work in the local and global welding community.

RECOGNIZING THE AMERICAN WELDING SOCIETY ON THEIR 100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. MARIO DIAZ-BALART OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 7, 2019
I, Mia Astorga

HON. ED PERLMUTTER
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 7, 2019

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Mia Astorga for receiving the Arvarda Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Mia Astorga is a student at Everitt Middle School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Mia Astorga exemplifies the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Mia Astorga for winning the Arvarda Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

IN HONOR OF THE AMERICAN PEA- NUT SHELLERS ASSOCIATION’S 100 YEAR ANNIVERSARY

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 7, 2019

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Madam Speaker, it is my great honor to extend a heartfelt congratulations to the American Peanut Shellers Association (APSA) as it celebrates 100 years in leading the effort to expand and advance the American peanut industry. The APSA will be celebrating this great milestone on Friday, April 5, 2019, during the Industry Spring Conference at the Bindiery on Oakland Library in Leesburg, Georgia.

The APSA was established by commercial peanut shellers and crushers from Georgia, Alabama, and Florida who began operations in early 1918 as the Southeastern Peanut Association (SPA). Approximately a year later, on April 5, 1919, a group of commercial peanut farmers representing their home states convened in Atlanta to officially charter the Southeastern Peanut Association. On November 30, 1993, the Southeastern Peanut Association officially changed its name to the American Peanut Shellers Association to incorporate other shelling companies from other states. The current APSA headquarters in Albany, Georgia was completed in 1986 and has been the official hub of this renowned association since it’s relocation from Americus, Georgia in the early 1960s.

For the past 100 years, Georgia peanut farmers through the APSA have been successful in improving the profitability of peanuts and peanut products by working to promote and increase consumption. In 1965, the APSA co-sponsored first USA Peanut Congress—the largest meeting of all segments of the peanut industry. Today, the APSA is the oldest organized group in the peanut industry boasting 10 active member shelling companies and 145 associate members who handle 90 percent of the peanuts grown in the United States.

I take much pride in the fact that Georgia leads the nation in production of peanuts with nearly 50 percent of the annual peanut crop. Georgia has 14,000 farms with peanuts and about 4,500 active farmers. Approximately 200 businesses in Georgia are peanut-related. Two million bags of peanuts are distributed annually and it contributes more than 50,000 jobs and an estimated $2 billion to the economy of the state of Georgia.

Since George Washington Carver discovered the many uses for the peanut in the early twentieth century, peanuts have become a household food staple and a source of dietary fiber, protein, and other healthy nutrients. Although peanuts are produced in other parts of the country, I am a firm believer that no peanuts are of higher quality or more delicious than Georgia peanuts.

On a personal note, I would like to thank John Powell, Executive Director of the American Peanut Shellers Association, and the rest of the wonderful staff as well as Chairman Ralph Johnson and all those who serve on the Associate Board of Directors. Their hard work and dedication contributed to the success of the APSA in many ways.

Madam Speaker, on behalf of the residents of Georgia’s Second Congressional District, the state of Georgia, and all those nationwide and worldwide who enjoy our tasty American peanuts, I am very proud today in paying tribute to the American Peanut Shellers Association for their exemplary services and dedicated efforts to support our Nation’s peanut industry over the past 100 years.

TRIBUTE TO MR. SHAY D. ASSAD

HON. STEPHEN F. LYNCH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 7, 2019

Mr. LYNCH. Madam Speaker, I wish to honor a Massachusetts constituent, Mr. Shay Assad, who will be retiring this year after nearly 25 years of combined military and federal service to our nation.

He graduated with distinction from the U.S. Naval Academy; thereafter, he served two tours of duty aboard U.S. Navy destroyers and won recognition as the Outstanding Junior Officer, Fifth Naval District. He is an Aegis Weapons system and Arleigh Burke class plank owner having served as the Naval Procurement Officer who procured the Navy’s first Aegis system for DDG–47 at the Naval Sea Systems Command. He commenced federal government civil service as the assistant Deputy Commandant, Installations and Logistics for Contracts at headquarters, the Marine Corps, Washington, D.C., serving as the senior civilian contracting official for the U.S. Marine Corps. Mr. Assad joined the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) in April 2006. During his tenure in OSD, Mr. Assad first served as the Director, Defense Pricing and Acquisition Policy (DPAP). As such he was the recognized functional leader of a workforce of 27,000 contracting and pricing professionals responsible for the procurement of approximately $300B in goods and services annually.

In addition, from January 2009 through June 5, 2011, he concurrently served in other Acquisition, Technology & Logistics (AT&L) leadership positions. For a period of time he served as the Acting Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology. He also performed the duties of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Acquisition. In June 2011, he left his role as Director, DPAP to newly establish the position of Director, Defense Pricing. In August 2017 through December 2018, he served as Acting Director, DPAP, concurrent with his duties as Director, Defense Pricing. His combined senior executive experience in the Defense Industry (where Mr. Assad served for 25 years prior to joining OSD) and in Government was without peer among members of the Senior Executive Service.

Among his most significant accomplishments for the Department of Defense, Mr. Assad led the development and implementation of the largest and most expansive plan in the Department’s history that focused on improving both the size and quality of the acquisition workforce. This plan, known as the Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Framework (DAWDF), initiated today as the cornerstone for improving the quality of the acquisition workforce. In addition, Mr. Assad developed and implemented the Department of Defense Contract Peer Review process which oversaw every sole source procurement in excess of $500 million dollars, as well as every significant competitive source selection within the Department of Defense over the past twelve years. The peer review process has been recognized to have enabled the savings of billions for the taxpayers through improving the quality of the Department’s contracts business dealings.

Mr. Assad also led the OSD peer review team that oversaw the successful conduct of the largest single source selection in the Department’s history—the KC–X tanker program resulting in saving billions for the taxpayers. He led the Department of Defense mediation and developed the successful strategy to resolve litigation associated with the Department’s Space Launch Program, enabling an increase in the security posture of the United States, while saving hundreds of millions for the taxpayers.

Over his tenure of federal service, Mr. Assad was the most decorated contracting and pricing professional in the career civil service having received numerous federal service awards. Principal among those awards were: 1) the Distinguished Service Medal with Bronze Palms; 2) the Distinguished Service Medal; 3) the Secretary of Defense Meritorious Service Medal; 4) the Secretary of Defense Exceptional Service Medal; 5) a Distinguished Presidential Rank Award; 6) a Meritorious Civilian Service Award; 7) the Department of Defense Inspector General Joseph H. Sherick Award (the highest honor bestowed on non-OIG employees); and 8) the David Acker Award for Acquisition Excellence. He was inducted into the Defense Acquisition University (DAU) Hall of Fame in recognition of his leadership in the acquisition profession and for the establishment of the DAWDF initiative. He has been the Department’s leading advocate for increasing employment opportunities for the blind and severely disabled; and has received numerous awards to include the E. Richard “Dick” Osborn Career Achievement Award (Ability One Program’s highest recognition) and the Osborne “Oz” Day Award for those efforts.
I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking Mr. Assad for his distinguished service to our country and in wishing him a fulfilling and enjoyable retirement.

GABE SIMON
HON. ED PERLMUTTER
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 7, 2019

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Gabe Simon for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Gabe Simon is a student at Standley Lake High School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Gabe Simon is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Gabe Simon for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

IN RECOGNITION OF STATE REPRESENTATIVE EDDIE DAY PASHINSKI, THE WILKES-BARRE FRIENDLY SONS’ MAN OF THE YEAR

HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 7, 2019

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Pennsylvania State Representative Eddie Day Pashinski, who will receive the Man of the Year Award at the Wilkes-Barre Friendly Sons’ annual St. Patrick’s Day celebration on Friday, March 15, 2019. Eddie has been a dedicated public servant for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

IN RECOGNITION OF STATE REPRESENTATIVE EDDIE DAY PASHINSKI, THE WILKES-BARRE FRIENDLY SONS’ MAN OF THE YEAR

HON. ED PERLMUTTER
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 7, 2019

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Kilyn Stewart for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Kilyn Stewart is a student at Arvada High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Kilyn Stewart is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Kilyn Stewart for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

FOR THE PEOPLE ACT OF 2019

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 6, 2019

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) to expand Americans’ access to the ballot box, reduce the influence of big money in politics, and strengthen ethics rules for public servants, and for other purposes:

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chair, H.R. 1, the “For the People Act of 2019” addresses many significant challenges to our democratic institutions and the conduct of federal elections. The very foundation of our democracy depends on ensuring that our elections are fair, accurate, and freely accessible to all American citizens. We have witnessed in the last few years the roll back of voting rights to
a time I had truly hoped would remain in the past. We must continue to be vigilant against anything that would impede the right to vote. We must also protect our democratic institutions for the people, and not just for a few wealthy interests.

The U.S. election system is complex and highly decentralized, encompassing approximately 10,000 local, county, and state election offices. States and local jurisdictions face a number of challenges in their administration of federal elections, including outdated and insecure technology. Most of us are on screens all day long and have become accustomed to the convenience. There are probably some young people that don’t like to read on paper at all. However, when it comes to electronic voting systems, these same conveniences may be subject to technical malfunctions as well as significant cybersecurity risks that have already been shown, in real elections, to undermine Americans’ constitutional right to vote.

The last major voting legislation was passed almost two decades ago. It created several new responsibilities for the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) to work with the Election Assistance Commission, election administrators, and manufacturers on voting systems technology standards development. The Science Committee was active in the development of that language.

Today’s bill, H.R. 1, makes an effort at expanding NIST’s role in voting and elections technology. While I support H.R. 1 overall, I do have some concerns with the proposed new scope of activities for NIST. NIST’s core mission is measurement science and standards. Most people have never heard of NIST and don’t understand what it does, but NIST plays a central and unique role in advancing U.S. competitiveness as well as in cybersecurity across the public and private sector. The agency has no regulatory authority, which allows it to win the trust of and work closely with industry and all kinds of stakeholders in the standards development process. The Science Committee has worked very hard to preserve this standards development function of NIST. NIST expressed concern to us that some of the language in this bill may compromise the agency’s ability to work closely with states and counties on elections technology. In addition, while other provisions in the bill are better aligned with NIST’s mission and worthy of support, we must ensure there is additional funding for NIST to accomplish these important goals. As this bill moves through the legislative process, I look forward to working with my colleagues in the House and Senate to address both of these issues.

Election and voting integrity and security are important to everyone in this Chamber on both sides of the aisle, and my colleagues on the Science Committee are eager to present legislative ideas for the role of NIST in voting and elections technology, as well as recommendations for sufficient levels of support to ensure the agency can succeed in this mission.

Mr. Chair, I support H.R. 1 and urge its passage.
Mr. Greene continued his studies at the University of Georgia, majoring in Business Administration, and he attended business seminars. He spent the next 29 years of his career as a regional manager for Rhodes Furniture Company.

Mr. Greene’s dedication to the military continued after his retirement. He was the first Squadron Commander of the “White Knuckle” Squadron, a unit formed by local civic leaders who have received orientation flights in Moody Air Force Base (AFB) aircraft. In 1991, he helped establish the Moody Support Group, which was instrumental in strengthening the relationships between the local community and the Air Force. As the Executive Director of the group, he helped protect Moody AFB from closure. In 2000, he was appointed to the Georgia Military Affairs Committee by then Governor Sonny Perdue.

In conjunction with his professional accomplishments, Mr. Greene was heavily involved in his community, serving as the Chairman (1972–85) of the Military Affairs Committee and Vice President (1978–79) of the Valdosta/Lowndes Chamber of Commerce; on the Board of Directors for the Valdosta State College/University Foundation; and as an active member of the ACC Commander’s Air Power Support Group, the National Civic Leader’s Group for the U.S. Air Force Chief of Staff, Rotary International, the Kiwanis Clubs of America, the Boy Scouts of America, the Young Men’s Christian Association, the Moody AFB Red Carpet Committee, the University of Georgia Gridiron Society, and the Sigma Alpha Epsilon Alumnae organization. In addition to his extensive community involvement, he was also a faithful member of the First United Methodist Church in Valdosta, where he once served on the Administrative Board.

Mr. Greene received several prestigious awards for his dedicated civic service, including the Distinguished Citizen award from the Alapaha Area Boy Scout Council (2000); the first-ever Chief of Staff of the Air Force Award for Exceptional Public Service (2007); and the Air Force Distinguished Public Service Award (2009). In 2000, he was honored as the Outstanding Citizen of the Year by the Air Force Association. Additionally, a portion of Bemiss Road from Valdosta to Moody AFB (W. Parker Greene Highway, 2005) and Moody AFB’s headquarters (W. Parker Greene Base Support Center, 2007) were named in his honor.

Mr. Greene achieved much in his life, but none of it would have been possible without the love and support of his loving wife, Lucy; his children, Sharon and Woodbridge Jr.; and a host of family and friends who will miss him deeply.

Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. once said, “Life’s most persistent and urgent question is, ‘What are you doing for others?’” Mr. Greene undoubtedly lived by this philosophy. From his extensive work with the development of Moody AFB to his efforts to provide a bridge between the military and civilians, his work made a tremendous impact on the lives of many.

On a personal note, I was privileged to work with Parker for over 26 years in behalf of Moody AFB and have not encountered a more committed citizen to his community and Nation.

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 7, 2019

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker, I enthusiastically rise today to honor the Dillard High School Lady Panthers girls’ basketball team and their coach Marcia Pinder on winning their 10th state championship on March 2, 2019, with a 43–40 win against Ponte Vedra Nease at George W. Jenkins High School.

Coach Pinder leads by example. Her dedication to Dillard High School and its basketball program is truly commendable.

Under Coach Pinder’s tutelage, the Dillard girls basketball team has consistently been recognized for being among the best in their sport.

In this year’s game, Genovea Johnson and Raven White, two senior stars on the team, helped carry the Lady Panthers to victory. They both have had the unique experience of attending Dillard since they were in middle school.

I would also like to recognize the entire Lady Panthers team, which includes: Markhyia Davis, Briah Christia, Chynna Mattair, Kayla Burrows, Sequoia Emmanuel, Angel Howell, Genovea Johnson, Kintaeja Ling, Taja Stephens, Ariyanna Boyce, Monique Harris, Raven White, and Marquis Harris.

Madam Speaker, I am so very proud of the Dillard High School Lady Panthers girls’ basketball team. They had a tremendous season and should be extremely proud of themselves. I wish Coach Pinder and the entire team many more years of continued success.

HON. CHRISS PAPPAS
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 7, 2019

Mr. PAPPAS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Toula Barber, who is being honored by the Daughters of Penelope Chapter No. 51 this Saturday, March 9, 2019 for her dedication to the organization. The Daughters of Penelope promotes the ideals and traditions of Hellenism in America, focusing on service to one’s community.

My own ancestors, like Toula herself, moved to this country from Greece for freedom and a better life. During her many years in New Hampshire, Toula has been more than just a model citizen—she has become a pillar of our community. Her warmth, deep sense of compassion, and ethic of community service are extraordinary, and I feel lucky to count her as a role model and a friend.

For many years, Toula served as a District Governor for the Daughters of Penelope Ilios Chapter No. 51. In this organization, Toula has done more than just uphold and carry on important traditions for the Greek community—she has also brought our Greek traditions to our broader Manchester community, helping make our city more inclusive and open.

On behalf of my constituents in New Hampshire’s First Congressional District, I want to thank Toula for her decades of dedication to our community. I hope that she enjoys celebrating this well-deserved honor, and I thank her for all that she does to make our state such a wonderful place to learn, live, and grow.

IN RECOGNITION OF BERNARD McGUIRL, ANCIENT ORDER OF Hibernians Division 4 PAUL “HOOK” O’MALLEY MAN OF THE YEAR AWARD

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 7, 2019

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Bernard McGurl, who will receive the Paul “Hook” O’Malley Man of the Year Award from the Ancient Order of Hibernians Division 4 on Thursday, March 7, 2019. Bernie grew up in Dunmore and is a graduate of Dunmore Central Catholic High School. He received degrees in political science and history from the University of Scranton and a law degree from the University of Pittsburgh. Bernie went on to attend Johnson College to study cabinetmaking and building construction. Early in his career, he worked jobs in construction, forestry, and rail.
Bernie is best known for his passion for preserving the environment. He has made extraordinary efforts to clean and maintain the Lackawanna River watershed, an area that encompasses 350 square miles across four counties in Northeastern Pennsylvania. Bernie was also instrumental in establishing the Lackawanna Heritage Trail. As Vice President of the Rail Trail Council, his work resulted in the acquisition of 40 miles of D&H railbed. As Executive Director for Lackawanna Valley Conservancy, he was successful in protected properties totaling 200 acres.

He is also a great supporter of the arts. Bernie is an active member of the Mulberry Poets and Writers Association. A lifelong learner, Bernie satisfies his intellectual curiosity and takes it upon himself to study different disciplines, including geology, history, ecology, and various aspects of engineering.

It is an honor to recognize a fellow environmentalist and public servant for all the great work he has done. May he continue to work for the good of the natural world and our community. I wish Bernard the best as he accepts the Paul “Hook” O’Malley Man of the Year award.

Mr. COOPER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Frank Allen-Tate Erickson for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Frank Allen-Tate Erickson is a student at Oberson Middle School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Frank Allen-Tate Erickson is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make their education and develop a work ethic which will provide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Frank Allen-Tate Erickson for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Jaelyn Velasquez for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Jaelyn Velasquez is a student at Arvada High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated Jaelyn Velasquez is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Jaelyn Velasquez for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Brad Byrne for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Mr. Byrne. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the 75th Anniversary of the founding of the United Negro College Fund, Inc. (UNCF). In its 75 years of existence, UNCF has helped thousands of students attend colleges and universities throughout the country; Through their work, they have created leaders and proud members of our communities whose contributions to the United States are immeasurable.

The UNCF was founded in 1944 to help increase the total number of black Americans enrolled in college. UNCF traces its founding to Frederick Douglass Patterson, who wrote an open letter in the Pittsburgh Courier to presidents of other private black colleges in 1934 urging them to “pool their small monies and make a united appeal to the national conscience.”

Today, UNCF is a strong organization with a profound mission to build a robust and nationally-recognized pipeline of under-represented students who, because of UNCF support, become highly-qualified college graduates. UNCF also seeks to ensure their network of 37-member Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) is a respected model of best practice in moving students to and through college and then into the workforce.

As co-Chair of the Bipartisan HBCU Caucus, I am proud to represent the many HBCUs in Alabama and advocate for the betterment of all HBCUs across the country. I have appreciated working with UNCF to accomplish this mission.

Since its founding, UNCF has raised more than $4.8 billion in scholarship aid for students. Each year, UNCF awards scholarships and internships to more than 10,000 students at 1,100 colleges and universities nationwide. Overall, more than 445,000 students have earned college degrees due to the support provided by UNCF.

It is impossible to measure the legacy and contributions of UNCF. Madam Speaker, please join me in commemorating the constant investments by UNCF in our low-income, first generation college students and HBCUs, and all of the immeasurable good they have done for our students and our nation.
On Tuesday, December 11, 2018, the Bearcats won the state championship game against the Warner Robins Demons (47-41) in triple overtime. This historic victory marked the second state football title in Bearcat history and the first since 1982. The team has played both their lowest-scoring and highest-scoring games of the season against the Demons, scoring zero points in October of 2018 and 47 points at the state championship game in December. Their victory in this year’s AAAAA state championship embodied decades of frustration, hard work, and determination bursting forth into an unbelievable season of athletic excellence and teamwork. The Bainbridge Bearcats is the first team in Georgia since 1992 to go from a .500 winning percentage or below to state champions. The team traveled over 1,853 miles and went on to defeat five consecutive top ten opponents for the first time in school history, won four consecutive state playoff field wins for the first time in the school’s history, and finished with a 10+ win season for only the 4th time in school history.

The Bainbridge Bearcats finished their season with a seven-game winning streak, five of which were on the road. The team also set school records for interceptions returned for touchdowns, sacks, and blocked kicks and punts. The team’s seniors completed their high school career with an astonishing 36-16 record, the best for any senior class in school history.

I cannot put into words the amount of pride that the citizens of Bainbridge, and indeed in the entire Second Congressional District, has in being able to call this outstanding team of athletes its own. They have accomplished an incredible feat, one that could not have been possible without the tireless leadership and encouragement from their head coach, Jeff Littleton and his staff, as well as their families, classmates, and members of the community who believed in their ability to bring home a state championship title.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join my wife, Vivian, and me, along with the more than 720,000 constituents of Georgia’s Second Congressional District in recognizing these hardworking young men who have persevered, made sacrifices, and developed the character that will help them to succeed in other aspects of life, and in congratulating them on their historic achievement.

EMILIE WEHR

HON. ED PERLMUTTER
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 7, 2019

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Emilie Wehr for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Emilie Wehr is a student at Arvada High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Emilie Wehr is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. Many students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Emilie Wehr for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

COMMEMORATING THE 1988 SUMGAIT POGROMS AGAINST THE ARMENIAN COMMUNITY

HON. BRAD SHERMAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 7, 2019

Mr. SHERMAN. Madam Speaker, I stand in solidarity with the Armenian American community in commemorating the February 1988 Sumgait Pogroms. Thirty-one years ago in the Azerbaijani town of Sumgait, peaceful Armenian residents were brutally targeted on the basis of their ethnicity and subjected to unprovoked violence. In 1988, the Economist reported the atrocities and documented the murder and mutilation of pregnant Armenian women and newborn babies in a maternity hospital. Other mainstream media reports from the time speak of Azerbaijani mobs hunting down Armenian families and committing murder, rape and theft.

The Sumgait Pogroms were the beginning of an escalation of violence against the Armenian minority, with a wave of anti-Armenian violence spreading to Kirovabad in November 1988 and to Baku in January 1990, which culminated in the 1991-1994 war over Artsakh (the former Nagorno Karabakh).

In response to the Sumgait and Kirovabad pogroms, Nobel Prize-winning dissident, nuclear physicist and human rights activist, Andrei Sakharov, appealed to the international community to condemn the atrocities and prevent further violence by stating: “Armenian people are again facing the threat of genocide. The events in Sumgait and Kirovabad may be its beginning. This must not be allowed to happen!” (November 26, 1988, The New York Times)

The government of Azerbaijan must be held accountable by the international community for the pogroms committed against its minority Armenian population, and I will continue to work in Congress to shed light on and learn the lessons of such atrocities.

DMITRII ZHELEZOGLO

HON. ED PERLMUTTER
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 7, 2019

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Dmitrii Zhelezoglo for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Dmitrii Zhelezoglo is a student at Arvada West High School and received this award because his parents, a brother and three sisters in Georgia’s Second Congressional District in recognizing these hardworking young men who have persevered, made sacrifices, and developed the character that will help them to succeed in other aspects of life, and in congratulating them on their historic achievement.

IN RECOGNITION OF HOLLY GROVE MIDDLE SCHOOL

HON. GEORGE HOLDING
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 7, 2019

Mr. HOLDING. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate a group of nine outstanding sixth graders at Holly Grove Middle School—one of ten national finalists in the 2019 Samsung Solve for Tomorrow contest.

This nationwide competition challenges students to use science, technology, engineering and math skills to formulate ideas for addressing local issues in their communities.

The group of sixth graders at Holly Grove developed an innovative bus stop sign that activates flashing lights to alert nearby drivers and pedestrians when a bus is 300 feet away. The advanced stop sign is powered by solar work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Dmitrii Zhelezoglo for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.
energy and even changes colors as the bus gets closer.

With STEM technology poised to be a centerpiece of the 21st century economy and job market, it is so exciting to see young students display such talent and technological ingenuity.

Congratulations to all the students and faculty members at Holly Grove involved in the project. I wish them all the best of luck as they compete for the national grand prize.

IN MEMORY OF ANN L. O’NEAL

HON. AL LAWSON, JR.
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 7, 2019

Mr. LAWSON of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Ann L. O’Neal, a dear friend, a beloved daughter of Florida A&M University (FAMU), the Tallahassee community and, indeed a great Floridian.

Ann had a tremendously vibrant presence in and around the Florida A&M campus, where she was widely known as “Auntie Ann”. She was a tremendous advocate for FAMU and was a tireless force for the betterment of the university, its students, and victory for all its athletic teams.

Ann truly took that line from the FAMU alma mater to heart—“on gridiron, diamond, track and field, I will fight whatever the battle be...” Ann was a fixture at every single football, basketball, softball, baseball game on campus for over 50 years, and her enduring loyalty to the University was infectious.

I can remember my time as a Rattler basketball player, Ann would always sit in the stands, right behind the team bench cheering us on. She would offer us encouragement when we needed it, and if you messed up or made a bad shot, she’d let you know that too. But it was all in love and Ann loved hard. And, I can say with great certainty that no one loved the Rattlers as Ann did.

In her professional life, Ann O’Neal broke barriers as the first female Space Analyst in FAMU’s Division of Facilities Planning, where she worked for more than 30 years. She did her job well, and with pride. She was recognized by the Florida Board of Regents, which preceded the Florida Board of Governors, which oversees Florida’s public universities, as the best Space Analyst in the state. For a time, she knew every inch of Florida A&M and its buildings and made sure that its space was allocated properly and accounted for.

Ann O’Neal was always full of enthusiasm, for all things FAMU and for life in general. In our sadness at her sudden passing, we remember that Ann loved the Lord, and Ann loved FAMU. She seized every opportunity and enjoyed every moment that she was given. I hope it is a comfort to Ann’s family and friends that so many people mourn their loss and are praying for them during this sad time.
Senate

Daily Digest

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S1717–S1747

Measures Introduced: Forty-three bills and three resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 691–733, and S. Res. 99–101.

Measures Reported:

S. 199, to provide for the transfer of certain Federal land in the State of Minnesota for the benefit of the Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe. (S. Rept. No. 116–3)

S. 216, to provide for equitable compensation to the Spokane Tribe of Indians of the Spokane Reservation for the use of tribal land for the production of hydropower by the Grand Coulee Dam. (S. Rept. No. 116–4)

Measures Passed:

Captain Humayun Khan Postal Facility: Senate passed S. 725, to change the address of the postal facility designated in honor of Captain Humayun Khan.

International Women's Day: Senate agreed to S. Res. 101, supporting the goals of International Women’s Day.

Appointments:

Board of Trustees of the Barry Goldwater Scholarship and Excellence in Education Foundation: The Chair, on behalf of the Democratic Leader, pursuant to Public Law 99–661, appointed the following individual to be a member of the Board of Trustees of the Barry Goldwater Scholarship and Excellence in Education Foundation: Senator Sinema, vice Senator Reed.

Matey Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Paul B. Matey, of New Jersey, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit. A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur at 5:30 p.m. on Monday, March 11, 2019.

Prior to the consideration of this nomination, Senate took the following action:

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Legislative Session.

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination.

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at approximately 3 p.m., on Monday, March 11, 2019, Senate resume consideration of the nomination; and that notwithstanding the provisions of Rule XXII, the cloture motions filed during the session of Thursday, March 7, 2019 ripen at 5:30 p.m., on Monday, March 11, 2019.


A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of the nomination of Paul B. Matey, of New Jersey, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit.

Prior to the consideration of this nomination, Senate took the following action:

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Legislative Session.

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination.

Beach Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of William Beach, of Kansas, to be Commissioner of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor.

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of the nomination of Neomi J. Rao, of the District of Columbia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia Circuit.
Prior to the consideration of this nomination, Senate took the following action:

Senators agreed to the motion to proceed to Legislative Session.

Senators agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination.

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

By 52 yeas to 46 nays (Vote No. EX. 39), Eric E. Murphy, of Ohio, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit. Pages S1720–27, S1747

By 67 yeas to 30 nays (Vote No. EX. 40), John Fleming, of Louisiana, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Economic Development. Pages S1727–30, S1747

Measures Placed on the Calendar:

 Measures Read the First Time: Pages S1732, S1747

Executive Communications: Pages S1732–33

Executive Reports of Committees: Page S1733

Additional Cosponsors: Pages S1734–35

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: Pages S1735–45

Additional Statements: Pages S1731–32

Authorities for Committees to Meet: Pages S1745–46

Record Votes: Two record votes were taken today. (Total—40)

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 5:18 p.m., until 3 p.m. on Monday, March 11, 2019. (For Senate’s program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today’s Record on page S1747.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Armed Services: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of William Bookless, of California, to be Principal Deputy Administrator, National Nuclear Security Administration, Department of Energy, and Veronica Daigle, of Virginia, and Thomas McCaffery, of California, both to be an Assistant Secretary, and Lisa M. Schenck, of Virginia, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Military Commission Review, all of the Department of Defense.

Providing Safe Military Housing and Infrastructure

Committee on Armed Services: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the chain of command’s accountability to provide safe military housing and other building infrastructure to servicemembers and their families, after receiving testimony from Mark T. Esper, Secretary of the Army, Richard V. Spencer, Secretary of the Navy, Heather A. Wilson, Secretary of the Air Force, General Mark A. Milley, USA, Chief of Staff of the Army, Admiral John M. Richardson, USN, Chief of Naval Operations, General Robert B. Neller, USMC, Commandant of the Marine Corps, and General David L. Goldfein, USAF, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, all of the Department of Defense.

China


Public Lands in the Western U.S.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee concluded a hearing to examine an overview of the multiple values and unique issues of access and development associated with public lands in the western United States, after receiving testimony from Sara Longan, Alaska Department of Natural Resources Deputy Commissioner, Anchorage; Laura Abram, First Solar, Inc., San Francisco, California; Bruce Hallin, Salt River Project, Phoenix, Arizona; Brent Keith, The Nature Conservancy, Arlington, Virginia; Patrick Malone, Barrick Gold of North America, Henderson, Nevada; and James D. Oggsbury, Western Governors’ Association, Denver, Colorado.

Business Meeting

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of Rita Baranwal, of Pennsylvania, to be an Assistant Secretary (Nuclear Energy), William Cooper, of Maryland, to be General Counsel, Christopher Fall, of Virginia, to be Director of the Office of Science, and Lane Genatowski, of New York, to be Director of the Advanced Research Projects Agency-Energy, all of the Department of Energy.
U.S.-VENUELA RELATIONS
Committee on Foreign Relations: Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere, Transnational Crime, Civilian Security, Democracy, Human Rights, and Global Women’s Issues concluded a hearing to examine United States-Venezuela relations and the path to a democratic transition, after receiving testimony from Mark Green, Administrator, United States Agency for International Development; Elliot Abrams, Special Representative for Venezuela, Department of State; and Eric Farnsworth, Council of the Americas, and Cynthia J. Arnson, Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars Latin American Program, both of Washington, D.C.

PRIVATE SECTOR DATA BREACHES
Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations concluded a hearing to examine private sector data breaches, including how additional Federal authority could enhance consumer protection and provide flexibility, after receiving testimony from Alicia Puente Cackley, Director, Financial Markets and Community Investment, Government Accountability Office; Andrew Smith, Director, Bureau of Consumer Protection, Federal Trade Commission; Mark Begor, and Jamil Farshchi, both of Equifax Inc., Atlanta, Georgia; Arne Sorenson, Marriott International, Bethesda, Maryland; and John Giligan, Center for Internet Security, Greenbush, New York.

BUSINESS MEETING
Committee on the Judiciary: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of Joseph F. Bianco, of New York, and Michael H. Park, of New York, both to be a United States Circuit Judge for the Second Circuit, Greg Girard Guidry, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Louisiana, Michael T. Liburdi, to be United States District Judge for the District of Arizona, and Peter D. Welte, to be United States District Judge for the District of North Dakota.

INTELLIGENCE
Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee held closed hearings on intelligence matters, receiving testimony from officials of the intelligence community.
Committee recessed subject to the call.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG PRICES
Special Committee on Aging: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the complex web of prescription drug prices, focusing on untangling the web and paths forward, after receiving testimony from Lisa Gill, Consumer Reports, Yonkers, New York; Pooja Babbrah, Point-of-Care Partners, LLC, Jacksonville, Florida; Stacie B. Dusetzina, Vanderbilt University School of Medicine, Nashville, Tennessee; and Jane Horvath, Horvath Health Policy, Washington, D.C.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action
Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 59 public bills, H.R. 1579–1637; and 13 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 24; and H. Res. 182–193 were introduced.

Additional Cosponsors:

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Takano to act as Speaker pro tempore for today.

Recess: The House recessed at 10:48 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon.

For the People Act of 2019: The House considered H.R. 1, to expand Americans’ access to the ballot box, reduce the influence of big money in politics, and strengthen ethics rules for public servants. Consideration began yesterday, March 6th.

Agreed to:
Lofgren en bloc amendment No. 1 consisting of the following amendments printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–16: Porter (No. 35) that expands the ban prohibiting foreign nationals from contributing to elections under Section 319 of FECA to also ban for- eign nationals from contributing to state or local ballot initiatives or referenda; Pocan (No. 36) that requires the creation of a single lobbying information disclosure portal that combines information currently held and made available to the public by the House, Senate, and DOJ; Ruiz (No. 40) that prohibits federal funds from being spent at businesses owned or controlled by the President, Vice President, or a Cabinet Member; Takano (No. 41) that establishes that a federal officeholder or candidate for
federal office must resolve their campaign contributions within 6 years of leaving office or campaign; Meng (No. 42) that requires the Election Assistance Commission poll worker training manual to ensure services are delivered in a culturally competent manner; Schneider (No. 44) that requires FEC to report to Congress within 180 days how to ensure financial disclosure for PACs and Super PACs established before Election Day but whose first disclosure would occur after Election Day, as well as their use of debt that is paid off after Election Day for disbursements made before Election Day; Brown (MD) (No. 46) that requires States to include in their annual report on voter registration statistics, the breakdown of race, ethnicity, age and gender of the individuals whose information is included in the report; Espaillat (No. 50) that requires the GAO to study the extent to which state redistricting commissions have met the membership diversity requirements in the bill; O'Halleran (No. 51) that prohibits senior executive branch officials from violating the Federal Travel Regulations with taxpayer funds, requires federal agencies to disclose quarterly reports to Congress detailing senior officials’ travel on government aircraft, and requires the Office of Government Ethics to issue a report to Congress on recommendations to strengthen the Federal Travel Regulations; O'Halleran (No. 52) that requires DOD to regularly disclose reports to Congress detailing the direct and indirect costs to the Department in support of presidential travel, including any costs incurred for travel to properties owned or operated by the President or his immediate family; codifies a recent GAO recommendation regarding DOD costs of presidential travel; O'Halleran (No. 53) that requires DOD to provide Congress regular reports on direct and indirect costs to the Department in support of travel on military aircraft provided to senior executive branch officials, including whether any spousal travel provided was reimbursed to the federal government; McAdams (No. 55) that decreases, from 20% to 10%, the threshold by which an individual qualifies as a “lobbyist” under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995; Phillips (No. 59) that expands the scope of the revolving door restriction to include a prohibition on “lobbying activity” for former government officials leaving public service during the two-year cooling off period; Phillips (No. 60) that ensures the FEC Blue Ribbon Advisory Panel consists of individuals with diverse party affiliation and diverse gender and ethnic backgrounds; Harder (No. 65) that states that any person or entity that makes a lobbying contact with a covered legislative branch official or a covered executive branch official shall indicate whether the person or entity is registered as a lobbyist; Horsford (No. 66) that requires all forms made available by the FEC to allow for accent symbols; and Finkenauer (No. 67) that exempts the State of Iowa’s current nonpartisan redistricting system from the Sec. 2401 requirement.

Green (TX) amendment (No. 26 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–16) that directs the Election Assistance Commission to carry out a pilot program under which the Commission shall provide funds during the one-year period beginning after the date of enactment, to local educational agencies for initiatives to provide voter registration information to secondary school students in the 12th grade;

Grijalva amendment (No. 27 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–16) that provides that States shall permit an individual who receives a vote by mail ballot to cast the ballot on the date of the election by delivering the ballot to a polling place;

Moore amendment (No. 29 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–16) that requires voting registration materials to be sent with notification of restoration of rights;

Moore amendment (No. 30 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–16) that requires voting registration materials to be sent with notification of restoration of rights;

Moore amendment (No. 34 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–16) that revises Title III, Part 3, Election Infrastructure Innovation Grant Program, to include an emphasis on increasing voter participation, engage the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), and increase funding for the competitive grants;

Pocan amendment (No. 37 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–16) that ends the practice of prison gerrymandering whereby incarcerated persons are counted in Census population counts as residents of correctional facilities and not their most recent residence prior to imprisonment;

Pocan amendment (No. 38 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–16) that requires states to seek to ensure that any voting machine used for the purposes of a federal election, by 2022, is manufactured in the United States;

Frankel (FL) amendment (No. 39 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–16) that clarifies that election administration improvement grants may be used to implement and model best practices for ballot design, ballot instructions, and the testing of ballots;

Beyer amendment (No. 43 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–16) that provides grants to states to encourage involvement of minors in election activities;
Brown (MD) amendment (No. 45 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–16) that ensures Sunday early voting;

Brown (MD) amendment (No. 47 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–16), as modified, that adds early voting to the minimum notification requirement for voters affected by polling place changes; instead of only requiring the State to notify individuals no later than seven days before the date of the election, this would include not later than seven days prior to the first day of early voting as well, whichever comes first;

Brown (MD) amendment (No. 48 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–16) that requires a portion of the early voting hours of operations to occur outside of normal business hours to ensure maximum accessibility to working individuals;

Brown (MD) amendment (No. 49 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–16) that requires the States to include in their bi-annual report to Congress on the operation of the voter information hotline, a description of any actions taken in response to reports of voter intimidation or suppression;

Raskin amendment (No. 3 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–16) that was debated on March 6th that prevents corporate expenditures for campaign purposes unless the corporation has established a process for determining the political will of its shareholders (by a recorded vote of 219 ayes to 215 noes, Roll No. 109);

Case amendment (No. 56 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–16) that incentives political party committees to prioritize small dollar donations (up to $200) to provide enhanced support for candidates;

Houlahan amendment (No. 57 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–16) that modifies Section 1611 (Early Voting) to require that States provide for ten hours of early voting per day rather than four hours, as specified in the base text;

Phillips amendment (No. 58 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–16) that clarifies the authority of FEC attorneys, including the General Counsel, to represent the FEC in actions before the Supreme Court;

Levin (MI) amendment (No. 61 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–16) that prohibits violators of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 and their immediate family members from serving on redistricting commissions;

Trahan amendment (No. 62 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–16) that prohibits agents registered under the Foreign Agents Act from serving on an independent redistricting commission;

Trahan amendment (No. 63 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–16) that extends the guarantee of residency for purposes of voting to family members of absent military personnel;

Kim amendment (No. 64 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–16) that requires all paper ballots used in an election for Federal office must be printed in the US on paper manufactured in the US;

Spanberger amendment (No. 68 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–16) that requires the Director of National Intelligence to provide state election officials and Congress an assessment regarding risks and threats to election infrastructure 180 days before a general election; and

Slotkin amendment (No. 69 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–16) that expands the ban on foreign money entering elections to include electioneering communications.

Rejected:

Hice (GA) amendment (No. 23 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–16) that sought to remove the granting of subpoena authority to the Director of the Office of Government Ethics;

Rodney Davis (IL) amendment (No. 28 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–16) that sought to require the Judicial Conference of the United States to implement a judicial code that is at least as stringent as the requirements placed on Members of Congress;

Davidson (OH) amendment (No. 31 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–16) that sought to ensure that states that have taken appropriate measures to increase voter turnout are not subject to additional federal voter registration mandates;

Cole amendment (No. 5 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–16) that was debated on March 6th that sought to restore a provision currently in law that bars government contractors from disclosing campaign contributions as part of the bidding process (by a recorded vote of 199 ayes to 235 noes, Roll No. 110);

Pressley amendment (No. 24 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–16) that sought to lower the mandatory minimum voting age to age 16 in federal elections (by a recorded vote of 126 ayes to 305 noes with two answering “present”, Roll No. 111);

Green (TN) amendment (No. 25 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–16) that sought to express a sense of Congress that free speech should be protected (by a recorded vote of 200 ayes to 233 noes, Roll No. 112);

Davidson (OH) amendment (No. 32 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–16) that sought to strike Title IV, subtitle F, which would allow the SEC to require disclosure of political contributions made by
public corporations (by a recorded vote of 194 ayes to 238 noes, Roll No. 113); and
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Davidson (OH) amendment (No. 33 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–16) that sought to protect the ability of 501(c)4s to advocate for causes by striking a provision intended to allow for additional IRS regulation of 501(c)4s (by a recorded vote of 195 ayes to 237 noes, Roll No. 114).
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Proceedings Postponed:

Brindisi amendment (No. 54 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–16) that seeks to direct states to equalize polling hours across the state within certain parameters; provide exceptions for municipalities to set longer hours.

H. Res. 172, the rule providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1) was agreed to yesterday, March 6th.

Suspension: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measure:

Condemning anti-Semitism as hateful expressions of intolerance that are contradictory to the values and aspirations that define the people of the United States and condemning anti-Muslim discrimination and bigotry against minorities as hateful expressions of intolerance that are contrary to the values and aspirations of the United States: H. Res. 183, amended, condemning anti-Semitism as hateful expressions of intolerance that are contradictory to the values and aspirations that define the people of the United States and condemning anti-Muslim discrimination and bigotry against minorities as hateful expressions of intolerance that are contrary to the values and aspirations of the United States, by a 2⁄3 yea-and-nay vote of 407 yeas to 23 nays with one answering “present”, Roll No. 108.
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Quorum Calls—Votes: One yea-and-nay vote and six recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H2554, H2555, H2556, H2556–57, H2557, H2558, and H2558–59. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 8:53 p.m.

Program for Friday: Complete consideration of H.R. 1—For the People Act of 2019.

Committee Meetings

PUBLIC WITNESS HEARING—TRIBAL PROGRAMS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies held a hearing entitled “Public Witness Hearing—Tribal Programs”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

APPROPRIATIONS—LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Legislative Branch held a budget hearing on the Library of Congress. Testimony was heard from Carla Hayden, Librarian of Congress.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE FOR IMMIGRATION REVIEW

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies held an oversight hearing on the Executive Office for Immigration Review. Testimony was heard from James McHenry, Director, Executive Office for Immigration Review.

ADDRESSING THE PUBLIC HEALTH EMERGENCY OF GUN VIOLENCE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies held a hearing entitled “Addressing the Public Health Emergency of Gun Violence”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

STAKEHOLDER PERSPECTIVES: AFFORDABLE HOUSING PRODUCTION

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies held a hearing entitled “Stakeholder Perspectives: Affordable Housing Production”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

VA WHOLE HEALTH, MENTAL HEALTH AND HOMELESSNESS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies held a hearing entitled “VA Whole Health, Mental Health and Homelessness”. Testimony was heard from David Carroll, Executive Director, Office of Mental Health and Suicide Prevention, Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs; Tracy W. Gaudet, M.D., Executive Director, National Office of Patient Centered Care and Cultural Transformation, Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs; and a public witness.

ENERGY WORKFORCE OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, and Related Agencies held
a hearing entitled “Energy Workforce Opportunities and Challenges”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

PUBLIC WITNESS HEARING—TRIBAL PROGRAMS
Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies held a hearing entitled “Public Witness Hearing—Tribal Programs”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

APPROPRIATIONS—SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government held a budget hearing on the Supreme Court of the United States. Testimony was heard from Samuel Alito, Associate Justice, Supreme Court of the United States; and Elena Kagan, Associate Justice, Supreme Court of the United States.

U.S. EUROPEAN COMMAND
Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Defense held an oversight hearing on the U.S. European Command. Testimony was heard from General Curtis M. Scaparrotti, Commander, U.S. European Command, and Supreme Allied Commander Europe (NATO). This hearing will be closed.

NATIONAL SECURITY CHALLENGES AND U.S. MILITARY ACTIVITIES IN THE GREATER MIDDLE EAST AND AFRICA

U.S. TRANSPORTATION COMMAND AND MARITIME ADMINISTRATION: STATE OF THE MOBILITY ENTERPRISE
Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces; and Subcommittee on Readiness held a joint hearing entitled “U.S. Transportation Command and Maritime Administration: State of the Mobility Enterprise”. Testimony was heard from General Steve Lyons, Commander, U.S. Transportation Command, Department of Defense; and Rear Admiral Mark H. Buzby, U.S. Navy (Ret.), Administrator, Maritime Administration, Department of Transportation.

THE COST OF INACTION: WHY CONGRESS MUST ADDRESS THE MULTIEMPLOYER PENSION CRISIS
Committee on Education and Labor: Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions held a hearing entitled “The Cost of Inaction: Why Congress Must Address the Multiemployer Pension Crisis”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

WASTED ENERGY: DOE’S INACTION ON EFFICIENCY STANDARDS AND ITS IMPACT ON CONSUMERS AND THE CLIMATE
Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Energy held a hearing entitled “Wasted Energy: DOE’s Inaction on Efficiency Standards and Its Impact on Consumers and the Climate”. Testimony was heard from Daniel Simmons, Assistant Secretary, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy; and public witnesses.

PUTTING CONSUMERS FIRST? A SEMI-ANNUAL REVIEW OF THE CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION BUREAU
Committee on Financial Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Putting Consumers First? A Semi-Annual Review of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau”. Testimony was heard from Kathy Kraninger, Director, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES
Committee on Foreign Affairs: Full Committee held a markup on H. Res. 75, strongly condemning the January 2019 terrorist attack on the 14 Riverside Complex in Nairobi, Kenya; H.R. 739, the “Cyber Diplomacy Act of 2019”; H. Res. 156 calling for accountability and justice for the assassination of Boris Nemtsov; H.R. 596, the “Crimea Annexation Non-recognition Act”; and H.R. 295, the “End Banking for Human Traffickers Act of 2019”. H. Res. 75 was ordered reported, without amendment. H.R. 739, H. Res. 156, H.R. 596, and H.R. 295 were ordered reported, as amended.

THE STATUS OF AMERICAN HOSTAGES IN IRAN
Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on the Middle East, North Africa, and International Terrorism held a hearing entitled “The Status of American Hostages in Iran”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

CBP WORKFORCE CHALLENGES: EXPLORING SOLUTIONS TO ADDRESS RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION
Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Oversight, Management, and Accountability held a

THE ENERGY WATER NEXUS: DRIER WATTS AND CHEAPER DROPS
Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Energy held a hearing entitled “The Energy Water Nexus: Drier Watts and Cheaper Drops”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

SMALL BUT MIGHTY: A REVIEW OF THE SBA MICROLOAN PROGRAM
Committee on Small Business: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Small but Mighty: A Review of the SBA Microloan Program”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

THE CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND: HOW FEDERAL INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENT CAN HELP COMMUNITIES MODERNIZE WATER INFRASTRUCTURE AND ADDRESS AFFORDABILITY CHALLENGES
Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment held a hearing entitled “The Clean Water State Revolving Fund: How Federal Infrastructure Investment Can Help Communities Modernize Water Infrastructure and Address Affordability Challenges”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

HEARING WITH THE NATIONAL TAXPAYER ADVOCATE ON THE IRS FILING SEASON
Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Oversight held a hearing entitled “Hearing with the National Taxpayer Advocate on the IRS Filing Season”. Testimony was heard from Nina E. Olson, National Taxpayer Advocate.

PROMOTING COMPETITION TO LOWER MEDICARE DRUG PRICES
Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing entitled “Promoting Competition to Lower Medicare Drug Prices”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

LEVELING THE PLAYING FIELD FOR WORKING FAMILIES: CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES
Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Worker and Family Support held a hearing entitled “Leveling the Playing Field for Working Families: Challenges and Opportunities”. Testimony was heard from Kelly Schulz, Secretary, Department of Commerce, Maryland; and public witnesses.

BUSINESS MEETING
Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Full Committee held a business meeting on Adoption of the
Committee’s Views and Estimates Letter. The Committee’s Views and Estimates Letter was adopted. This meeting was closed.

Joint Meetings
VETERANS SERVICE ORGANIZATIONS

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs: Senate Committee on Veterans’ Affairs concluded a joint hearing with the House Committee on Veterans’ Affairs to examine the legislative presentation of multiple veterans service organizations, after receiving testimony from Regis William Riley, AMVETS, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; David Zurfluh, Paralyzed Veterans of America, Ruston, Washington; John Rowan, Vietnam Veterans of America, Middle Village, New York; Jeremy Butler, Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America, New York, New York; Jared Lyon, Student Veterans of America, Alexandria, Virginia; Charles A. Susino, American Ex-Prisoners of War, Piscataway, New Jersey; and Rene C. Bardorf, Wounded Warrior Project, Washington, D.C.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, MARCH 8, 2019
(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate
No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House
No hearings are scheduled.
Next Meeting of the SENATE
3 p.m., Monday, March 11

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: Senate will resume consideration of the nomination of Paul B. Matey, of New Jersey, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit, and vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination at 5:30 p.m.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
9 a.m., Friday, March 8

House Chamber

Program for Friday: Complete consideration of H.R. 1—For the People Act of 2019.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE
Bishop, Sanford D., Jr., Ga., E264, E266, E268
Byrne, Bradley, Ala., E268
Cartwright, Matt., Pa., E265, E267
Cooper, Jim, Tenn., E268
Costa, Jim, Calif., E263

Diaz-Balart, Mario, Fla., E263
Hastings, Alcee L., Fla., E267
Holding, George, N.C., E269
Johnson, Eddie Bernice, Tex., E265
Katko, John, N.Y., E265
Lawson, Al., Jr., Fla., E269, E270
Lynch, Stephen F., Mass., E264

Maloney, Carolyn B., N.Y., E263
Pappas, Chris, N.H., E267
Rogers, Mike, Ala., E266
Sherman, Brad, Calif., E269