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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC, October 23, 2019.

I hereby appoint the Honorable Bobby L. Rush to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes 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.

NFL SHOULD END RACIST EXPLOITATION OF NATIVE AMERICANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. McCollum) for 5 minutes.

Ms. McCollum. Mr. Speaker, the National Football League is celebrating its 100th anniversary, and its popularity and economic success is indisputable. Millions of fans watched the NFL last year, and the league’s 32 teams split more than $16 billion in revenue.

One team, the Washington franchise, exploits a racist slur and a racist mascot that insults and demeans Native Americans to help generate profits for the NFL owners.

In the 21st century, we should rightly condemn the use of racial slurs that disparage African Americans, Latinos, Asians, or anyone. And there is no doubt about it. The term “redskin,” in fact, was used in conjunction with scalp hunting in the 19th century.

In 1863, in Winona, Minnesota, my home State, a newspaper, the Winona Daily Republican, printed an announcement: “The State reward for dead Indians has been increased to $200 for every redskin sent to purgatory. This sum is more than the dead bodies of all the Indians east of the Red River are worth.”

There are millions of Native Americans in this country whose ancestors endured forced removal from their lands, suppression of their culture, and state-sponsored campaigns of ethnic cleansing. The NFL racist mascot mocks this painful history.

Tomorrow night, the Washington team and its racist mascot will be in Minnesota, the home of 11 proud sovereign Tribal nations. I will be joining Tribal leaders, elected officials, and other Minnesota gathering outside the stadium. We will be speaking out against racism and exploitation. We will stand proudly with our Native American brothers and sisters. With one voice, we will be calling on the NFL to end its racist exploitation of Native Americans and to do one thing: Change the mascot.

HONORING THE LIFE OF THOMAS H. TRACY, JR.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Rodney Davis) for 5 minutes.

Mr. Rodney Davis of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor my friend, Tom Tracy, Jr., an active and beloved community member who passed away unexpectedly last month at the age of 47.

Tom grew up in Ivesdale, Illinois. After graduating from Bement High School, he went on to attend Southern Illinois University at Carbondale and earned his MBA from Eastern Illinois University.

He spent over two decades working in the banking industry before accepting the role of president and CEO of Farm Credit Illinois in 2015. In this position, he led an organization of 220 full-time employees and a multibillion-dollar loan portfolio for its farm owners.

Those who worked closely with him described Tom as an extraordinary executive with a kind and charitable heart.

Outside of work, Tom showed he grew up in Bement and learned how to actually get involved in his community to make it better. Tom gave generously to local charities, and he served on the board for Kirby Medical Center’s Kirby Foundation in Monticello. Tom lived his entire life in humble service to his friends, to his neighbors, and to his family.

He was a kind young man. Tom’s life was full of promise. He is truly going to be missed.

Shannon and I are deeply saddened by his passing, and our prayers are with all those who knew Tom, all those who worked with Tom, but especially...
his wife, Erin, and his children, Alex and Maggie.

Rest in peace, my friend.

HONORING THE HONORABLE LOU FREY, JR.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MURPHY) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor former Congressman Lou Frey, who represented the Orlando area in this Chamber for a decade, from 1969 to 1979.

He passed away recently but leaves behind an enduring legacy. Congressman Frey was many things, but above all, he was a loving husband, a wonderful father and grandfather, and an extraordinary public servant who cared deeply about central Florida and about this country.

He was a man with strongly held views, but also one willing to make principled compromises in the interest of bipartisan progress. His accomplishments before, during, and after his tenure in Congress are too long to list, but their impact can be summarized like this: Orlando is a better city; Florida is a better State; and America is a better Nation.

As the chair of Future Forum, a group dedicated to empowering young people, I regard Lou Frey as a role model of the most passionate causes was helping younger Americans learn about this country, about how our government works, and about how choosing a career in public service can bring you a sense of inner joy and enable you to improve the lives of others.

Lou, working with former Senator Bob Graham, was instrumental in getting Florida to pass legislation requiring all students in the State to complete civics education. When I saw how young Floridians responded in the wake of the Pulse and Parkland shootings, turning those tragedies into a resurrection call for government action, I thought of and silently thanked Lou Frey.

Rest in peace, Congressman.

PROTECT AMERICA FROM FOREIGN INTERFERENCE IN ELECTIONS

Mrs. MURPHY of Florida. I rise in strong support of the SHIELD Act. I helped introduce this legislation, and the House will consider it on the floor later today.

This bill will protect our country from foreign interference in our elections. Russia’s assault on our democracy in 2016 exposed gaps in our Nation’s defenses.

It used to be that the primary threat from adversary nations was their potential use of traditional weapons of war. But our society is rapidly changing and so is the nature of conflict.

Today, our enemies are far more likely to use computer malware than cruise missiles. And if they do, they don’t think twice about exploiting loopholes in our laws in order to influence our elections.

That is why passing the SHIELD Act is so critical to maintaining the foundation of our democracy, our system of free and fair elections.

We know Russia and possibly other foreign powers will likely use similar tactics in 2020. And why wouldn’t they? Russia has shown almost no consequences for their actions in 2016.

While Russia assisted a Republican on that occasion, it could aid a Democrat in the future. That is because Moscow’s loyalty is to itself, not to any U.S. political party. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle should never forget that fact.

To defend our democracy, we need to act now to protect our elections. We need to pass the SHIELD Act.

I commend Chairwoman LOFGREN for her leadership in drafting this critical piece of legislation, and I urge all of my colleagues to support it.

WORDS OF PRESIDENT ZELENSKY HAVE BEEN IGNORED

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

Mr. MEUSER. Mr. Speaker, an overlooked factor of these relentless investigations and this impeachment inquiry is the way in which the words of Ukrainian President Zelensky have been largely ignored.

Zelensky said, without condition, that he felt no pressure from President Trump related to corruption investigations in Ukraine. President Zelensky’s words have been largely ignored because they do not fit the narrative pushed by the Democratic leadership of this House.

Mr. Speaker, an overlooked factor of these relentless investigations and this impeachment inquiry is the way in which the words of Ukrainian President Zelensky have been largely ignored.

Zelensky said, without condition, that he felt no pressure from President Trump related to corruption investigations in Ukraine. President Zelensky’s words have been largely ignored because they do not fit the narrative pushed by the Democratic leadership of this House.

Just think, had President Zelensky wanted to severely damage our President, he could have lied and stated he did feel pressure. Doesn’t that scenario give you chills? Had a foreign leader simply altered and fabricated one publicly stated phrase, the entire Democratic Caucus of this House would be calling for our President’s head, repeating it over and over.

That is the reality of this sickening and dangerous presumption of guilt that some Members of this body are choosing to push.

Our President deserves nothing less than the due process and presumption of innocence afforded to all Americans by our Constitution. Anything less is an affront to the Republic our Founders created and to all the electorate, Democratic and Republican.

RECOGNIZING ARMENIAN GENOCIDE AND TURKISH INVASION

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as an American, concerned because our country stands at a crossroads in foreign policy and history, I might add.

In recent days, we have seen this administration cynically abandon our Kurdish allies in northeast Syria and open the door to a Turkish invasion. These decisions were made without consulting our allies, our distinguished diplomats, and regional experts like Ambassador Jeffrey. Much damage has been done. Yesterday, President Putin and President Erdogan signed an agreement. I believe, that harms American interests in that part of the world.

Hundreds of people have been killed. Tens of thousands have been displaced. Dangerous ISIS prisoners, who have been killing and wounding Americans, are now on the loose, threatening increased international terrorist actions in Europe and the United States. This is a real threat.

Turkey’s actions have shown it to be a dangerous actor on the international stage, but it is not the first time. We must immediately impose sanctions to show our commitment to a stable international order and the rule of law, and Turkey must understand that.

Clearly, the international reputation of the United States has, I think, been deeply damaged.

As chairman of the Transatlantic Legislators’ Dialogue, I know. Our European partners ask me all the time: Are we together? Do we share the same values of the rule of law, of democratic freedoms?

The United States should never, ever end up standing alone. The past few days also reminds us of another injustice that must be rectified.

In 1915, the Ottoman Empire embarked upon systematic deportation of 1.5 million Armenians. These innocent men, women, and children became the first genocide in the 20th century. Yet, as I stand here this morning, the brutal atrocity has still not received the official recognition by our government that it deserves.

Turkey outrageously continues to ignore the voices of the survivors and the descendants around the world. Many of these survivors settled in my district in the San Joaquin Valley where they have lived and where they have raised their children in the blessings of liberty, and they made it in the American way.

That is the reality of this sickening and dangerous presumption of guilt that some Members of this body are choosing to push.

Our President deserves nothing less than the due process and presumption of innocence afforded to all Americans by our Constitution. Anything less is an affront to the Republic our Founders created and to all the electorate, Democratic and Republican.

Turkey outrageously continues to ignore the voices of the survivors and the descendants around the world. Many of these survivors settled in my district in the San Joaquin Valley where they have lived and where they have raised their children in the blessings of liberty, and they made it in the American way.

But this is not justice. The road to justice begins with full recognition of the Armenian people’s suffering. Both the Armenian-American community and our European partners ask me all the time: Are we together? Do we share the same values of the rule of law, of democratic freedoms?

Both Turkey and the United States, immediately, should recognize that the Armenian genocide occurred, as the European Union has done.

I am proud to support H. Res. 296 which, over the objections of Ankara, would establish permanent U.S. recognition and ongoing American remembrance of the Armenian genocide.

That is the right thing to do. I urge my colleagues who have yet to publicly endorse this bipartisan resolution to join me, with over 110 cosponsors, in calling for a long-overdue
passage by the United States House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, the horrors of the Armenian genocide can never ever be undone. Words alone cannot comfort those who suffered nor dry the tears of another generation. We must all remember that every vote is counted and that no one—no foreign power—has the right to interfere in the elections of foreign adversaries. Yes, these things are all related.

With the 2020 elections fast approaching, now is the time to take action by supporting the SHIELD Act. The SHIELD Act puts four commonsense bipartisan restrictions in place to improve our defenses against anyone meddling in our elections. No one should do that, and every American should take issue. It closes loopholes, strengthens reporting requirements, restricts exchange of information between campaigns, and limits any involvement with foreign agents.

As public officials, we raise our hand to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States. We must rise to this occasion to do just that. That is what we should do as Members of the House of Representatives. Our constituents expect it from us to ensure that every vote is counted and that no one—no foreign source—can meddle in American elections, ever, as took place with the 2016 American elections, ever, as took place that roughly 20 veterans commit suicide a day. We must do our part to prevent tragedies like this from happening.

That is why I introduced H.R. 2123, the Veterans E-Health and Telemedicine Support Act, as we call it—in 2017, alongside Congresswoman JULIA BROWNLEY. This bipartisan legislation reduces barriers for veterans seeking healthcare by removing burdensome location requirements, increasing access to care regardless of where the healthcare professional or the patient is located.

Prior to the VETS Act’s enactment, VA doctors could only provide telehealth services across State lines if both the veteran and the doctor were located in Federal facilities. Undoing this restriction was successful under the VETS Act’s adoption, and it is just one way that we can improve access to telehealth for millions of veterans nationwide.

Prior to the VETS Act, we were able to do that successfully a number of years ago with the STEP Act, the Servicemembers’ Telemedicine and E-Health Portable Act, and it did the same thing for 1.1 million American heroes who are members of our Active-Duty military, Reserve, and Guard. The act lifted those same bureaucratic barriers to expand better access through telemedicine.

Through innovation and bipartisan support, we can continue to strengthen telemedicine care for all Americans.

PASSING USMCA

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 discuss the importance of telemedicine.

Recently, I had the pleasure of participating in a roundtable discussion at Saint Francis University in Cambria County, Pennsylvania. Representatives from the university, Better Care America, University of Pittsburgh Medical Center, and Highmark, among others, gathered to share their expertise on telemedicine and its impact on rural health.

Telemedicine is an incredibly important tool for millions of Americans, but particularly for those who live in rural communities. With telemedicine, we can increase access to care for those who live far away from a doctor’s office or hospital.

Of course, this benefit extends beyond rural communities. Telemedicine is crucial in ensuring older Americans and those with limited mobility are able to access quality medical care by eliminating roadblocks like finding transportation to a doctor’s appointment. By increasing convenience and access, telemedicine encourages individuals to take a more proactive approach in managing their health.

Telemedicine can also have a positive impact on the health and well-being of our veterans. Their sacrifice and willingness to serve our country is a debt that we can never truly repay. The least we can do, however, is to ensure that they have access to quality healthcare. This includes mental health.

Many of our men and women in uniform are suffering privately with post-traumatic stress, depression, anxiety, brain injuries, and more. The Department of Veterans Affairs estimates that roughly 20 veterans commit suicide a day. We must do our part to prevent tragedies like this from happening.

That is why I introduced H.R. 2123, the Veterans E-Health and Telemedicine Support Act, as we call it—in 2017, alongside Congresswoman JULIA BROWNLEY. This bipartisan legislation reduces barriers for veterans seeking healthcare by removing burdensome location requirements, increasing access to care regardless of where the healthcare professional or the patient is located.

Prior to the VETS Act’s enactment, VA doctors could only provide telehealth services across State lines if both the veteran and the doctor were located in Federal facilities. Undoing this restriction was successful under the VETS Act’s adoption, and it is just one way that we can improve access to telehealth for millions of veterans nationwide.

Prior to the VETS Act, we were able to do that successfully a number of years ago with the STEP Act, the Servicemembers’ Telemedicine and E-Health Portable Act, and it did the same thing for 1.1 million American heroes who are members of our Active-Duty military, Reserve, and Guard. The act lifted those same bureaucratic barriers to expand better access through telemedicine.

Through innovation and bipartisan support, we can continue to strengthen telemedicine care for all Americans.

REMEMBERING ASSISTANT CHIEF CHRISTIAN JOHNSON

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the life and service of Assistant Fire Chief Christian Johnson of Okanogan County Fire District 3. Chief Johnson recently passed away due to injuries he sustained while fighting the Spring Coulee fire in north central Washington last September.

Chief Johnson was an American hero. He served our country honorably, retiring from the Army after 22 years before joining the fire department nearly 20 years ago to serve his local community. His wife, Pam, described him as selfless, kind, and always ready to help someone in need. He was well-known and well-loved in Okanogan County, which is clear from the community’s outpouring of support in recent weeks.

I encourage all in north central Washington to pay their respects at Chief Johnson’s memorial this Thursday, October 24, at 1 p.m. at the Okanogan County Fairgrounds.

My deepest condolences go out to Pam and the Johnson family. The people of central Washington are eternally grateful for his selfless service to protect our communities.

Chief Johnson, may you rest in peace.

A RENEWED VISION FOR JOB CORPS CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CENTERS

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

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to applaud and thank the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the U.S. Forest Service for the recent announcement renewing their commitment and vision to the Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center program.

Operated by the USDA and the Forest Service, Job Corps Civilian Conservation Centers, or CCCs, serve rural communities across the country by training the next generation of America’s workforce to carry out a unique
and particularly important mission: conserving our Federal lands, mitigating fire threats, and suppressing active wildfires.

My central Washington district is home to two of these centers: Columbia Basin in Moses Lake and Fort Simcoe in Wenatchee. These centers, students learn hands-on skills that they utilize to expand public access to Federal lands, improve campsites in national forests throughout Washington State, and serve as impactful stewards of our environment.

I have personally supported and defended Job Corps Civilian Conservation Centers because I have witnessed firsthand how these programs act as catalysts for the young people I represent, giving them a chance to give back to their community while learning life-changing skills.

I was sincerely grateful to Secretary Perdue for committing to work with me and my colleagues in Congress to help improve CCC programs across the country instead of transferring operations to the Department of Labor this year. Now, with this recent announcement, Secretary Perdue has followed through on his word.

Under the Secretary’s direction, Forest Service Chief Vicki Christiansen announced a recommitment to Job Corps CCC students by realigning the mission of these centers with the Forest Service’s own motto, which is “Caring for the Land and Serving People.” The U.S. Forest Service is uniquely qualified to administer Civilian Conservation Centers, which play a critical role throughout the United States and go above and beyond traditional Job Corps programs. Under this new vision, these specialized Job Corps programs will better prepare both urban and rural youth to become the next generation of responsible land managers.

The Forest Service has committed to revamp the CCC’s curriculum to meet the needs of Forest Service regions across the United States. Focusing on regional performance targets will allow the agency to increase student learning opportunities while making much-needed improvements to forest conditions.

By strengthening the alumni network and supporting a pipeline between CCCs and the Forest Service, these centers can focus on jobs in forestry, firefighting, and conservation, which are all critical careers throughout the rural West.

In the words of Chief Christiansen: “Our Job Corps faculty and students embody the Forest Service values of service, interdependence, conservation, diversity, and safety.”

As I have seen firsthand, these students and our public lands deserve this investment.

So, Mr. Speaker, I thank Secretary Sonny Perdue and Chief Vicki Christiansen for their commitment to rural America, our national lands, and the students of the Civilian Conservation Centers.

RECOGNIZING POLICE OFFICERS FROM MIDDLETOWN, PENNSYLVANIA, FOR THEIR SERVICE

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize four police officers from Middletown Township, Bucks County, Pennsylvania. Officers Ryan Morrison, Christopher Viscardi, Glenn McPherson, and Robert Compton were recognized for their service during three separate cases this year.

On April 5, Officers McPherson and Viscardi were in Doylestown, Pennsylvania, to attend a court hearing. As they sat in their vehicle, they noticed a man threatening to jump from the top of the Bucks County Justice Center parking garage. Both officers quickly jumped into action, and Officer McPherson calmed the man down while Officer Viscardi contacted local law enforcement for assistance.

On June 16, Officer Compton was able to track down and detain the suspect following two gas station robberies by the same suspect.

On July 2, Officer Morrison noticed a car tailgating him and flashing high beams, which initiated a traffic stop. During that stop, Officer Morrison found the driver was intoxicated and the passenger had several warrants and was in possession of a firearm and narcotics.

Mr. Speaker, because of the actions of these brave officers and their colleagues, Pennsylvania’s First District is a safer place. We thank these heroes for their service.

IN RECOGNITION OF MASON CHANDLER ALLEN

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Mason Chandler Allen. A fellow native of Levittown, Pennsylvania, Mason was an intelligent and thoughtful 11-year-old boy when he was diagnosed with osteosarcoma, the most common form of bone cancer, in late 2015.

Through months of exhaustive chemotherapy, physical therapy, and several surgeries, Mason was never without a smile or his amazing sense of humor. He even got to hang out with his football idol, Philadelphia Eagles’ star Darren Sproles, at an Eagles practice, and later, on the sideline of an Eagles game.

A year after homeschooling, Mason came back to school with the aid of crutches, and was excited to join clubs, launch the school’s newspaper, and was soon able to leave the crutches behind. Following a holiday season surrounded by his family, the cancer returned in January of 2017. And on March 11, Mason lost his battle with cancer.

Soon after, Mason’s family and friends founded the Mason Chandler Allen Memorial Foundation to increase awareness and funding to fight pediatric cancer. On September 28, the foundation held its third annual Steps Towards the Cure Walk in my hometown of Levittown. This walk benefits pediatric cancer research funding and supports quality of life projects for children and teens who are fighting cancer.

Mr. Speaker, as long as organizations like this exist, we can continue the fight to end childhood cancer forever.

IN HONOR OF FRANK TROUTMAN, JR.

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Frank Troutman, Jr., who passed away on August 10 at the age of 84.

A great citizen of the State of Georgia, Mr. Troutman was passionate with every endeavor he undertook.

In academics, he graduated from the University of Georgia, earning Phi Beta Kappa membership, attended the university’s law school, and remained a lifelong voracious reader and lover of history. He was one of the biggest Georgia Bulldog fans in the State, making the trip to Pasadena in 1943 to see the Dawgs play UCLA in the Rose Bowl.

Mr. Troutman served for 15 years as president of his family’s Castleberry’s food business, introducing modern techniques to the company, and making it into the business that it is today. And he was the first Republican elected to the Richmond County Commission, being largely responsible for introducing the Republican Party in the State of Georgia.

It would be hard to find anyone in Georgia more passionate about our State than Mr. Troutman, and I am thankful to have called him a fellow Georgian. His family and friends will be in our thoughts and prayers during this difficult time.

IN REMEMBRANCE OF JUDGE TOM EDENFIELD

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the life of Judge Tom Edenfield, who passed away on Tuesday, October 15, at the age of 80.

Born and raised in Savannah, Georgia, Judge Edenfield made our community a better place to live during his numerous posts in the judicial system.

Only a few examples of his positions include his work as an associate assistant to the district attorney, creating his own law firm, and presiding as a municipal court judge. Constantly using his position to help others as a municipal court judge, he would often suspend sentences in return for individuals attending a house of worship. He additionally assisted with the county’s drug court in order to help people reclaim their lives from substance abuse problems and avoid incarceration.

Judge Edenfield’s colleagues remember him as always having a smile on his face and a bad joke, along with being a mentor to all members of the bar. He will be missed throughout our
community, and I will keep his family and friends in my thoughts and prayers during this most difficult time.

IN REMEMBRANCE OF HARRIET KONTER

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the life of Ms. Harriet Konter, who passed away on Sunday, October 13 at the age of 94. Ms. Konter was truly a pioneering woman in Georgia real estate. Working in the industry for over 50 years, she became the first female president of the Georgia Association of Realtors in 1987, as well as the first female member of the Armstrong Atlantic State University Foundation, owning two local supermarkets, and more.

Ms. Konter will be missed throughout Savannah. Her family and friends will be in my thoughts and prayers during this most difficult time.

IN RECOGNITION OF PIERCE COUNTY HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Pierce County High School for being recognized by the Department of Education as a Blue Ribbon School for 2019. This prestigious award recognized approximately 350 schools across the country for their commitment to academic excellence and closing the achievement gaps among diverse groups of students.

To commemorate the award, Pierce County High School will receive a flag that is a symbol of excellence in teaching and learning. The school has been providing a high-quality education to its students for a number of years, and this is not the first time the school has been recognized.

In 2018, Pierce County’s principal, Ms. Dara Bennett, was named the Principal of the Year in the State of Georgia. Additionally, the National Federation of State High School Associations named their athletic department the third best in the Nation.

To teachers, students, and staff alike at Pierce County High School, congratulations on your awards and keep up the good work.

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 35 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.
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AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. JACQUELINE LEE) at noon.

PRAYER

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

Loving and gracious God, we give You thanks for giving us another day. Help us this day to draw closer to You, so that with Your spirit, and aware of Your presence among us, we may all face the tasks of this day.

Bless the Members of the people’s House. Help them to think clearly, speak confidently, and act courageously in the belief that all noble service is based upon patience, truth, and love.

May these decisive days through which we are living make them genuine enough to maintain their integrity, great enough to be humble, and good enough to keep their faith, always regarding public office as a sacred trust. Give them the wisdom and the courage to fail not their fellow citizens, nor You.

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 gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Mrs. TRAHAN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. TRAHAN led the Pledge of Allegiance.

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.

REMEMBERING ELLIjah CUMmINGS

(Ms. KELLY of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise today to remember our dear colleague, Congressman Elijah Cummings.

Throughout his life, he was a passionate and committed leader but also someone who would stop to show compassion and kindness to constituents, staff, and Members alike.

His life was defined, in his words, by “pain, passion, and purpose.” At just 11 years old, he and his friends began working to integrate a segregated swimming pool in South Baltimore.

He would go on to achieve many of the highest accolades in education, earning 12 honorary doctorate degrees.

Before serving in the Halls of Congress, he served the people of Maryland for 14 years in the general assembly, including breaking the color barrier with his election to speaker pro tempore, the second highest ranking office in the Maryland House of Delegates.

He would come to Congress in 1996. All of his contributions and service to this Nation could never be summed up in a few seconds, but it stands on its own. When the history books are written, I know his name and legacy will be proudly enshrined within its pages.

His passing is a great loss to his family and friends, the city of Baltimore, this institution, and our Nation.

I hope you are dancing with the angels. May you rest in peace, my friend.

CELEBRATING PARAMEDIC ROGER SWOR

(Mr. STAUBER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. STAUBER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate Roger Swor, a paramedic from my district who has dedicated his life to providing exceptional emergency medical care.

Roger is now the longest-serving street paramedic in Minnesota and was recently honored by the National Registry of Emergency Medical Technicians for achieving 40 years of National EMS Certification. This is a distinction held by very few EMS professionals.

Roger has answered tens of thousands of 911 calls in his career. He has done everything from holding hands with crash victims in his arms to delivering babies. As described by his nephew, Adam, who served many shifts alongside his uncle, “Roger is universally regarded as the paramedic you want to see when you are in trouble.”

On behalf of Minnesota’s Eighth Congressional District, I congratulate Roger on his recent achievement and thank him for his professional service. Paramedic Roger Swor, you are the best of the best.

IMPLEMENT ELECTRONIC SYSTEMS TO KEEP OUR ROADS SAFE

(Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the SAFE DRIVERS Act Introduced by my colleague, Representative Seth MOULTON.
CONGRATULATING STAFF SERGEANT DAKOTA BOWEN, NCO OF 2019

(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 of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, congratulations to Staff Sergeant Dakota Bowen, who serves with Charlie Company, 3rd Battalion, 39th Infantry Regiment, at Fort Jackson, South Carolina. He is the Army’s 2019 Noncommissioned Officer of the Year.

The NCO of the Year is the Army’s top soldier, with competition annually on a variety of tasks testing their knowledge, skills, and abilities. Staff Sergeant Bowen emerged as the top NCO of the competition to win soldier of the year as this year’s top NCO.

General Joseph Martin, the Army Vice Chief of Staff, calls NCOs the heart and soul of the Army. “When the Army desperately needs leadership, we turn to you, and you have never failed us,” he said in a keynote speech at the awards ceremony.

As a 30-year Army veteran myself with three sons who have served in the Army, I know firsthand that this analysis is correct.

South Carolina is grateful for Staff Sergeant Dakota Bowen and his commitment to American families, promoting the truth that freedom is not free.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th, or the anniversary today of the Beirut bombing, murdering 241 service members, in the global war on terrorism.

HONORING THE LIFE OF FRANK “TOWKAR” APPICE

(Mr. ROSE of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ROSE of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Frank “TowKar” Appice, a veteran of the U.S. Navy, avid motorcyclist, and active member of our community. He passed away in 2017, but he is not forgotten. I am so proud that we recently named a street after him on Staten Island.

Frank was the founder and chairman of the board of Rolling Thunder, Chapter 2 New York, as well as an integral part of creating two chapters in Brooklyn.

Frank always wanted to use motorcycling to give back to our community, particularly our veterans. Every year, he oversaw the Disabled American Veteran runs for Chapter 2 New York, raising over $75,000 for disabled veterans.

It is a fitting honor that his wife and children have formed a scholarship fund in his honor. This fund will continue Frank’s passion for supporting veterans, ensuring that children of veterans or students who volunteer with veterans organizations can afford an education.

This scholarship ensures that we will always remember and learn from Frank and his service.

Frank, we will continue to honor you and your work.

God Bless Frank, and God bless the United States of America.

CONDEMNING UNFAIR IMPEACHMENT PROCEEDINGS

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

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to strongly condemn the unfair, hasty, hyperpartisan, impeachment inquiry process being conducted by House Democrats.

Nothing, not even the cold, hard facts, will stop the partisan politics of my colleagues on the left from nullifying the 2020 election.

One of Speaker PELOSI’s committee chairs who she chose to lead this process promised years ago that she would find a way to impeach the President. This has been the plan from the beginning.

Certain minority rights have been denied to Republicans during this process, like equal subpoena power, a right that Republicans provided Democrats during the Clinton impeachment.

Chairman SCHIFF started this trend of dishonesty by promoting false allegations related to the President and Russia. Now, he has publicly mischaracterized his committee’s handling of the whistleblower inquiry and deceived the American people about his relationship with the whistleblower.

Democrats still refuse to hold a full House vote on their impeachment inquiry, yet they continue this baseless impeachment inquiry of President Trump instead of tackling the issues most important to our citizens.

I urge American people to take a hard look at the lack of transparency and accountability surrounding this unfounded impeachment inquiry.

HONORING GEORGE RAMIREZ FOR HIS CONTRIBUTIONS TO BROWNSVILLE, TEXAS

(Mr. VELA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. VELA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. George Ramirez for his extraordinary contribution to the culture and arts in Brownsville, Texas.

Mr. Ramirez was the longtime president of the Brownsville Society for the Performing Arts and founder of the Brownsville Latin Jazz Festival. He has been invaluable in bringing quality cultural entertainment to my community. Under Mr. Ramirez’ leadership, the Brownsville Society for the Performing Arts has produced hundreds of shows, concerts, and cultural programs.

He dedicated his life to making the arts accessible to the people of the Rio Grande Valley.

In June 2017, Mr. Ramirez established his own low-powered radio station, which enabled him to bring music to everyone.

Mr. Ramirez helped create a number of cultural events, including the Brownsville Guitar Ensemble Festival and Competition, the Brownsville International Flamenco Festival, and the Ancient Cultures Festival.

He also spearheaded the efforts to bring Handel’s “Messiah” concerts to Brownsville, Mozart’s “Requiem in D Minor,” Bach’s “Mass in B Minor,” and the annual children’s “Hansel and Gretel” opera production.

A group of students in the University of Texas opera program had never seen an opera, so he coordinated and funded a trip to take them to the Houston Grand Opera. He was very active in helping students gain exposure to the arts, offering several music scholarships.

Mr. Ramirez’ latest accomplishment was playing a vital role in the opening of the Brownsville Performing Arts Academy, a place that will carry on the tradition of Mr. Ramirez’ work.

STOP POLITICAL GAMES AND GET BACK TO WORK

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

Mr. GUEST. Madam Speaker, the impeachment of a President is a serious process that will have lasting effects on our Republic. It requires a transparent and trustworthy Congress to conduct a proper investigation because of the attempts to undo the will of the American people.

As a former prosecutor, I know that holding hearings behind closed doors is not transparent. Withholding information from the American people does not empower our citizens. The facts to the American public is not proper.

These actions alone point to an illegitimate process that will continue to
divide our Nation for the sake of partisan politics.

I ask, is the political gamesmanship worth letting our infrastructure continue to crumble? Is it worth ignoring the opioid crisis in our country? Is it worth undermining our democracy to attack our opponents at every turn? It is absolutely not.

We have real problems in this country that the American people elected us to solve, and we cannot ignore these problems while we focus on this improper and partisan political process.

Madam Speaker, I encourage my colleagues across the aisle to stop the political games so that we can get back to work on the issues that are important to the American people.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG PRICES

(Mr. SCHRADER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SCHRADER. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3, the Lower Drug Costs Now Act of 2019. It is clear that our struggling seniors are the right to negotiate drug costs just like we have in commercial plans, the Veterans Administration, the Department of Defense, and Medicaid.

Seniors should not be subject to artificially high copays and out-of-pocket expenses because of an out-of-date law that prohibits Medicare from negotiating prices with pharmaceutical companies. Price negotiation is a free market principle that our country embraces in almost every other aspect of life. Why should our seniors not have the same right?

H.R. 3 also limits Medicare part D out-of-pocket expenses to $2,000 a year. This aligns closely with how the private market works and a Senate companion bill.

Making sure seniors can afford their medicines keeps them out of the expensive hospital system and saves patients and taxpayers, alike, lots of money.

Finally, there is an effort in the bill to limit the inflationary impact on drug costs that have been on the market for a long time and improve price transparency so we can actually shed some light on what is going on.

This is long overdue. It is time for bipartisan and bicameral action on one of the most pressing issues of our day for seniors and all Americans.

FIND AGREEMENT ON USMCA

(Mrs. AXNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. AXNE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to continue to work with U.S. Trade Representative Robert Lighthizer to find agreement on the USMCA soon.

I visit each of the 16 counties in my district every month, and whether it is touring manufacturers, visiting with farmers, or stopping into small businesses, everywhere I go the message is loud and clear: Uncertainty is hurting our bottom line.

Agriculture is the backbone of Iowa’s economy. One out of every $5 is produced from Iowa agriculture in our State. This is why it is neither a partisan nor a political issue; it is simply the right thing to do.

Between devastating weather events, ongoing trade wars, and the EPA’s unprecedented abuse of biofuel waivers, our farmers have been put through enough. They are asking for our help.

As elected Representatives, we owe them the right answer. We must answer their call and get this deal done right and without unnecessary delay.

Madam Speaker, I thank my colleagues for the work they have done, and I urge them to expedite negotiations and finalize this agreement soon to make sure that we can make lives whole for the people suffering in the State of Iowa and across this country.

MINOR LEAGUE BASEBALL

(Mrs. TRAHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. TRAHAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today on behalf of millions of Americans to call “foul” on Major League Baseball.

This week, Major League Baseball is discussing a proposal to cut the number of minor league franchises by 25 percent. The Lowell Spinners, a Red Sox affiliate, is among the 42 teams being forced out.

This plan is a betrayal of the fans and players as well as stadium vendors and employees around the Nation. It is an affront to the people of Lowell who swung for the fences in building LeLacheur Park, one of the Nation’s best minor league parks.

As the World Series gets underway, remember that the minor league system produces the talent we see on the baseball diamond. MLB’s plan is way off base and will hurt so many communities across the country that rely on minor league teams’ presence.

Let’s call it a balk and get back to rooting for the home team.

THE NEW NORMAL: BLACKOUTS

(Mr. HARDER of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HARDER of California. Madam Speaker, I rise in frustration for my constituents in California’s Central Valley. Folks across my community are reeling from blackouts caused by greed, corruption, and mismanagement at our State’s largest utility, PG&E.

I am not the only one who is fed up. More than 1,000 people in my district had their power cut by PG&E, some for days.

Now the company is saying more blackouts could be coming this week and that it could be the new normal for the next decade. I refuse to accept that.

Regular people can’t choose to not pay their bills, and PG&E shouldn’t be able to abuse that fact by refusing to invest in their grid. These blackouts are happening because rich executives are giving millions in bonuses instead of investing in their crumbling infrastructure.

Hundreds of thousands of people lost power because of these executives’ greed. PG&E even proposed handing out another $16 million in additional bonuses this year. It took a judge to stop their plan. Meanwhile, their shut-offs are estimated to cost our families more than $2 billion.

MEDICARE LOW-INCOME LEGISLATION

(Mr. DELGADO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DELGADO. Madam Speaker, I rise today on behalf of seniors in upstate New York.

This August, I joined a forum with AARP in New Paltz on the need to address the skyrocketing cost of prescription drugs in our communities. I heard harrowing stories from seniors, many of whom are on fixed income, who have seen the medication they rely on triple in price.

The system is working against our seniors. Right now, qualified covered retirement accounts are included in determining income and eligibility under the Medicare part D low-income subsidy program, and this means seniors must choose between saving for retirement and lifesaving medication.

Saving for retirement shouldn’t jeopardize how low-income subsidies for Medicare part D beneficiaries are distributed. That is why I joined my colleagues in introducing H.R. 4655, the Enhancing Retirement Security for Medicare Beneficiaries Act of 2019, to remove retirement accounts from that determination and lower out-of-pocket costs for our seniors.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4655.

ELECTION REFORM

(Mr. HIGGINS of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Madam Speaker, this Saturday, October 26, early voting begins in New York State for the first time, expanding the window for voters to select their government representatives.

This country has long upheld its protection of free and fair elections, keeping the power and decisionmaking where it should be: with, and only with, the American people.

Foreign interference in our elections is real, and its existence is threatening the legitimacy of our elections, national security, and the democracy this Nation was founded on.
Today the House will vote on the SHIELD Act, adding further transparency in campaigns, stiffer penalties for voter deception, and further restrictions against foreign interference, including making campaigns mandatory reporters if there is any offer of foreign assistance in those campaigns.

Madam Speaker, I urge others to join me in voting to protect the vote of the American people.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG PRICES

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

Mr. RUIZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today because seniors in my district are walking out of the pharmacy without their medications after they look at the out-of-pocket price and say to themselves, “I can’t afford this.” They are not taking the medications they need, which jeopardizes their lives, and this is unacceptable.

It is their health—their very lives—that are on the line. That is why, when we are talking about prescription drugs, we must focus on lowering the out-of-pocket costs for seniors.

That is why I support H.R. 3, the Lower Drug Costs Now Act, because it requires Medicare to negotiate drug prices so that my constituents can get a fair and affordable price for their medications. It also caps the annual out-of-pocket costs for those seniors who require many medications or expensive medication.

No one should have to choose between buying groceries to eat or getting medications they need, and H.R. 3 will lower costs so seniors don’t have to make that decision.

BRIDGETON VFW

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

Mr. VAN DREW. Madam Speaker, today I want to share my appreciation for the Veterans of Foreign Wars Post of Bridgeton in south Jersey. This community provides a space for veterans to come together and connect with others, and these are other folks who understand the hardships and the rewards of service.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars meet monthly to share their experiences and bond with one another in Bridgeton. They also organize special services for holidays, like Memorial Day and Veterans Day, so the members can commemorate these days together.

In addition, the VFW reaches out to the greater Bridgeton community by hosting barbecues, community dinners, and other festivals to connect with their neighbors and sometimes raise funds for important charitable causes. I would like to thank the brave veterans of the Bridgeton VFW. Their service to our Nation is tremendous. I am overjoyed that this community has given them a safe place to remember their service together.

Madam Speaker, they are our best; they are our shining stars; and they are our heroes.

May God bless them.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 23, 2019.
Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Dear Madam Speaker: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(b) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on October 23, 2019:

That the Senate passed S. 1590.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,
CHERYL L. JOHNSON.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4617, STOPPING HARMFUL INTERFERENCE IN ELECTIONS FOR A LASTING DEMOCRACY ACT

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 650 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 650

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4617) to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to clarify the obligations of foreign election interference, to require evidence of foreign election interference, and to require the Federal Election Commission to report on foreign election interference.

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker, on Tuesday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 650, providing for consideration of H.R. 4617, the Stopping Harmful Interference in Elections for a Lasting Democracy Act.

The rule provides for one hour of debate, equally divided and controlled by the Chair and ranking member of the Committee on House Administration.

The House rule also excludes the amendment in the nature of a substitute that was offered as an amendment under a structured rule.

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker, on Tuesday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 650, providing for consideration of H.R. 4617, the Stopping Harmful Interference in Elections for a Lasting Democracy Act.

The rule also excludes the amendment in the nature of a substitute that was offered as an amendment under a structured rule.

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker, on Tuesday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 650, providing for consideration of H.R. 4617, the Stopping Harmful Interference in Elections for a Lasting Democracy Act.

The rule also excludes the amendment in the nature of a substitute that was offered as an amendment under a structured rule.

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker, on Tuesday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 650, providing for consideration of H.R. 4617, the Stopping Harmful Interference in Elections for a Lasting Democracy Act.
We, as Democrats, say that foreign governments should not be allowed to buy political advertisements in a clear and ongoing attempt to spread conspiracy theories and sow discord among the American electorate.

I feel that for reasons undecipherable, the Republicans will still vote against today’s bill.

In fact, let us pause here for a moment. The use of social media platforms to undermine our democracy is not only historical, but is happening today, as we speak. An article that appeared in yesterday’s Washington Post outlines how Russia’s intelligence apparatus through the Internet Research Agency continues to use Facebook and Facebook’s photo-sharing app, Instagram, to sow discord among the American people.

With alarming precision, they target our vulnerabilities, our fears, our baser instincts in an effort of tearing asunder the fabric of our democracy.

As it turns out, past is indeed prologue, and unless we want Facebook and others to be left to play an ongoing game of whack-a-mole against Russian, and now apparently Iranian, and potentially other intelligence agencies, we in Congress need to provide the needed support that any platform can fully meet the threat posed by these nefarious actors.

Madam Speaker, on this side of the aisle, we say that we should strengthen the ban against foreign nationals and foreign governments spending money in our elections, and we have put pen to paper to bring forth a bill to ensure that we do, indeed, strengthen such a ban.

Again, I predict that many, if not all, of my colleagues across the aisle will vote against today’s bill, and, therefore, against the notion that foreign governments should not be spending money in our elections.

Today’s bill is a direct rebuke of the Trump campaign’s sharing of nonpublic information with Russian nationals in an attempt to sow confusion in the American electorate. Republicans are ready and willing to work with Democrats on bipartisan solutions to prevent foreign interference and secure our elections, but instead, the majority is once again proposing a partisan bill that fails to put forward real solutions to these problems.

Let’s take a look at just a few of those provisions in H.R. 4617:

- First, H.R. 4617 imposes draconian limitations on online political advertising that will only make it harder for Americans to participate in our elections. It applies a model of regulation that is generally ineffective and one in which every Member of this Chamber could vote for. But my friends have chosen not to do that.

- Madam Speaker, we are here on another attempt by the majority to push deeply partisan measures to change America’s electoral system in response to the 2016 Presidential election.

Early this year, the majority pushed through H.R. 1, which they gave the misnomer of, “For the People Act.” The reality was that H.R. 1 was completely misnamed. It was not “for the people,” it was for the Democratic majority, by the Democratic majority in hopes of maintaining the Democratic majority for many years to come.

Similarly today, we are considering H.R. 4617, yet another misnamed and misguided bill aimed at changing America’s election laws. The majority has called H.R. 4617 the SHIELD Act. Unfortunately, this bill shields us from exactly nothing. It expands the power of the Federal Government, limits freedom of speech, and reduces the ability of the American people to participate in their own elections, all while failing to protect our democracy from foreign interference.

Before I talk about the problems with the SHIELD Act, I think we should be clear: Republicans stand ready and willing to work with Democrats on bipartisan solutions to reform our election system and protect it from foreign influence.

My good friend from Illinois, Ranking Member Rodney Davis, has proposed such a bill that would do exactly that. H.R. 4736, the Honest Elections Act updates existing election laws in a fair way. It strengthens the Foreign Agents Registration Act to combat election interference, modernizes online political ad disclosure, increases monitoring of spending by foreign nationals in our elections, and bans the practice of ballot harvesting.

These are the kinds of bipartisan solutions Republicans and Democrats should be able to come together on. But instead, the majority is once again proposing a partisan bill that fails to put forward real solutions to these problems.

Let’s take a look at just a few of those provisions in H.R. 4617:

- First, H.R. 4617 also attempts to add limitations on the ability of foreign nationals to buy online ads for electioneering communications. But I note this will likely have very little effect. The primary means by which Russia interfered in the 2016 election was through traditional social media posts and troll farms, which this bill will not impact.

- What is worse, the bill also expands the definition of what counts as “electioneering communication” to include, “issues of national importance.” This term is going to become so overinclusive that it will become meaningless. If a company wants to take out an advertisement talking about the need for jobs in their community, they may be shocked to learn that they have actually purchased an electioneering communication and are now subject to new rules of political advertisement.

- But instead, the majority is once again proposing a partisan bill that will not secure our elections, but instead, just simply make it harder for Americans to exercise their right to freedom of speech.

- What is worse, the bill expands the power of the United States Attorney General—hardly a nonpartisan figure—by allowing that political official to interfere in State elections, by any means necessary. What we need is intervention ability would mean that the Congress is once again expanding the power of Washington at the expense of the States.

Madam Speaker, a bill this flawed should never have come before the Rules Committee and should not be coming to the floor. Republicans are ready and willing to work with Democrats on bipartisan solutions to prevent foreign interference and secure our elections, but instead, the majority is putting forward a deeply partisan product that will not secure our elections and will only make it harder for...
Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for reminding everybody here that I was offered a chance by my colleague, Ed PERLMUTTER, a Democrat from Colorado, to actually ask Facebook, ask Mark Zuckerberg, a question of why they took that payment.

The answer, Mr. HASTINGS, is yes. I would like to yield to the Rules Committee. I specifically spoke with Mr. PERLMUTTER in the committee hearing room, where he told me that Chairwoman WATERS would allow Members who were not on the committee, like me, to ask questions, but I probably have to come back in about 5 hours.

I am hoping to do that. I am hoping to go back there later this afternoon and ask that question.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, in light of the process questions that the gentleman asked about hearings, I am proud of our Democratic majority’s record when it comes to regular order.

At the beginning of this Congress, we instituted a rule that requires hearings and markups for bills that come through the Rules Committee, and we have followed that rule.

In fact, the House Administration Committee had a primary jurisdiction for this bill, held three hearings to develop the SHIELD Act. Those three hearings took place on February 14, May 8, and May 21, and they are clearly listed in the House Administration Committee’s report.

Mr. Speaker, with that in mind, I include in the RECORD the House Administration Committee’s report.

Hearings

For the purposes of section 103(c) of H. Res. 6 of the 116th Congress the following hearings were used to develop or consider H.R. 2722:

1) On Wednesday, May 8, 2019 the Committee held a hearing titled “Election Security.” The following witnesses testified: Mr. Larry Norden, Brennan Center for Justice; Ms. Marian Schneider, Verified Voting; Mr. Joseph Lorenzo Hall, Center for Democracy and Technology; The Honorable Joelyn Benson, Secretary of State, State of Michigan; and The Honorable John Merrill, Secretary of State, State of Alabama.

2) On Tuesday, May 21, 2019, the Committee held a hearing titled “Oversight of the Election Assistance Commission.” The following witnesses testified: The Honorable Christy McCormick, Commissioner and Chairwoman, Election Assistance Commission, accompanied by The Honorable Ben Hovland, Commissioner and Vice Chair, Election Assistance Commission; The Honorable Don Palmer, Commissioner, Election Assistance Commission; and The Honorable Thomas Hicks, Commissioner, Election Assistance Commission.

3) On Thursday, February 14, 2019, the Committee held a hearing titled “For the People: Our American Vote.” The following witnesses testified: Mr. Chiraag Bains, Director of Legal Strategies, Demos; Ms. Wendy Weiser, Director, Democracy Program, Brennan Center; and Mr. Edward Warden, former student at NYU School of Law; Mr. Fred Wertheimer, President, Democracy 21; The Honorable Kim

We have a process here in the House for a reason. Madam Speaker. The process is set up to make sure what gets to the floor will address the problem at hand and will not harm the rights of the American people. Instead, the language in this bill is so broad that it does little to stop foreign political propaganda and, instead, creates a chilling effect on America’s free speech.

If the House had held hearings on this legislation, then we could have appropriately tailored language to address the real problem of foreign interference without affecting free speech.

In 2016, the Russians tampered in our elections and engaged in stunning misinformation campaigns in an effort to undermine our elections.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS), distinguished ranking member of the Committee on House Administration, and my good friend.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to come to this great institution to talk about this piece of legislation. I thank the ranking member and also my colleague from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) for a great spirited debate last night in the Rules Committee, but I still today, have to rise in opposition to the rule for consideration of H.R. 4617.

Last night at the Rules Committee meeting, there was bipartisan consensus that this bill has not gone through regular order. We did not have the opportunity to hold a single hearing addressing foreign political propaganda in the Committee on House Administration.

We are focusing on paid political advertisements, when the Senate Intel’s bipartisan report stated that “paid advertisements were not key” to Russia’s election cycle on digital advertising, the Russians spent $100,000 of that over 2 years on paid political Facebook ads.

This is relevant information. This should have been considered and discussed in a committee hearing before sidestepping process and rushing a bill to the floor that does not address key issues.

None of us had a chance to ask Facebook: “Why did you take a payment from Russia?”

“Was it in dollars?”

“Why don’t you tell us?”

“Why in the world did you take $100,000 from Russia and put overtly political ads online?”

At some point, companies that participate in the political process, we need to have them in front of us to ask them why; ask them how. But we didn’t get a chance to do that because the Committee on House Administration had zero hearings before rushing this bill to the floor.

We have a process here in the House for a reason. Madam Speaker. The process is set up to make sure what gets to the floor will address the problem at hand and will not harm the rights of the American people. Instead, the language in this bill is so broad that it does little to stop foreign political propaganda and, instead, creates a chilling effect on America’s free speech.

If the House had held hearings on this legislation, then we could have appropriately tailored language to address the real problem of foreign interference without affecting free speech.

In 2016, the Russians tampered in our elections and engaged in stunning misinformation campaigns in an effort to undermine our elections.
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Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for reminding everybody here that I was offered a chance by my colleague, Ed PERLMUTTER, a Democrat from Colorado, to actually ask Facebook, ask Mark Zuckerberg, a question of why they took that payment.

The answer, Mr. HASTINGS, is yes. I would like to yield to the Rules Committee. I specifically spoke with Mr. PERLMUTTER in the committee hearing room, where he told me that Chairwoman WATERS would allow Members who were not on the committee, like me, to ask questions, but I probably have to come back in about 5 hours.

I am hoping to do that. I am hoping to go back there later this afternoon and ask that question.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, in light of the process questions that the gentleman asked about hearings, I am proud of our Democratic majority’s record when it comes to regular order.

At the beginning of this Congress, we instituted a rule that requires hearings and markups for bills that come through the Rules Committee, and we have followed that rule.

In fact, the House Administration Committee had a primary jurisdiction for this bill, held three hearings to develop the SHIELD Act. Those three hearings took place on February 14, May 8, and May 21, and they are clearly listed in the House Administration Committee’s report.

Mr. Speaker, with that in mind, I include in the RECORD the House Administration Committee’s report.

Hearings

For the purposes of section 103(c) of H. Res. 6 of the 116th Congress the following hearings were used to develop or consider H.R. 2722:

1) On Wednesday, May 8, 2019 the Committee held a hearing titled “Election Security.” The following witnesses testified: Mr. Larry Norden, Brennan Center for Justice; Ms. Marian Schneider, Verified Voting; Mr. Joseph Lorenzo Hall, Center for Democracy and Technology; The Honorable Joelyn Benson, Secretary of State, State of Michigan; and The Honorable John Merrill, Secretary of State, State of Alabama.

2) On Tuesday, May 21, 2019, the Committee held a hearing titled “Oversight of the Election Assistance Commission.” The following witnesses testified: The Honorable Christy McCormick, Commissioner and Chairwoman, Election Assistance Commission, accompanied by The Honorable Ben Hovland, Commissioner and Vice Chair, Election Assistance Commission; The Honorable Don Palmer, Commissioner, Election Assistance Commission; and The Honorable Thomas Hicks, Commissioner, Election Assistance Commission.

3) On Thursday, February 14, 2019, the Committee held a hearing titled “For the People: Our American Vote.” The following witnesses testified: Mr. Chiraag Bains, Director of Legal Strategies, Demos; Ms. Wendy Weiser, Director, Democracy Program, Brennan Center; and Mr. Edward Warden, former student at NYU School of Law; Mr. Fred Wertheimer, President, Democracy 21; The Honorable Kim
Wyman, Secretary of State, State of Washington; Mr. Alejandro Rangel-Lopez, Senior at Dodge City High School, Dodge City Kansas, and plaintiff in LULAC & Rangel-Lopez v. County Clerk Peter Earle, Wisconsin Civil Rights Trial Lawyer; Mr. Brandon A. Jessup, Data Science and Information Systems Professional; Executive Director, Michigan Forward; Mr. Quentin Heastie, Acting, President, Institute for Free Speech.

COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

On Wednesday, October 16, 2019, the Committee met in open session and ordered the bill H.R. 2353, as amended, reported with amendment to the House, by a roll call vote of 6 to 1, a quorum being present. During consideration of the bill an amendment (Amendment No. 5) offered by Mr. Davis of Illinois and was agreed to by voice vote:

An amendment (No. 5) offered by Mr. Davis of Illinois to amend section 201(b) of the amendment in the nature of a substitute to insert “labor organization” after “a corporation” and after “the corporation” each place that it appears.

Mr. HASTINGS. In addition to those three hearings, the House Administration Committee held eight other election-related hearings this year.

I also want to point out that while it isn’t the primary committee of jurisdiction for this bill, the Judiciary Committee held two hearings on election security.

The House Administration Committee also held a markup on H.R. 4617. Several amendments were offered, including an amendment by the gentleman who just spoke, my friend, Ranking Member DAVIS, that was adopted by the committee.

This is how the process is supposed to work, Mr. Speaker, and I am hopeful that that will help clarify some aspects of what was brought up about process.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), my good friend.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his leadership.

I thank the House Administration Committee and the chairwoman of the committee, the Chairwoman of the Committee on House Administration, the gentlelady from California, Chairwoman LORFENG, because it is your leadership and your ranking member. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for managing this rule.

I want to emphasize, particularly to the gentleman from Florida, for his recitation of the number of hearings that were held, but I want to emphasize time is of the essence.

Right now, in many of our jurisdictions, there are local elections going on. In just a couple of weeks or more, many of us need to engage in either primaries or the signing up of candidates for the 2020 election. We have taken an oath to protect and serve and to uphold the Constitution of the United States.

Everyone knows what happened in 2016. Everywhere you go, local officials and State officials are asking us, the Federal Government: What are you doing to protect the sanctity of the 2020 election?

There is no doubt that, in volume 1, there is clarity of the number of Russian operatives contacting and interacting with the Trump campaign in 2016. There is no conflict or disagreement with the bias of those that participated, Russian operatives, in this campaign, Russian bots.

Time is of the essence. One of the most important elements of this bill that I applaud is the inclusion of my language in H.R. 2353, Duty to Refuse and Report Foreign Interference in American Elections.

I don’t think one American would disagree, not respecting any party affiliation, that if an operative from another country came to you to give you information on your opponent and you have a responsibility to report it to the FBI under the Federal election laws, which was my bill, Duty to Refuse and Report Foreign Interference.

We don’t disagree in that. I hope we don’t disagree that it is inappropriate to seek foreign assistance for a campaign, because one of the things of the Founding Fathers that I think is very clear in the Constitution and is very clear in the papers that surround it—the Federalist Papers and the comments of Benjamin Franklin when the audience was waiting, wondering whether we had a monarchy or a republic, and he said a republic, if we can keep it—that is that this Constitution and this process of elections was supposed to be unfettered, one vote, one person.

That is why we have had to perfect it with the Voting Rights Act that we are trying to reauthorize, certain aspects of it. That is why we have written laws to protect voters and election laws wherein we protect voters— one vote, one person.

So, I support the underlying bill, H.R. 4617, Stopping Harmful Interference in Elections for a Lasting Democracy.

Remember, Benjamin Franklin said it is a republic, if we can keep it.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Rule for H.R. 4617, the “Stopping Harmful Interference in Elections for A Lasting Democracy,” or S.H.E.E.L. Act and the underlying legislation.

I support this legislation introduced by my colleague, the Chairwoman of the Committee on House Administration, the gentlelady from California, Chairwoman LORFENG, because it is:

1. Creates a duty to report illicit offers of campaign assistance from foreign governments and their agents;

2. Helps prevent foreign interference in future elections by improving transparency of online political advertisements;

3. Closes loopholes that allow foreign nationals and foreign governments to spend in U.S. elections;

4. Restricts exchange of campaign information between candidates and foreign governments and their agents; and

5. Prohibits deceptive practices about voting procedures.

Madam Speaker, earlier this year FBI Director Christopher Wray testified before the Congress that foreign interference in our democracy is “a 365-day-a-year threat.”

This is outrageous; American elections are to be decided by Americans. That is why I am particularly pleased that H.R. 4617 incorporates the key provisions of H.R. 2353, the “Duty To Refuse And Report Foreign Interference In Elections Act” that I introduced in April of this year.

Madam Speaker, our friends across the aisle voted against Republicans voted against H.R. 1, the “For The People Act of 2019,” which, inter alia, would strengthen our elections, fight the threat against H.R. 2722, the “Securing America’s Federal Elections Act” or SAFE Act, which closes dangerous gaps in our voting security into the 21st Century.

Today our Republican colleagues have another chance to demonstrate that they take seriously their oath to defend the Constitution against all enemies, foreign or domestic.

Madam Speaker, on January 6, 2017, representatives of the Intelligence Community advised the President-Elect that the Russian Federation conducted a sophisticated campaign to subvert our democracy with the goal of electing Donald Trump and defeating Hillary Clinton.

The Report issued by Special Counsel Robert Mueller on March 22, 2019 revealed that the Russians effecuated their goals by selectively disseminating stolen emails, with the end of maximizing the adverse impact this would have on Secretary Clinton’s electoral prospects.

The Mueller Report further indicated that Russia’s misinformation efforts also included the dissemination of fake online profiles on social media platforms, with the goal of echoing and amplifying politically divisive messages, so as to sow discord within the electorate and suppress the vote for Secretary Clinton.

As the Mueller Report lays bare, the Trump Campaign knew what Russia was doing and welcomed that assistance, did nothing to discourage it, did not report it, denied its existence and knowingly and happily accepted the benefits of the hostile foreign interference.

While some may tolerate this as an awful but lawful conduct, none of the bill’s sponsors or supporters do because it is deeply corrosive of our democracy.

In April of this year I introduced H.R. 2353, the “Duty To Refuse and Report Foreign Interference in American Elections Act of 2019,” to close the loophole that if an offer of election campaign assistance from any agent or entity acting on behalf or in the interest of a foreign government.

This duty to refuse and report applies to candidates and any person working for, or volunteering with, a candidate for election to federal office.

This legislation also requires the Federal Election Commission to require that a candidate for election to federal office must certify that he or she is compliant with the above requirements on penalty of not more than 5 years in prison and a fine of not more than $250,000.

Madam Speaker, the threat to our country is real, as documented in detail in the report issued by Special Counsel Mueller, confirmed by the unanimous assessment of our nation’s Intelligence Community, and affirmed most recently by FBI Director Wray who testified in Congress that foreign interference in our democracy is “a 365-day-a-year threat.”

It is past time to write into the books of law the sensible and self-protective principle that
American elections are to be decided only by American citizens, and not influenced by foreign adversaries.

I encourage all members to join me in voting to keep Americans in control of our electoral process and elections by voting to pass H.R. 4746, the SHEILD Act.

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

Just quickly, to respond to a couple of points my friends made, first, let’s remember President Obama was the President of the United States when a lot of the activity that my friends are concerned about took place. In 2018, when President Trump was President, we don’t have accusations of foreign interference. As a matter of fact, it was a pretty good election cycle for my friends, and I congratulate them on that.

So, I suspect this administration has done a better job than the last administration in dealing with these issues. But I agree there are some things we can and should work on to improve our system, and we have offered—Mr. DAVIS chief among them—a variety of areas where we can cooperate and where we, frankly, agree.

In the areas where we can’t agree, let’s set them aside and have our disagreements. But where we can, let’s put things together that we all agree on and at least get those things passed. That would be my recommended choice.

Madam Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to immediately suspend the enforcement of the appropriations bill until the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2020 and the Defense Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2020 are law.

Madam Speaker, Congress has failed to meet the deadline for one of our most crucial responsibilities, to pass the authorization act and the appropriations bill for our national defense prior to the start of the fiscal year. We did not succeed in getting either of these bills into law by September 30, and now the Department of Defense is operating under a continuing resolution, which in no way adequately supports and funds our military.

Instead of pushing forward, the House is distracted by an unprecedented and unauthorized impeachment inquiry, which is remarkable mostly for the complete lack of transparency the majority has adopted. Republicans have repeatedly denied their constituents’ requests to attend depositions with witnesses and even to review transcripts and other documents. Moreover, the House is proceeding in this inquiry without ever taking a vote to authorize it or establish the parameters and ensure due process.

At a time when threats are continuing to emerge around the world, and our constituents want us to tackle important issues impacting their everyday lives, the House can ill afford the distraction this inquiry is causing.

Consequently, my amendment will require us to suspend the impeachment inquiry until such time as both the NDAA and the Defense Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2020 have been enacted.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the Record, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. JACKSON-LEE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY), my good friend, the distinguished ranking member of the House Armed Services Committee.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and join him in opposing the previous question. So that Congress can meet its most fundamental responsibilities under the Constitution.

Article I, Section 8 says that it is Congress’ responsibility to “raise and support” “provide and maintain” for the military forces of the United States.

Congress is failing in that responsibility. Not only have we missed the October 1 deadline, but we are currently operating under a stopgap funding measure that prevents our military from adapting to a volatile world, and even that expires in less than a month.

In this debate today, we have heard a lot about Russian attempts to interfere in our elections. Well, who is on the front lines of protecting the country in cyberspace as well as the other domains? Is it the American military. It is the Cyber Command that is funded for less than a month.

It seems to me that we ought to start with the first responsibility of providing for our military, which is on the front lines of defending us, yes, in cyberspace as well as all the other domains of warfare.

While this House and Washington in general are consumed by secret impeachment proceedings, adversaries are looking to take advantage of this Washington dysfunction.

Who gets caught in the middle of all this political squabbling? It is our troops, the very men and women who volunteer to risk their lives to protect us. They are the ones who suffer the most.

There are dozens of programs in every military service that cannot begin under the current stopgap funding measure. There are dozens of programs in every service where we need to do more of something, but we can’t do more under the current continuing resolution.

There are many programs we need to hire good people to work on. You can’t do that under the current stopgap funding measure.

Instead of what we get is political squabbling.

Now, I know there will be people who say: Well, the House has passed these bills. It is the Senate’s fault. It is Trump’s fault. It is somebody else’s fault.

We have enough of that squabbling, finger-pointing, and blame. What we need are results. Results will require the leadership of this House to focus on getting first things done first, and that means we need to get these essential defense bills signed into law. To get them signed into law, they have to be done in a bipartisan way.

Madam Speaker, I am absolutely convinced that, given the chaos and volatility of this world, the United States is going to be tested severely in the weeks to come. The best thing this Congress can do is put aside the political squabbling and focus on support for those people who are defending us, the American military.

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker, through you, I would advise my friend that I have no further speakers, and I am prepared to close if he is.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER), the distinguished ranking Republican Member of the Committee on Appropriations, my good friend.

Mr. GRANGER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” and defeat the previous question.

The House should focus on our constitutional responsibility to fund the government and provide for our national defense.

Current government funding runs out in 29 days. But instead of finalizing the National Defense Authorization Act or Defense appropriations bill, we are debating partisan messaging bills and distracted by an impeachment process that lacks any semblance of transparency.

Last year, Republicans made defense their highest priority. The Defense appropriations bill was law before the end of the fiscal year, and the NDAA was signed in August. This year, the NDAA has been in conference for more than a month, and the House last acted on Defense appropriations in June.

China and Russia aren’t slowing down their defense buildup. Why should we handicap our own military and allow our enemies to take advantage of our distraction? This is dangerous and shortsighted.

Our highest priority must be keeping the government functioning and the Defense Department fully funded. This House must focus on providing for our national defense and work with our colleagues in the Senate and the White House.

In order to achieve this goal, I urge a “no” vote on the previous question, a “no” vote on the rule, and a “no” vote on the underlying measure.

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.
Madam Speaker, very briefly, the last three speakers, including my good friend from Oklahoma, have mentioned the ongoing impeachment inquiry here in the House of Representatives, and they speak of it as being a lack of transparency. It is almost as if the Republicans are not in the hearings that are going on in this inquiry.

In my understanding, although I am not a member of either of the committees of jurisdiction, I have spoken with and briefly, the person who is the responsible person for ongoing matters at this time say that the other side is there. Their lawyers are asking questions. Members, if they choose, are asking questions.

So I don’t understand what they are talking about about a lack of transparency, particularly when the previous impeachments that were done were done by special prosecutors. This is a solemn process.

And while I agree with my colleagues about the National Defense Authorization measure, the simple fact of the matter is that we also have a constitutional responsibility to ensure that the executive branch of this government functions in an appropriate manner and does not do as they are doing: failing to respond to the oversight responsibilities of the Article I House of Representatives.

I rather suspect that that is just talk when they say that there is no transparency. I suggest to them to stick around. They are going to see some transparency real soon.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I want to begin by thanking my very good friend from Florida for what we always get, which is always a thoughtful debate, always professional, always civil. And even when we disagree, I always enjoy the exchange, so I thank my friend for that.

I was, disheartened, though, that the process in terms of impeachment that we are going through right now is remotely transparent. The American people can’t get in there. And, frankly, I can tell you, Members, under the rules of the Intelligence Committee, all of us, as long as it is not classified, are supposed to be able to get transcripts. We haven’t been able to get those things. So we will watch as this unfolds.

But my friends would have been far better to do what has been done in previous impeachments; that is, to hold a formal vote, to set up a process.

I do remind my friend, when we went through this during the Clinton years, the President, President Clinton, had the right to have counsel there, the right to cross-examine witnesses, the right to subpoena witnesses. Our friends who were then in the minority had the right to subpoena witnesses.

Now we are here. There is no process. It is very one-sided, very opaque, very obscure, and extremely partisan.

But back to the legislation at hand. The tragedy here is that we could work together on a variety of things that we both agree would make good law. My good friend, the ranking—excuse me—the chairwoman on the House Administration Committee, Ms. Lorraine, mentioned that last night.

There are actually elements in this bill which, I agree with my friend, are things we could work on together. There are other things that, whether we are right or wrong, my friend knows we will disagree with, and we will not accept and, frankly, the United States Senate will not accept and the President will not accept.

So it is a classic legislative dilemma: What do you want to do? Do you want to make a point or do you want to make law?

If you want to make law, you get to do the things that you agree on and that can pass the other Chamber and be signed by the President. So far in this discussion, I have a concern about making law. My good friends have been more interested in making a point than actually making law.

So I urge opposition to the rule on H.R. 4617 because it is deeply flawed and a political solution will not solve the underlying problems. It will not prevent foreign interference in our elections. It will only make it harder for Americans to participate in their own democracy.

It applies inappropriate regulatory schemes to online advertisement. It applies overly inclusive definitions that could make almost any advertisement a political advertisement and expands the power of the Attorney General at the expense of the States.

My friends seemed, over and over, to want to federalize State elections. We don’t want to do that. That is a big mistake. One of the best securities we have is that we have multiple jurisdictions, and the people close to the people make the laws under which our elections occur.

We can work together in a bipartisan manner and find real solutions to real problems, and I hope and I believe some day we will, Madam Speaker. But in the interim, I urge the House to reject both this rule and this bill so that we can actually advance, together, on something that can pass and become law.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the previous question, “no” on the rule, and “no” on the underlying legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I rather suspect that that is just talk when they say that there is no transparency. I suggest to them to stick around. They are going to see some transparency real soon.

Madam Speaker, I urge a “yes” vote on the rule and a “yes” vote on the previous question.

The material previously referred to by Mr. COLE is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 650

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution, the Committees on the Judiciary, Ways and Means, Financial Services, Oversight and Reform, and Foreign Affairs and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence shall suspend pursuing matters referred to by the Speaker in her announcement of September 21, 2019, until such time as the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2020 and the Department of Defense Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2020 are signed into law.

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes had it. Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. SCHRIER). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or which are objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

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

DEBBIE SMITH REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2019

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the
H. R. 777

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have access to the bill's text and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have access to the bill's text and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. R. 777, the Debbie Smith Reauthorization Act of 2019.

The Debbie Smith Act, named for a courageous woman who has fought for the rights of survivors of sexual assault, is critical to helping States process DNA evidence and reduce the Nation’s large backlog of untested DNA samples.

The law, which helped author and enact its original form in 2004, was developed in response to a crisis of untested DNA samples, a problem that we have helped to reduce but which, unfortunately, still requires our urgent attention today.

Over the past several decades, evidence from DNA samples has helped us solve an increasing number of criminal cases and has been particularly valuable in identifying the perpetrators of the horrible and all-too-common crime of sexual assault.

The use of DNA evidence kits in sexual assault cases is critical, and it is imperative that the evidence that is collected is analyzed as soon as possible. When the evidence is collected and processed, the DNA profile is added to the Combined DNA Index System so that matches against other DNA profiles can be sought, increasing the scope of the database.

By testing the DNA evidence left at the scene of a rape or sexual assault, we can identify perpetrators, which helps us to increase the likelihood of solving these crimes.

Obtaining some measure of justice and society to take violent criminals off the streets. DNA evidence also allows us, definitively, to exonerate the falsely accused.

Over time, however, crime labs across the country, regretfully, developed a large backlog of DNA samples that they had not tested, an intolerable situation calling for Federal action.

In response, in 2000, I cosponsored the DNA Analysis Backlog Elimination Act of 2000 (H.R. 777) to reauthorize programs authorized under the Debbie Smith Act of 2004. Unfortunately, I think it is the wrong one.

Senator CORNYN’s bill, S. 820, passed the Senate in May by unanimous consent. It has been sitting here in the House waiting to be acted upon for more than 5 months. But my colleagues have been too busy chasing impeachment pledges to notice or care. I offered an amendment right here at this desk previously on the floor, to move forward the Debbie Smith Act, but the Democrats voted it down at that time. The program expired at the end of September without so much as a glance from my fellow Democratic colleagues.

Unfortunately, I think it is the wrong one.

Senator CORNYN’s bill, S. 820, passed the Senate in May by unanimous consent. It has been sitting here in the House waiting to be acted upon for more than 5 months. But my colleagues have been too busy chasing impeachment pledges to notice or care. I offered an amendment right here at this desk previously on the floor, to move forward the Debbie Smith Act, but the Democrats voted it down at that time. The program expired at the end of September without so much as a glance from my fellow Democratic colleagues.

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

In recent years, the grants we have reauthorized the Debbie Smith Act in 2008 and again in 2014.

In 2014, I introduced the Rape Kit DNA Analysis Backlog Elimination Act, which provided $40 million to help States analyze DNA evidence; and in 2002, I introduced the Rape Kit DNA Analysis Backlog Elimination Act. This legislation authorized funding to help police departments finance the testing of rape kits to reduce the backlog. Working with my colleagues and with advocates, we maintained the pressure to address this problem.

Then, in 2004, I was the original co-sponsor of the Debbie Smith Act, and the Democrats voted it down at that time. The program expired at the end of September without so much as a glance from my fellow Democratic colleagues. Finally, House Republicans did file a discharge petition to force consideration of this important legislation.

Let me repeat that, Madam Speaker. Democrats were too busy on their crusade against the duly-elected President to engage in their efforts to nullify the will and vote of the American people to take up and pass a bipartisan bill to help rape survivors and victims and law enforcement.
Even today, all we are doing is ensuring there will be more delay in the reauthorization of this vital program. That is because rather than pass the bipartisan bill the Senate passed 5 months ago, the majority is bringing an alternative to the floor. In the ultimate act of hubris and partisanship, the majority is insisting that this body pass a bill with an H.R. number instead of the Senate bill that has sat idle here for 5 months.

When if we passed the Senate bill? It would go immediately 16 blocks down Pennsylvania Avenue and be signed by the President today. Instead, unfortunately, the majority is engaging, I believe, in a game of political brinksmanship and holding their authorization of these precious grant dollars hostage, grant dollars that provide closure and solace to countless survivors of rape and the family members of victims of rape.

The majority’s actions are putting an unwinnable game on getting this program reauthorized. And for what reason? I can’t think of a single good reason. Perhaps someone on the other side of the aisle can provide one. Is that what they want? They want the credit for the Senate bill. I expect and agree that the Senate bill is an important antirape legislation ever signed into law.

The results of the grant program speak for themselves. The National Institute of Justice reports that since 2005 Debbie Smith funding is responsible for 192,000, or about 42 percent, of DNA matches in the FBI database. So when it can match and convict a rapist, it prevents future rapes. The FBI says rapists will attack roughly seven times, so if you catch that person and put them in jail, you protect other women.

And as improved technology enables collection of DNA evidence, demand for grant funding has dramatically increased. We need this funding. This funding keeps rapists and other criminals behind bars. Even more importantly, the program can deliver some measure of justice to survivors of violence.

Unfortunately, this Debbie Smith Act authorization expired on September 30. And the Violence Against Women Act, which included an extension of the Debbie Smith program has not been passed in the Senate.

I truly want to thank not only Chairman NADLER, but also Speaker PELOSI, Leader HOYER, the entire Democratic Caucus for recognizing the importance of this grant program and moving H.R. 777 forward.

Despite its lapse in authorization, we have the opportunity to make sure that this successful program continues to help solve and prevent violent rape and protect survivors.

The Debbie Smith Act has always enjoyed broad bipartisan support, and I hope we continue that tradition today. I urge all of my colleagues to support the reauthorization of the Debbie Smith Act. It protects women from sexual violence. It is important.

And, again, I thank all of my colleagues that opposed this legislation in the past, particularly ANN WAGNER, who has championed fighting sex trafficking and protecting women in other areas.

Mr. CLINE. Madam Speaker, Debbie Smith’s courage to share her story with the world has changed the lives of millions, and the law bearing her name has helped countless victims of sexual assault see their attackers face the justice they deserve.

The importance of DNA evidence in criminal investigations and prosecutions is unquestionable. Since this program was first enacted, incredible progress has been made to reduce DNA backlog.

This legislation will reauthorize this vital program and will continue to support State and local law enforcement agencies’ efforts to reduce DNA backlogs and analyze DNA evidence collected from crimes.

As a former prosecutor, I know all too well how critical DNA evidence is to achieving justice for victims of sexual violence. I have been a strong advocate to reauthorize this program. I signed the discharge petition and spoke on this bill last month.

With passage of this bill today, we move a step closer to protecting people from violent sexual predators and allow justice to be served through our legal system.

It would have been better if we had taken up the Senate bill instead of pointing fingers and casting blame, but I hope that we will pass legislation quickly to get this grant money to the States and to those agencies that need it to make sure that justice is served. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Mississippi (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, Debbie Smith’s story has been the subject of partisan politics since 2001. In 2001, I invited a woman named Debbie Smith to testify before the Oversight and Government Reform Committee. Debbie was a rape survivor, and I remember being struck by her story of waiting more than 6 years for her rape kit to be processed. And Debbie’s story is not unique.

Across this country, DNA evidence collected from crime scenes sits in a backlog, because forensic labs and other violent crime victims have limited capacity or resources to process it in a timely manner.

So I wrote and passed the Debbie Smith Act, which at the time was called the most important antirape legislation ever signed into law.

The results of the grant program speak for themselves. The National Institute of Justice reports that since 2005 Debbie Smith funding is responsible for 192,000, or about 42 percent, of DNA matches in the FBI database. So when it can match and convict a rapist, it prevents future rapes. The FBI says rapists will attack roughly seven times, so if you catch that person and put them in jail, you protect other women.

And as improved technology enables collection of DNA evidence, demand for grant funding has dramatically increased. We need this funding. This funding keeps rapists and other criminals behind bars. Even more importantly, the program can deliver some measure of justice to survivors of violence.

Unfortunately, this Debbie Smith Act authorization expired on September 30. And the Violence Against Women Act, which included an extension of the Debbie Smith program has not been passed in the Senate.

I truly want to thank not only Chairman NADLER, but also Speaker PELOSI, Leader HOYER, the entire Democratic Caucus for recognizing the importance of this grant program and moving H.R. 777 forward.

Despite its lapse in authorization, we have the opportunity to make sure that this successful program continues to help solve and prevent violent rape and protect survivors.

The Debbie Smith Act has always enjoyed broad bipartisan support, and I hope we continue that tradition today. I urge all of my colleagues to support the reauthorization of the Debbie Smith Act. It protects women from sexual violence. It is important.

And, again, I thank all of my colleagues that opposed this legislation in the past, particularly ANN WAGNER, who has championed fighting sex trafficking and protecting women in other areas.

Ms. LESKO. Madam Speaker, the chairman said he wanted to remind me and others that the Debbie Smith Act was included in the VAWA Act that was passed out of the House. You didn’t have to remind me. Unfortunately, as he knows and others know, the VAWA Act was loaded with liberal poison pills known and others know, the VAWA Act was loaded with liberal poison pills.

Mr. CLINE. Madam Speaker, Debbie Smith’s courage to share her story with the world has changed the lives of millions, and the law bearing her name has helped countless victims of sexual assault see their attackers face the justice they deserve.

The importance of DNA evidence in criminal investigations and prosecutions is unquestionable. Since this program was first enacted, incredible progress has been made to reduce DNA backlog.

This legislation will reauthorize this vital program and will continue to support State and local law enforcement agencies’ efforts to reduce DNA backlogs and analyze DNA evidence collected from crimes.

As a former prosecutor, I know all too well how critical DNA evidence is to achieving justice for victims of sexual violence. I have been a strong advocate to reauthorize this program. I signed the discharge petition and spoke on this bill last month.

With passage of this bill today, we move a step closer to protecting people from violent sexual predators and allow justice to be served through our legal system.

It would have been better if we had taken up the Senate bill instead of pointing fingers and casting blame, but I hope that we will pass legislation quickly to get this grant money to the States and to those agencies that need it to make sure that justice is served. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding, and I express my appreciation to the manager of our friends on the other side of the aisle, my colleague from Arizona, and my colleague on the Judiciary Committee. Let me say, first of all, to CAROLYN MALONEY, if we go down memory lane, we have been together on this issue from the very start. We know when you had Debbie Smith come when she was willing to speak at a time that, I would say, was most concerning in the early stages of this. She was willing to come to the United States Congress and to share her story.
And, Congresswoman MALONEY, let me thank you for crafting the legislation, working with any number of bipartisan cosponsors, some of whom are no longer in the United States Congress, but I remember as a member of the Judiciary Committee being very closely aligned in supporting this bill. And so we have made great strides. And the over 140,000 cases that have been solved is a testament to the great need of this legislation. There is no doubt.

And of course, as we know from 2004—that is 15 years ago—that at that time, and continuing to a certain extent, the enormity of the backlog. Those of us who interact with law enforcement and interact with our district attorneys, we know that that has been an atrocious Achilles’ heel in providing comfort and justice to those who have been violated.

I am reminded of the forensic lab that we had in Houston; we had to do a complete massive overhaul for the Harris County lab to ensure that we were in compliance or that we were going after the backlog. That is the word that we should be focused on, the “backlog.” Backlog means injustice or no justice.

And certainly, as I have heard stories—just as recently as last night, I was on the phone with a constituent with a story that was just overwhelming, and she was trying to craft her next documentary.

And so this legislation is answering the pain of individuals who have come forward—and even those who are not able to identify a person immediately, and the DNA provides that opportunity—and it reauthorizes the bill. It ensures that grantee states and localities prioritize DNA analysis of crime scene samples, rape kits, other sexual assault evidence, and also carries cases without an identified suspect.

I am glad that this bill is on the floor. It is very clear. We wrote a Violence Against Women Act starting in 2017 that was a monumental tribute to this month, in fact, which is Domestic Violence Awareness Month.

We know that there are many around the Nation who have experienced and suffered this. In fact, there was a recent trial in Houston with a family that had to be very clear. We wrote a Violence Against Women Act starting in 2017 that was a monumental tribute to this month, in fact, which is Domestic Violence Awareness Month.

We need the Violence Against Women Act. And I might take an exception to the fact that this bill is a holistic bill. It is a law enforcement bill. It is a bill of improving services to victims of domestic violence, and dating violence and sexual assault.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, we have some very unique aspects in that legislation. We have counseling for men and boys, something very unique. I can’t view that as controversial.

We, likewise, have extended the protection of the arm of justice to Native American women.

And let me just speak to law enforcement, because I speak to them almost every weekend that I am at home: $291 million; and the creativity of prosecutors, local prosecutors, and law enforcement is amazing with those dollars.

So I believe that we can do both. We can continue to affirm and complement the enormity of the work of CAROLYN MALONEY, the years of work that we have worked with her and attacked the backlog, which none of us ever want to hear or see. We want no backlog.

We hope that this bill moves in the Senate, but it is not accurate that this bill, the Violence Against Women Act—there are active supporters of this legislation in the Senate, and I am looking at one right now. Working in a bipartisan manner to pass the Debbie Smith DNA bill and pass, to give relief to victims of domestic violence and others, the Violence Against Women Act.

Madam Speaker, I ask Members to vote for Debbie Smith.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER), my friend.

Mrs. WAGNER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO), my friend, for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support H.R. 777, the Debbie Smith Reauthorization Act.

Along with my friend CAROLYN MALONEY, I introduced the Debbie Smith Act with the support of the Rape, Abuse, and Incest National Network, RAINN.

Madam Speaker, I thank Congresswoman MALONEY for her untiring work to end and prevent sex trafficking and other forms of violence against women, which I also support, and for her willingness to reach across the aisle to get things done. She is a warrior for vulnerable women and children, and I am so proud to work with her on this important legislation.

Debbie Smith programs provide much-needed funding for crime labs to process DNA evidence and strengthen the national DNA database, which has over 17 million profiles in it. It provides justice to victims. Under Debbie Smith, Congress provides $151 million annually, to State and local labs for DNA and rape kit testing.

Better technology has improved our ability to test and track DNA samples from crime scenes, and this data is making a real difference in the efforts to bring rapists and other sexual predators of sexual violence to justice. The FBI DNA database has been used in more than—are you ready for this, Madam Speaker?—465,270 investigations.

One in five rape kits entered into the national database generates a DNA match pointing to a serial rapist.

Since the Debbie Smith program was created back in 2005, nearly 200,000 DNA matches have been made in criminal cases, providing justice to victims in cases that may have otherwise gone unsolved.

But law enforcement can’t keep up. Untested DNA cases have increased by 85 percent since 2011. In my own home State of Missouri alone, more than 5,400 untested rape kits are sitting in labs and in storerooms. We need the Debbie Smith programs now more than ever.

This legislation authorizes $151 million for Debbie Smith DNA Backlog Grant programs, $4.5 million for grants to State and local governments for training programs, and $30 million for State and local governments to create programs to collect and use DNA evidence related to sexual assault.

The Senate unanimously sent their version of this legislation over to the House in May, but the House leadership did not bring it to the floor, allowing it to expire on September 30.

Both Democrats and Republicans on the Judiciary Committee, along with Congresswoman MALONEY, have led the charge on this reauthorization. It saddens me that the Judiciary members had to file a discharge petition to get Speaker PALOOZI to put this bill on the floor.

This is not about personal ownership or asserting the House’s authority. This is about getting something signed into law.

I worry that the Senate version of this bill includes accountability and performance measures that are not in the House bill. If the Senate bill were being voted upon today, the President could sign it into law tomorrow.

Looking forward, I implore both parties, House and Senate, to ensure the Debbie Smith Reauthorization gets to the President’s desk as soon as possible.

Madam Speaker, I thank Leader MCCARTHY, Ranking Member COLLINS, Chairman NADLER very, very much, and Congresswoman MALONEY most of all.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in reauthorizing these programs that convict dangerous predators and help victims to get the justice that they deserve.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. ARMSTRONG), my friend.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Madam Speaker, only in Congress can we fight about something that I think we all generally agree on.

The bill the House is considering today will reauthorize the Debbie Smith grant program. I strongly support reauthorization.

But this law has a 15-year history of nearly unanimous support. Congress has held both Republican and Democratic majorities and Presidents, but more importantly, it has a 15-year history as a standalone bill.
So my question is: What changed? When did it become so essential to become a part of VAWA? And if it is essential to be a part of VAWA, then why did we pull it out, and why are we voting on it again as a standalone bill? On May 16, the Senate continued the bipartisan tradition and they passed a standalone reauthorization. We sat on that bill for months in the House.

House Republicans—I know; I was part of it. I was on the floor arguing for it before the last break, before the September authorization passed. We tried twice to get it voted on.

As stated by the founder of the Rape, Abuse, and Incest National Network, the House is using the Debbie Smith Act as leverage to get the Senate to pass other things that have nothing to do with DNA testing.

So, finally, today we brought the Debbie Smith Act to the floor, but even today, it is the wrong bill. The bill we are considering today has some serious flaws. Most importantly, it is making changes to the Senate bill that nobody ever asked for.

Just like the Senate, it extends the program to 2024. However, for some reason, we have inexplicably omitted accountability provisions that Congress has required for these grant programs for nearly a decade.

These accountability measures are important. They include mandating a report on the effectiveness of the grant program to reduce the backlog of unanalyzed DNA evidence in sexual assault cases. They require recommendations to enhance the grant program, and they require the National Institute of Justice to define goals of the DNA Capacity Enhancement and Backlog Reduction program and develop performance measures for each one of these goals. All of these are worthy.

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

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman from North Dakota an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Madam Speaker, I can’t think of an issue where accountability matters more than when we are collecting DNA evidence to get convictions of violent sexual offenders and to give some semblance of justice.

I am going to support the bill. I hope we get it back quickly. I hope we get to some resolution with the Senate. This needs to be done quickly as possible.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 8 1/2 minutes remaining.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, are we on the same page?

I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I am a little puzzled by what I am hearing on the floor today and, frankly, what I heard in committee this morning on a different bill.

The gist of that is, well, we passed a bill, but we know it is not exactly the way the Senate wants it; therefore, we shouldn’t pass it. We should only pass a bill exactly the way the Senate wants it; otherwise, it is only for show.

On this bill, look what happened. This reauthorization was included in the VAWA reauthorization, which we passed and sent to the Senate.

Ah, but that was political, we are told, because the Senate doesn’t agree in every respect with the VAWA reauthorization we passed, so they won’t touch it.

Well, I don’t understand that. I always thought, from the time I was in third grade, that they should pass their own version of the VAWA bill. If it is different from ours, we go to conference.

But no. No, we can’t rely on them to do that. They have to have a bill that they agree with totally, or they won’t look at the subject no matter how important.

Ah, but they introduced their own. They took it out of VAWA, and they did their own Debbie Smith bill.

Fine. We are doing a Debbie Smith bill because we don’t agree exactly with what they did. They put in some new accountability provisions. We have always had accountability provisions in the Senate bill there. It has always been the law. They are adding some new ones which we judge to be unduly burdensome on small providers. It is a judgment.

We should pass this bill. They have passed it in a different version of the bill. We can go to conference, iron it out. That is the way the process is supposed to work.

My Republican colleagues seem to think that we should never talk to the Senate; we should only pass a bill exactly the way they passed it. Or if they haven’t passed it exactly the way we want, he will want it and if we pass a bill differently, then it is just political posturing. That is nonsense.

This reauthorization bill is a good bill. It is the way we think it ought to be. If we pass it—their bill is already passed a different reauthorization bill. I regret that they didn’t pass the entire VAWA reauthorization bill, but we can go to conference. We can iron it out.

If someone wants to argue that the provisions in that bill are better, let them offer it here, but not be heard to say we should only do exactly what the Senate wants. That doesn’t make sense.

We are our own independent body. We were elected to do our job. This is the way we want to do it. This is the way we think the bill ought to be. We put it in the VAWA reauthorization bill. We have given up waiting for the Senate on that one.

They passed a Debbie Smith bill in a version we don’t entirely approve of. We will pass our own version. We will get together. We will see if we can agree on it. That is the way the process ought to work.

If we pass this bill, that is the way the process will work, and we are more likely to get a reauthorization bill than by standing here and saying: Don’t pass this bill. Only pass a bill—which we won’t do—exactly in a form that we don’t like, exactly the way the Senate wanted it.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I don’t think that anybody said that we have to do exactly what the Senate asks all the time, but it does make sense that, if a Senate bill has been sitting here for 5 months and it extends it, what we are doing in the House bill, plus it has accountability measures, that it would get done sooner and it would get signed into law sooner, and then the States and the local law enforcement would have the money sooner to get rid of the backlog of the rape kits. That is all we are saying.

So I don’t understand the reason we are just not doing that bill, except maybe that they want an H.R. name, some House Member’s name on it instead of a Senate Member’s name on it. That is all I can think of.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), my friend.

Mr. CHABOT. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 777, the Debbie Smith Reauthorization Act of 2019.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank our colleagues, CAROLYN MALONEY and DEBBIE LESKO and others, for their leadership on this important legislation to reauthorize the DNA Backlog Elimination grant program for another 5 years.

Madam Speaker, there are over 400,000 victims of sexual assault in this country each and every year. That equates to approximately one sexual assault per minute.

Debbie Smith was one of those victims; and although she underwent forensic examination, her kit went unanalyzed for over 5 years. The purpose of this legislation is to ensure that no other victim ever has to wait that long for justice again.

DNA analysis is an invaluable tool in identifying and convicting criminal suspects. The increased use of DNA evidence in criminal prosecutions has led to an increase in the collection and processing of DNA kits, which has led to a substantial backlog in the processing of DNA evidence, really, all across the country.
step in the right direction, this body really should have already considered the Senate-passed reauthorization so as to get it to the President’s desk.

Continued funding will ensure that law enforcement nationwide will have the resources they need to process DNA evidence, prosecute, and punish those who commit these heinous acts of violence.

Again, I thank Congresswoman MALONEY and Congresswoman LESKO for their leadership on this, and I urge its passage.

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

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

In closing, Madam Speaker, I will support this bill, and I urge my colleagues to do the same. While this is not the most expeditious manner to get this vital program reauthorized, it is the one that our Democratic majority has put before us.

I am very much in the habit of holding rape victims and survivors hostage to play political games, and it really deeply saddens me that it appears that our majority may be doing this.

We had the opportunity to pass the Senate bill, and it has been sitting here for 5 months. We had the opportunity to show rape victims and survivors that we care about their plight. We had the opportunity to send the Debbie Smith Reauthorization Act of 2019 to the President’s desk today. Instead, our majority has decided to squander these opportunities.

It was bad enough that the Democratic majority allowed this authorization to lapse last month. It is even worse that we are placing this reauthorization into the realm of uncertainty.

There is no timetable or guarantee that the Senate will act on this bill. The one thing we know is that if we were voting on the Senate bill, it would pass today. It could have been signed by the President immediately. Unfortunately, we are now only marginally better off than we were this morning with regards to this reauthorization.

In the rush to impeach our President, our majority appears to have forgotten what we were sent here to do. Despite the petty motives sometimes of our majority, I will vote for the bill before us today and show support for the victims and survivors of rape. I urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

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

Madam Speaker, it is critical that we do all that we can to prevent sexual assault and that we ensure survivors receive the essential services they need, which is why we passed the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act earlier this year.

And I would remind my colleagues that the VAWA Act, which included the authorization for the Debbie Smith Reauthorization Act, expired last September 30, 2018, when the Republicans had the majority in the House, the majority in the Senate, and the President.

So the fact that it lapsed was unfortunate, but it was also the responsibility of the Republican Party, which then had control of the Senate, the House, and the Presidency to get its continuation, which they neglected to do.

We continue to urge the Senate to do the right thing and pass the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act, which is why we passed the reauthorization.

And we will also, again, today pass provisions to reauthorize the Debbie Smith Act by advancing this bill today. In doing so, we reaffirm our commitment to this important program.

I, therefore, urge my colleagues to support this bill, and to continue to fight to support the more comprehensive measures in the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, as a senior member of both the Judiciary Committee and a co-sponsor, I rise in strong support of H.R. 777, the "Debbie Smith Reauthorization Act of 2019," which reauthorizes the Debbie Smith Act and the Debbie Smith Backlog Grant program for an additional five years, through FY 2024.

These grant programs to address DNA backlogs and provide DNA training and technical assistance on local, state, and federal levels.

It is essential that these programs be reauthorized so that the backlog of unprocessed rape kits can be reduced and then eliminated, and perpetrators of sexual assault crimes can be prosecuted and convicted.

There is an ever-present need to continue robust funding for programs such as the Debbie Smith DNA Backlog Grant Program in order to make sure victims do not fall through the cracks of the system. Women who have been raped have a right to expect police to thoroughly investigate the case and prosecute the offenders; however, many rape kits across the country are never even tested, and the perpetrators never face justice.

Under the Debbie Smith Act, not less than 40 percent of the total amount awarded in grants must be used for DNA analyses of samples from crime scenes, rape kits and other sexual assault evidence, and in cases that do not have an identified suspect. Madam Speaker, the number of backlogged DNA samples was in excess of 100,000 nationwide as recently as January 2014.

H.R. 777 reauthorizes for five years (until the end of fiscal year 2024) the following programs:

1. "Debbie Smith Reauthorization" grants for state and local DNA crime laboratories to address DNA backlogs and enhance their capacity.
2. DNA training and technical directed to law enforcement, courts, forensic scientists, and defenders.
3. DNA training and technical assistance directed to sexual assault nurse examiner/"SANE") programs.

In my congressional district, these grant programs have resulted in forensic laboratories being hired to clear much of the Houston Police Department’s backlog of untested DNA benefit from this type of legislation.

Just within the past year, decades-old rape kits that sat untested in Houston have identified at least one-third potential offenders in cases where there was sufficient DNA, according to the Houston Police Department.

In my district more than 6,600 rape kits have been cleared because of the funding made possible by the grant programs that H.R. 777 will reauthorize.

This record of success highlights the importance and continuing need to provide adequate funding so law enforcement agencies can conduct necessary DNA testing and training.

Madam Speaker, when enacted in 2004, the Debbie Smith Act was the first piece of legislation aimed at ending the backlog of untested rape kits and other unanalyzed DNA evidence.

Debbie Smith grants have played a critical role in states across the country. The importance of the Debbie Smith Act is highlighted by the fact that delays in processing DNA evidence can result in delays apprehending or prosecuting violent or serial offenders or it can result in wrongfully convicted individuals serving time in prison for crimes they did not commit.

Law enforcement has increasingly recognized that the backlog of DNA evidence awaiting entry in state databases can prevent law enforcement officials from solving many heinous crimes—which has made the Debbie Smith Act recognized as such a crucial program.

Madam Speaker, the DNA Initiative is an invaluable tool for law enforcement today, and it will continue to be a legislative priority of mine. That is why I am pleased to co-sponsor H.R. 777 and urge my colleagues to join me in voting to approve this critically important legislation.

Why We Also Need the Enactment of the Entire Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act

Although the country needs the provisions of the Debbie Smith Act, survivors of domestic violence and sexual assault need and deserve more.

The Senate must pass the full VAWA Reauthorization, which includes:

- Improving services for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking;
- Giving law enforcement enhanced tools to combat domestic violence and sexual assault; Making vital new investments in prevention;
- Helping to better protect Native American women;
- Preserving and improving housing protections for survivors;
- Strengthening the health care system’s response to domestic violence and sexual assault.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question was taken. The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.
Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion were postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the request of the Speaker, the pro tempore will make an announcement in the Chamber today.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The question was taken; and the yeas and nays were ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

So the previous question was ordered.

Mr. ESTES. Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 579.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. ESTES. Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 579.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. ESTES. Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 579.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. ESTES. Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 579.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. ESTES. Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 579.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. ESTES. Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 579.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. ESTES. Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 579.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. ESTES. Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 579.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. ESTES. Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 579.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. ESTES. Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 579.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. ESTES. Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 579.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. ESTES. Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 579.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. ESTES. Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 579.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. ESTES. Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 579.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. ESTES. Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 579.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. ESTES. Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 579.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. ESTES. Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 579.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. ESTES. Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 579.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. ESTES. Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 579.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. ESTES. Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 579.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. ESTES. Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 579.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. ESTES. Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 579.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. ESTES. Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 579.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. ESTES. Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 579.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. ESTES. Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 579.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. ESTES. Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 579.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.
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ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE  

So the resolution was agreed to.  

PERSONAL EXPLANATION  

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I was unable to attend votes between October 15 and 23 due to a long standing family commitment. While this would not have change the outcome below is how I would have voted on each roll call. 

Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 579 and "nay" on rollcall No. 580.  

PERSONAL EXPLANATION  

Mr. BERGMAN. Madam Speaker, The White House held a roundtable on the National Crisis of Veteran Suicide, which I was unable to make the first two series of votes. 

Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 576, "nay" on rollcall No. 577, "yea" on rollcall No. 578, "nay" on rollcall No. 579, and "nay" on rollcall No. 580. 

Mr. BERGMAN. Madam Speaker, The White House held a roundtable on the National Crisis of Veteran Suicide, which I was unable to make the first two series of votes. 

STOPPING HARMFUL INTERFERENCE IN ELECTIONS FOR A LASTING DEMOCRACY ACT  

GENERAL LEAVE  

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous material on H.R. 4617. 

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection? 

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California. 

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California. 
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We have been warned repeatedly about this. The former Director of National Intelligence, Dan Coats, wrote earlier this year in his Worldwide Threat Assessment, that as the 2020 elections advance, our "adversaries and foreign political organizations are doing it as we sit here." 
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fashion to influence U.S. policy, actions, and elections.

Earlier this month, the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence released a report showing how the Kremlin’s “information warfare campaign was broad in scope and entailed objectives to undermine the result of the 2016 presidential election.” This included using content to “push Americans further away from one another and to foment distrust in government institutions.” The Senate report also found that “no single group of Americans was targeted by Russia more than is the Russian group”—“information operations more than African Americans.”

Among the bipartisan Senate report’s recommendations, are for Congress to “examine legislative approaches to ensuring Americans know the sources of online political advertisements,” and to harmonize the rules that apply online with television, radio, and satellite communications.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. It builds on two other bills that strengthen the integrity of our democracy. In March, the House passed H.R. 1, the For the People Act, which included strong standards for ballot box election security, and provisions to shut down loopholes that allow foreign money, including from foreign governments, to influence elections here.

In June, the House passed H.R. 2722, the SAFE Act, which sets strong cyber security standards for election infrastructure and provides resources to States to replace paperless and other outdated systems with voter-verified paper ballot systems.

Now we are turning to another element of election security. H.R. 4617 closes gaps in the law that allow foreign nationals and foreign governments to launder money into our elections. It promotes full transparency of the sources behind online campaign advertising, and it codifies a basic norm that political committees should report offers of illicit campaign assistance from foreign governments, both to the FBI and the FEC, rather than welcome interference from foreign governments.

Title II closes loopholes and gaps in the law that permit foreign nationals and foreign governments to influence elections. It codifies existing FEC regulations prohibiting foreign nationals from influencing decisions about campaign spending. It requires the FEC to conduct an audit of illicit money in elections and report its recommendations to Congress after every election cycle. It prohibits foreign spending in connection with ballot initiatives and referenda; and it prohibits foreign spending on digital advertising that promotes, attacks, supports, or opposes the election of candidates—or in the case of foreign governments, political advertising during an election year about national legislative issues of public importance.

I will note that some of these elements received bipartisan support when similar provisions were included in H.R. 1.

Title III deters foreign interference in elections. For example, it restricts campaigns from sharing nonpublic campaign materials, like internal opposition research and internal polling data with foreign governments and their agents, or those on the sanctions list, which can include oligarchs.

It also includes the Deceptive Practices and Voter Intimidation Prevention Act—this was also part of H.R. 1—and prohibits knowingly false statements about voting and elections that are made with the intent to impede someone from exercising their franchise. It also provides mechanisms to ensure that state and local officials and the attorney general, as necessary, disseminate correct information in the wake of false information that might spread.

Mr. Chair, free and fair elections are the core of what it means to live in a democracy like ours. Free and fair elections are at the heart of what it means to be a citizen of the United States. It is our solemn duty to defend them.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, I said many times since becoming the ranking member of the Committee on House Administration, I have been willing to accept any amount of jurisdiction over election legislation in the House, that the greatest threat to our Nation’s election system is partisanship.

Why is partisanship the greatest threat?

Because when you have one side drafting partisan legislation to further their own political agenda, it causes inaction. When it comes to securing our Nation’s elections, we cannot afford inaction. That is why it is imperative that our colleagues across the aisle work with us to find a bipartisan solution to preventing foreign interference in elections.

Unfortunately, that is not the route that the majority party chose to take this Congress. We saw this pattern first begin with the majority’s H.R. 1. Over 700 pages of political initiatives to help them Federalize elections, then again, for the SAVE Act, a partisan election bill that sets a new standard for Federalize elections and take power away from States. Both bills were drafted without bipartisan input and rushed through the House.

Back then, I told my colleagues if they were serious about reforming elections and making them more secure, we needed to work together. But here we are again with another partisan election bill that has no chance—zero chances—of becoming law. This time it is the SHIELD Act, a bill aimed at preventing foreign interference in our elections, like what we saw with Russia’s misinformation campaign through social media in the 2016 Presidential election.

Let’s be clear; it is safe to say that no one on either side of the aisle wants foreign meddling in our elections. Let me repeat that: I don’t believe a single Republican or Democrat in this House wants foreign meddling in our elections.

And I want to be clear that there is bipartisan agreement on some of the intended goals of SHIELD. We should have increased transparency and political digital advertising, and we should use very limited authority for the處 for foreign nationals to meddle in our elections.

But this bill isn’t a serious attempt to address the type of interference that we saw in 2016, Mr. Chairman. It is jammed full of poison pills that the Democrats knew would make SHIELD a nonstarter. The SHIELD Act contains provisions that would Federalize elections, which as I have already pointed out, is the favorite solution of our majority for any challenge.

This bill expands the powers of the Department of Justice to allow the Attorney General to insert himself or herself into individual races at the Federal, State, and local level. That is a complete Federal overreach of States’ constitutional rights to maintain their own elections.

Think about it: The AG can come into your race, every State and local race if they—he or she—wants to “correct misconduct.” There are also provisions of this bill that I believe are unconstitutional and will have a chilling effect on our freedom of speech. For instance, we should not be proposing broad, vague regulations for disclosing online political ads that create unworkable standards for the American public.

Out of the $1.4 billion spent on political digital ads in 2016, Russia spent $100,000 over 2 years on Facebook ads. The majority of those were not even election ads, so it wouldn’t have even been regulated by the Honest Ads Act.

Why would we then overreach and threaten American’s free speech with this bill when it doesn’t even address
Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Chairman, we know that there have been foreign attacks on our election infrastructure. That is a fact.

Knowing there are those out there who seek to rob us of our democracy, why would we want the door wide open? Why would we not create a shield when our democracy is under attack?

The SHIELD Act, carefully drafted by my colleague and chair, Ms. LOFGREN, requires that political campaigns report any information they receive from foreign agents to the FBI so we can centralize information and stop attacks. Why would we not want to do that?

The SHIELD Act establishes strong penalties for online voter intimidation by foreign actors. Why would we not want to do that?

The SHIELD Act closes loopholes that allow foreigners to spend their money in our elections. Why would we not want to do that?

There are people out there every day trying to cast doubt on our elections. We have no excuse—not excuse—for not doing all we can to make ourselves less vulnerable.

This should be a bipartisan no-brainer, Mr. Chairman. I urge my colleagues to support the SHIELD Act to protect our democracy.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK), my good friend and a very well-respected member of the House Administration Committee.

The SHIELD Act establishes strong penalties for online voter intimidation by foreign actors. Why would we not want to do that?

The SHIELD Act closes loopholes that allow foreigners to spend their money in our elections. Why would we not want to do that?

There are people out there every day trying to cast doubt on our elections. We have no excuse—not excuse—for not doing all we can to make ourselves less vulnerable.

This should be a bipartisan no-brainer, Mr. Chairman. I urge my colleagues to support the SHIELD Act to protect our democracy.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Chair, I thank my good friend, colleague, and the ranking member for yielding this time.

I also want to say how thankful I am that we are in this body, in public, in front of the American people debating something that is very important to this nation, that at least this process isn’t being held behind closed doors, away from the American people like some other issues are being held right now. I am at least still thankful for that.

But here we go again. It is another attempt by our friends on the other side to bring a bad idea to fix a bad situation. This is the third attempt for a Federal takeover of our election system.

It kind of reminds me of a popular commercial that is on television right now about these young people in a horror show. There is something evil after them, and they are outside of this spooky, old house and are like: “We have to go somewhere to hide.”

One of the young people says: “Why don’t we get in the runnin’ car?”

The others say: “That is a dumb idea. Let’s go hide in the spooky shed behind the chainsaws.”

Here we go, running to chainsaws again, running to chainsaws getting ourselves in a worse situation. This would have done nothing to prohibit the Russian meddling in the 2016 election—nothing.

What would have made a difference is the Obama administration, which was advised that the Russians were attempting to hack into our system, that they were meddling. The Obama cyber-security czar, he brought it to their attention and pushed the measures, and he was told to stand down.

We did nothing within the power that we already have to try to stop foreign influence in our elections. That is where we need to be focused.

If this goes further than needs to happen by giving the Federal Government more power, more authority to take away the authority that has been given to the States to oversee their elections, then we weren’t able to address these concerns, this thing has been rushed to the floor with zero hearings. Let me repeat that: There have been no hearings, no fact-finding to get to the bottom of what would be the best solution to this problem.

It was a quickly scheduled markup that was rushed to the floor. And here we are again, working on a piece of legislation that would do nothing to fix the problem and has no chance of going anywhere in the Senate.

I suggest that we work together on a bipartisan basis to actually come up with a solution that works for the American people.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chair, I would note that I think this bill would have done a lot to save us from the Russian attacks in 2016.

I will tell you one thing. The chairman of the Trump campaign, Mr. Manafort, gave information and target data to a Russian agent multiple times while the Russians were buying ads. That would be prohibited under this act.

Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN), a much-valued member of the House Administration Committee.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chair, I thank Madam Chair for her exceptional work on the SHIELD Act, which is long overdue.

For 2 years, our colleagues across the aisle had control over the Judiciary Committee, the Rules Committee, and the House Administration Committee. They had no hearings about the sweeping and systematic campaign by the Russians to subvert and undermine our election.

The Democrats have brought forth the SHIELD Act. There is not a single paragraph of any of the words uttered by our distinguished colleagues declaring it is partisan.

Name me one provision in this act that is partisan. There is nothing partisan about it, except that their response to it is partisan.

Now, some of our colleagues said that this is unconstitutional. A takeover, a Federal takeover, I think we just heard the words uttered by our distinguished colleague from Georgia.

Do you know who engineered the Federal takeover of the American elections? The Founders of America did, the Framers of our Constitution. In Article IV, they were the ones who said...
Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD), a respected and valued member of the committee.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. I rise today with the strong support of H.R. 4617, the SHIELD Act.

Mr. Chairman, the world knows that our democracy was attacked in 2016 by foreign actors. We have a responsibility as a Congress to fight back against foreign cyber intrusions into our democracy and protect the integrity of our elections. The SHIELD Act does just that.

Mr. Chair, right now, our country is facing an existential crisis. The question for each of us is: What are we going to do? What are we going to do to defend the principles and the Constitution upon which this country was founded?

The vote today on the SHIELD Act will be one of those moments that, some years from now, we will all look back on, and each of us will have to give an account for what we did. We must take a vote to defend our democracy from foreign interference and ensure that every American vote counts. The remedy is to call him out, to denounce such conduct for the meddling that it is. The remedy is not to insert the government into our elections.

Mr. Chair, I fear today is to fail. We are a guest, you are not entitled to participate in our elections or in the debate that influences them.

That is especially important in a nation where sovereignty is vested not with the government, but with the people. In most countries, the government is the sovereign. Here in America, the people are sovereign. But in America, our sovereignty doesn’t govern. It hires help. That is what all of us are. We are hired help.

And once we are hired, the sovereign people then discuss among themselves what we are doing. In America, this discussion informs their decision over whether to keep us or to hire somebody else. That is a unique exercise of American sovereignty, and it ought to be off limits to all others.

But where I fervently disagree is with this bill’s use of governmental power to interfere with freedom of speech and association that is absolutely essential to the preservation of our liberty. Except for incitement to commit crimes, every person must be free to speak their minds.

If a foreign national inserts himself into an American political discussion, if they are in the United States, is it any business of ours? Should Congress be deciding who they can talk to, we will have cracked the touchstone of our Bill of Rights, and that crack will grow until it shatters the bedrock of our freedom.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chair, may I ask how much time remains?

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California has 18 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Illinois has 15 minutes remaining.

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

I would just like to note that it was election officials who won the Citizens United case, that, while the First Amendment protects political speech, disclosure permits citizens and shareholders to react to the speech. They were the ones, in the Citizens United case, who urged transparency. And it was Justice Kavanagh himself who pointed out that foreign citizens don’t have a First Amendment right to meddle in our elections.

Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES), who has done so much on our ethics and election reform effort.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Chair, I thank Chairwoman LOFGREN for her incredible work. Nobody has done more in this Congress to protect our democracy and lift up the voices of everyday Americans than ZOE LOFGREN, so I thank her for yielding.
easy maneuver. You decide: None of us will get on the bill. It will be all Democrats that are supporting it or voting for it, and then we can say it is a partisan bill.

The measure of whether something is bipartisan or not is to go out and talk to the people in the country. And this is one of the most bipartisan bills you could possibly put together, judged by what people out in the country want to see.

Republicans, Independents, Democrats coming off of the 2016 election said to this Congress: “Protect our house.” Not this House, the United States of America. “Protect our elections from foreign interference.”

That wasn’t just coming from Democrats. That wasn’t a partisan voice out in the wilderness. That was everybody saying it, including Republicans and Independents.

So the fact that the Republicans don’t want to get on a bill that Americans want to see doesn’t make the bill partisan. It means that Republicans are not listening carefully enough to what the American people want to see.

We have tried now, three times—three times—to get our Republican colleagues to support these basic measures that would safeguard the integrity of our elections. H.R. 1, the For the People Act, contained many of the same provisions.

I get it. I heard what you said: Oh, the bill is too big. It does these other things. We love the election security stuff—we can go get those quotes from the H.R. 1 debate—oh, if you would just do the election security or the ballot box security measures to protect our elections, we would be on that in a minute.

Well, you got a second chance, a second bite at the apple with the SAFE Act. I thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) for shepherding that through the committee, the SAFE Act, that would protect the ballot box.

But did Republicans vote for that to protect our democracy? No, they missed the second. Strike two.

So now we have the SHIELD Act to protect us against foreign interference, foreign money coming into our elections and trying to influence the outcome, misinformation campaigns coming from overseas, all this interference that we have to push back on, that the American people are concerned about.

So now you get a third chance to show that you want to protect our elections and safeguard our elections. This is the opportunity to stand up, support what the American people want to see, which is us protecting our democracy.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, there are too many comments I would like to make, so I will reserve them until we have a few less speakers. I am sure we will have a chance to debate some of the issues that my good friend and colleague from Maryland brought up.

Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from the great State of Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH).

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman so much for yielding to me.

Mr. Chair, I would say that, if I were in a court of law, I would tell you in advance that I am about to make an argument that is conditionally relevant, meaning: Bear with me. It will make sense when I get to the point.

So this morning, in committee—and I serve on the Energy and Commerce Committee—we were having a hearing and ObamaCare came up. About five or six times, people said, on the Democrat side of the aisle, ObamaCare is being sabotaged by the Trump administration.

Well, I started thinking about that, and I realized that that wasn’t really fair, that the problem was that this Congress and the Democrats in this House voted 262 action items for ObamaCare voted on by the Democrats. None of the Republicans in the House at the time—I was not here, but none of the Republicans voted for it. 262 action items were given over to the Secretary.

So now have the SHIELD Act, and you are saying: All right, Morgan, what does this have to do with the SHIELD Act?

I direct you to page 49, lines 10 to 25, Corrective Action: “If the Attorney General receives a credible report that materially false information has been or is being communicated in violation” of this bill, “and if the Attorney General determines that the State and local officials have not taken adequate steps to promptly communicate accurate information to correct the materially false information, the Attorney General shall, pursuant to the written procedures and standards under subsection (b)—which, by the way, the Attorney General determines—‘communicate to the public, by any means’—any means—’including by means of written, electronic, or telephonic communications, accurate information designed to correct the materially false information’.”

What are we about to do in this bill? Mr. Chairman, is we are about to give the Attorney General the power to come into our congressional elections and to come into any election and start running ads, to run robocalls, to get involved in the election process, because I wouldn’t want Attorney General Holder making decisions on my ads, and I don’t think my friends, Mr. Chairman, on the other side of the aisle would want Attorney General Barr making decisions on their ads.

But that is what this bill does. It creates a situation where the Attorney General is going to come into our districts if they think that one of us has issued a materially false ad and, instead of letting the voters make a decision as to whether or not I have done something wrong or my opponent has done something wrong or you have done something wrong or your opponent has done something wrong, the Attorney General is going to make that decision all by himself.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chair, I yield the gentleman from Virginia an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Chair, when you don’t like it, you are going to come back and say: Oh, my gosh, they are sabotaging the intent of the bill.

Well, forget the intent. Read the bill. Read the bill.

This bill has significant problems. It needs to go back to committee and be worked on some more. I appreciate it, but until this is corrected, I must vote ‘no’ to try to protect our system from having it being taken over by whomever the Attorney General might be.

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

I wonder if my friend from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), my colleague on the Judiciary Committee, Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, let me thank the gentlewoman for her leadership.

Maybe my friends have gotten a little bit of absentmindedness. This is volume I and II of the Mueller report, a distinguished veteran of the Vietnam war.

Page 174, volume I, it says specifically, well-documented: “On February 16, 2018, a Federal grand jury in the District of Columbia returned an indictment against 13 Russian nationals and three Russian entities—including the Internet Research Agency, IRA, and Concord Management and Consulting LLC, Concord—with violating U.S. criminal laws in order to interfere with the U.S. election process. The indictment charges all of the defendants with conspiracy to defraud the United States . . . three defendants with conspiracy to commit wire fraud and bank fraud . . . and five defendants with aggravated identity theft, Counts Three through Eight. Internet Research Agency Indictment, Concord, which is one of the entities charged in the Count One conspiracy, entered an appearance through U.S. counsel and moved to dismiss. . . .”

They were indicted on the basis of their interference in the 2016 election.

Let me be very clear. I rise to support this legislation, grateful that in
this bill is H.R. 2353. Duty to refuse or report foreign interference was language that I had that said that you cannot accept information from a foreign operative.

With that in mind, I thank the gentlelady from California for her leadership.

Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4617, the "Stopping Harmful Influence in Elections for A Lasting Democracy Act," or SHIELD Act and the underlying legislation.

I support the legislation introduced by my colleague, the Chairwoman of the Committee on House Administration, the gentlelady from California, Chairwoman LOFGREN, because it:

1. Creates a duty to report illicit offers of campaign assistance from foreign governments and their agents;
2. Helps prevent foreign interference in future elections by improving transparency of online political advertisements;
3. Closes loopholes that allow foreign nationals and foreign governments to spend in U.S. elections;
4. Prevents the exchange of campaign information between candidates and foreign governments and their agents; and
5. Prohibits deceptive practices about voting procedures.

Mr. Chair, earlier this year FBI Director Christopher Wray testified before the Congress that foreign interference in our democracy is "a 365-day-a-year threat." This is outrageous; American elections are to be decided by Americans.

That is why I am particularly pleased that H.R. 4617 incorporates the key provisions of H.R. 2353, the "Duty To Refuse And Report Foreign Interference In Elections Act" that I introduced in April of this year.

Mr. Chair, our friends across the aisle voted against Republicans voted against H.R. 1, the "For The People Act of 2019," which, inter alia, would secure our elections, and then against H.R. 2722, the "Securing America's Federal Elections Act" or SAFE Act, which closes dangerous gaps in our voting security into the 21st Century.

Unlike our Republican colleagues have another chance to demonstrate that they take seriously their oath to defend the Constitution against all enemies, foreign or domestic.

Mr. Chair, on January 6, 2017, representatives of the Intelligence Community advised the President-Elect that the Russian Federation actively engaged and knowing and happily accepted the benefits of the hostile foreign interference.

While some may tolerate this as awfully but lawful conduct, none of the bill’s sponsors or supporters do because it is deeply corrosive of our democracy.

In April of this year I introduced H.R. 2353, the "Duty to Refuse and Report Foreign Interference in American Elections Act of 2019," to impose an affirmative duty to refuse any offer of election campaign assistance from any agent or entity acting on behalf or in the interest of a foreign government and to report to the Federal Bureau of Investigation any such offer of assistance from an agent or entity acting on behalf or in the interest of a foreign government.

This duty to refuse and report applies to candidates and any person working for, or volunteering with, a candidate for election to federal office.

The legislation also requires the Federal Election Commission to require that a candidate for election to federal office must certify quarterly that he or she is in compliance with the above requirements on penalty of not more than 5 years in prison and a fine of not more than $250,000.

Mr. Chair, the threat to our country is real, as documented in detail in the report issued by Special Counsel Mueller, confirmed by the unanimous assessment of our nation’s Intelligence Community, and affirmed most recently by FBI Director Wray who testified in Congress that foreign interference in our democracy is "a 365-day-a-year threat.

It is past time to write into the books of law the sensible and self-protective principle that American elections are to be decided only by American citizens, and not influenced by foreign adversaries.

I encourage all members to join me in voting to keep Americans in control of our electoral process and elections by voting to pass H.R. 4716, the SHIELD Act.

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

I have some folks who are on their way here, but I offer some more remarks, so, while we are waiting, I will offer my remarks on some of the comments that were made by my colleagues.

One of my colleagues talked about bipartisanship, that this is a bipartisan bill. It is not a bipartisan bill.

Mr. Chairman, the majority party clearly had an opportunity to put through our committee and onto the floor a bill that had Republican and Democrat cosponsors. Instead of doing that, they chose to follow the exact same path that they followed in the past three years and other pieces of legislation: They didn’t want to put real solutions forward; they want to put political talking points forward.

They decided to combine what my colleague from Virginia just talked about, allowing an Attorney General to participate, possibly, in Federal campaigns. That should scare every American, regardless of whether you are Republican or Democrat. Let’s keep our elections run in the most safe and effective way possible: at the State and local level.

So it is not bipartisan. This bill is not bipartisan. There are 187 cosponsors of the SHIELD Act, and not a single Republican.

And that is a ploy? That is how we run away from bipartisanship? No, bipartisanship was what we were talking about.

Now, how do you get bipartisanship? Well, you have hearings.

Not a single hearing was held in the House Administration Committee where we could ask questions to the social media platforms that are going to be affected by this piece of legislation if it becomes law, I certainly would have loved to have asked Mark Zuckerberg.

I tried to go over today, to the Committee on Financial Services to ask Mr. Zuckerberg why in the world did Facebook or anybody at Facebook take a payment from Russia for overtly political ads. They took $100,000 in payment out of $1.4 billion in digital ads that were bought during the 2016 cycle. That check was cashed.

I don’t know if they wrote a check; I don’t know if they paid cash; I don’t know if they paid rubles; but I don’t think we ought to be able to get to the bottom of it.

I didn’t even have a chance to ask before this bill was rushed to the floor. Too many questions.

If you want bipartisanship, you have got to earn it. Bipartisanship by allowing us to have a seat at the table. That is not tough to discuss. It is not too hard to sit down and work out bipartisan solutions. There are only nine members of the House Administration Committee. We didn’t even have a chance to do that, to sit down and talk about our priorities. It was great H.R. 1 was brought up. That is the bill that was written in secret by special interests before we were all even sworn in. H.R. 1 had every single Member of the majority party signed on as a cosponsor before they even had a chance to read it. It wasn’t even introduced yet.

And let’s talk about what H.R. 1 did, what my colleague called strike one. H.R. 1. Every single Member of this institution who voted for that bill voted to put either your taxpayer dollars or corporate money for the first time ever in our Nation’s history into their own political campaign coffers. That is not a strike to vote against that bill. That is not a strike to vote against H.R. 1. That is terrible. Nobody thinks getting more money out of politics would be solved by those provisions.

The SAFE Act, well, when the majority decided to write their bill after we had one hearing, they didn’t even listen to their own witness about the efficacy of certain types of voting machines and the safety capabilities. They didn’t listen to their own witness. They still tried to create a process that would have made safe election machines and a paper backup mechanism which would have made them essentially illegal after the year 2021 or 2022.
We know counties upon counties and election authorities in this Nation that have purchased these machines that their own witness said was safe, but that would be a waste of their own taxpayer dollars now because somebody in Washington that didn't work with them, didn't allow us a chance to work in a bipartisan way, they would have wasted hundreds of thousands of dollars on voting machines.

My local Democratic election official in my home county of Christian County, Kentucky, worked with the local Republican county board to purchase almost $300,000 in election machines that if the SAFE Act was signed into law, that expense would have lit 300 grand up with a match. That is wrong. Let's talk to our local election officials. I do. That is certainly not strike two. I think that is another home run, too.

Now the SHIELD Act. Again, I said it is not bipartisan, 137 cosponsors, all Democrats. We want to talk about bipartisanship, Mr. Chair, we can talk all we want. I want to see some action. I haven't seen some action. We talked in the Rules Committee last night about no hearings, no ability to question witnesses together, nobody, and I mean nobody, in this institution, no one wants foreign interference. You want a bipartisan bill? Our next colleague who is going to talk was a co-sponsor of a bipartisan bill that could have come to the floor, but we weren't given the chance.

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. KILMER), who is a leader in the Honest Ads Act.

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank Congresswoman LOFGREN for yielding and for her leadership on this critical election security package.

Mr. Chairman, foreign interests shouldn't be able to influence American elections, period. That is not a Democratic notion. It is not a Republican notion. That is an American notion. We know that there is an election just a year away, and we know that just this week one of the world's most prominent social media companies acknowledged that Russia, Iran, China, and other adversaries are actively working to interfere in our next elections.

This is a no-brainer. It is time to take real action to fix loopholes and protect our elections from foreign interference. That is why the SHIELD Act is so important. There is a ton in this bill, and I am proud that many of the components of the SHIELD Act are based on bills the New Democratic Coalition endorsed, among them the Honest Ads Act.

Right now if a candidate or a group runs political ads on television that is publicly available information. The public and the press are able to access that information on who is buying the ad, how much they are paying. Same thing on radio. But that is not true on social media. If an entity buys ads on social media, there are no disclosure requirements under the law, even though we know foreign adversaries are seeking to buy online ads.

The Honest Ads Act would change that, and that is why it is a bipartisan bill; 18 Democratic sponsors, 18 Republican sponsors, the chair of Senate Judiciary, the vice chair of the Intelligence Committee.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Chairman, they see this as a way to our democracy and our national security. To enable law enforcement and the press and others to better detect and investigate foreign involvement in our elections.

The House has a choice to make, a choice to keep loopholes open and continue to see threats against our democracy or a choice to take action and pass the SHIELD Act. I am proud to be a sponsor of this bill.

I thank CHICAGO and her team for their hard work on this, and I am confident the House will make the right choice and pass this bill.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I will tell you, my colleague from the great State of Washington, you can't get much more bipartisan than Mr. KILMER. I certainly wish we would have signed the same discussing the floor that my colleague spoke about that had an even number of Republican and Democratic cosponsors, but unfortunately, we don't have the opportunity to do that, Mr. Chairman. Unfortunately, we are watching poison pills like the one that my colleague from Virginia spoke about where an attorney general can come in and decide to correct the record on Federal elections. I think that for any American. That is not a solution.

I do believe that we will see this bill passed. I am not proud that this bill is going to pass, because this bill is not going to be strong now.

And I know my good friend and colleague, the chairperson of the House Administration Committee, have discussed a couple of times about Supreme Court Justice Kavanaugh. I think her and I agree with Justice Kavanaugh, that foreign bad actors, they don't have freedom of speech protections in the United States of America. But the sad fact, Mr. Chairman, is that if this bill were to pass into law, it would do nothing to affect the bad actors who interfered in our 2016 elections. Nothing.

Our bill, the Honest Elections Act would. We will positively affect those bad actors, and we will make sure they are held accountable. If this bill passes, I believe the majority party would give more free speech protections to those foreign bad actors.

Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), my good friend.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The bill under consideration is an attempt to protect our elections from foreign interference. That is a goal that I certainly share, and I think all of us share.

In fact, I tried to offer an amendment to the bill that would have closed a gaping hole in the security of our election system. It is a weakness that basically rolls out the red carpet to foreign interference. Unfortunately, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle blocked my amendment.

My proposal would have prohibited the practice known as ballot harvesting, which is something that is only legal in a few states, where literally anyone can collect absentee ballots. In California where ballot harvesting is legal, anyone, including paid campaign workers and foreign nationals, are allowed to collect an unlimited number of ballots.

California Democrats have refused to put any guard rails on ballot collection, leaving it wide open to fraud and abuse by both foreign and domestic bad actors.

Every time I voice my concern about ballot harvesting, my friends on the other side of the aisle and the media keep asking for evidence of abuse.

Mr. Chairman, the reason there is no evidence of ballot harvesting fraud is because California Democrats have declined to put in any provision that doesn't collect evidence. If you collect ballots in California, you aren't required to give your name to the voter whose ballot you are collecting, and when you turn in that ballot to election officials, you are not required to give your name at that point either. There is no requirement to document the chain of custody of ballots. And there is nothing in the State law prohibiting foreign nationals from collecting and handling ballots. California Democrats have refused to put in any provision in California law prohibiting foreign nationals from collecting and handling ballots.

You know, in reality, the only rule is there are no rules. Mr. Chairman, this isn't the Wild West. We shouldn't wait for fraud and abuse to occur before we act. By rejecting my amendment, Democrats have not only left a door open to foreign involvement in our elections, they have laid out the welcome mat.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. LAMB), a star in our caucus.

Mr. LAMB. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I am proud to stand up in support of the SHIELD Act, which incorporates my bill, H.R. 4703, The DEFEND Act. The DEFEND Act, as incorporated here, would forbid paid internet activity by foreign actors, foreign political parties, and foreign intelligence services and the like.

This is a problem because in 2016 across Pennsylvania users of social
Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. Mr. Chairman, people in small towns and cities in my home State of Minnesota and in neighborhoods all across the Nation are being targeted for manipulation.

Foreign governments have found a weakness in our national security. They are exploiting it by using social media platforms to influence Americans, with the hope that they will vote for foreign interests, not American interests.

Democrats and Republicans need to come together now—to do something about it. It is what our Founders—Washington, Adams, Jefferson, Madison, and others—would have demanded.

That is why I am proud to support the SHIELD Act, an important legislative package that includes my bill, the Firewall Act, that simply prevents foreign nationals from paying for online political advertisements, something to which my distinguished colleague from Illinois referred just moments ago.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this historic and necessary package and help us build a wall, a digital wall, to protect Americans from foreign interference in our elections.

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

Mr. Chair, I thank my colleagues for their comments today.

Look, there is a lot of activity and the opportunity to come to this floor and debate very important issues, and there are no more important issues than protecting the validity and safety of our election system here in this institution in the great United States of America.

You know what? We heard a lot about this process not being bipartisan, Mr. Chairman. Well, let’s talk about what we have done bipartisan manner to protect our elections.

When Republicans were in charge of this institution, we worked in a bipartisan fashion to actually appropriate over $300 million to go to our States, to work with our local officials, to partner with the Department of Homeland Security to ensure that our election infrastructure is safer than it was in 2016.

We all learned the lessons of 2016, and we worked together to put solutions on the table.

That is exactly what we should be doing here. But on the SHIELD Act, unfortunately, the Democratic majority did not allow us a seat at the table. You know, you go to my home State of Illinois, where they have been raving about their partnership with this administration’s Department of Homeland Security, and look at the 2018 election cycle. We had record turnout in a midterm election, and not one incident of interference has been brought forth. So it looks like we have done something good together in a bipartisan fashion in the past.

I certainly hope, Mr. Chair, we could do that in the future.

Many of the provisions that my colleagues talked about and that I spoke about are just simply too egregious for us to support. We want to support a bill that has proper hearings, goes through regular order, and provides an opportunity for Republicans and Democrats to work together, just like we did to protect America’s election systems for the 2018 election cycle.

I want to see results, Mr. Chair. I am not seeing results with the SHIELD Act.

Let’s come together. Let’s take another swing, take another crack at the bat. Let’s hit another home run together. Because according to my count right now, that bipartisan investment of $300-plus million that we worked together on, that is a grand slam. Let’s start working on some more grand slams together.

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

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

Mr. Chair, I am disappointed that, apparently, we are not going to get support for this important bill from at least the ranking member and some of the Members who have spoken today on the other side of the aisle.

There are no poison pills in this bill, and much of the bill is made up of bills that had bipartisan support.

It is interesting to hear that somehow this is partisan because the Republican leadership refuses to step forward to confront the danger that we face from Russian interference in our elections and the possible interference from other nations. We have been told by the FBI that might include Iran as well as Turkey.

I listened carefully to my friend, the ranking member, about the money that was appropriated—appropriated—appropriated; we supported that—in the last Congress for election security. Democrats included $600 million this year for election security. We sent it to the Senate, and unlike last year, they now are refusing to act.

I remember back in law school that I was told by one of my professors, who I liked so much, that if you can’t argue the law and you can’t argue the facts, argue a lot. I think that is some of what we heard today.

We have had some hearings on these issues, three in the House Administration Committee. Although the Elections Subcommittee, which has been so active, did not focus entirely on these issues, it did touch also on these issues, in fact, just earlier this week. In the House Administration Committee, there have been 11 of these hearings.

To say that this bill threatens First Amendment rights is certainly incorrect. Now, I value the ACLU. We work with them very closely on a variety of issues, including the role of due process in immigration, and they have an important role in American society. But when it comes to campaign finance reform, they have a long history of opposing laws that regulate the raising
and spending of money to influence elections.

The ACLU filed an amicus brief in support of the Citizens United case. They opposed the effort by the Congress to get rid of the dark money in our elections. They, I think, misunderstand the issue of free speech when it comes to foreign governments.

I will quote the entire thing again that Justice Kavanagh wrote: ‘‘The United States has a compelling interest in the perpetuation and advancement of American democracy. We, as I mentioned earlier, in this country. I think it is essential for our democracy. We have had a disclosure regime that the Senate cares so little about preventing foreign influence over the U.S. political process. We don’t have to worry about whether the Russian trolls’ rights to free speech are being violated when we keep them from interfering in our elections because we have a compelling interest to keep the Russians and others from trying to influence our elections to hurt our country. We have a right to defend ourselves from them, and the SHIELD Act does that.

I would like to note also that elements in this bill would have prevented some of the conduct or problems that occurred in the 2016 election. I was interested that my colleague expressed concern that we didn’t hear from some of the platforms, that we didn’t hear from Mark Zuckerberg. He is correct. We did not call Facebook into the House Administration Committee. Frankly, if they had said, ‘‘We don’t want to do this,’’ I would have said, ‘‘Too bad.’’

We need to set some rules that prevent the lack of responsibility on the part of some of these platforms. They accepted money from Russian influencers to place ads to harm our democracy. This bill requires them to make a reasonable effort to find out that the ads that are being placed are not actually coming from our foreign adversaries.

We, as I mentioned earlier, in this bill directly prohibit the sharing of sensitive campaign information by American campaigns with foreign actors. That happened in the 2016 election. We had the chairman of the Trump campaign, Mr. Manafort, sharing internal polling data with a Russian agent, sharing the playbook for the States at play with a Russian agent.

I have wondered a lot about what was going on there. I didn’t get an answer to that, but this bill makes that impermissible. This bill makes that a crime.

It also requires campaigns to report to the FBI when they have been contacted by a foreign campaign. We all know now that the Russians contacted the Trump campaign, and the President’s son said: ‘‘If it is what you say, I love it.’’ They supposedly had dirt on the opponent. They were going to funnel information into the campaign. Did the campaign tell the FBI? No, they did not.

Well, if this bill had passed, there would have been a requirement to notify the FEC and the FBI that the Russians were trying to interfere in the campaign.

Now, I would think that would be something that most people would think we should do anyway, that we shouldn’t need a law to require it. But, apparently, we do, and this bill would include that.

I want to mention the Honest Ads Act. The Honest Ads Act has been introduced with a broad bipartisan group to make sure that there is disclosure.

We have had a disclosure regime when it comes to broadcast TV and radio for a long time, but it did not extend to the digital advertising environment. That is a mistake because as information migrates to the digital world, we need to have disclosure there, too. The Honest Ads Act does that. It is incorporated in the SHIELD Act.

It is important. It requires the platforms to maintain copies of the ads for 4 years. It requires that there be a disclosure of who is paying for it. The American people have a right to know who is trying to influence them online, just as they do in TV broadcasting. Does it make a difference? Yes, it does. I remember in my State of California, a number of years ago, there was an initiative to control smoking in restaurants. It was polling at, like, 80 percent, something of that nature. Then it came out that the backers of the initiative were the tobacco companies. They were doing it to undercut local ordinances that were stricter than what they were trying to put into place at the State level.

Support for the initiative dropped like a stone because people aren’t stupid. They know that they have to consider the source of the information when they are voting.

The American voters have a right to know who is spending money to influence them.

I would like to say that this measure deserves the support of every Member of this body. To say that the Senate will take it up—I would hate to think that the Senate cares so little about protecting our country from foreign influence that they would simply say no. Mr. Chair, I urge adoption of this bill. I think it is important for our country. I think it is essential for our democracy.

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

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on House Administration, the bill, so framed as to be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116–35, modified by the amendment printed in part A of House Report 116–253. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 4617

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) Short Title—The Act may be cited as the ‘‘Stopping Harmful Interference in Elections for a Lasting Democracy Act’’ or the ‘‘SHIELD Act’’.

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

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—ENHANCED REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

Subtitle A—Establishing Duty to Report Foreign Election Interference

Sec. 101. Federal campaign reporting of foreign contact.

Sec. 102. Federal campaign foreign contact reporting compliance system.

Sec. 103. Criminal penalties.

Sec. 104. Rule of construction.

Subtitle B—Strengthening Oversight of Online Political Advertising

Sec. 111. Short title.

Sec. 112. Purpose.

Sec. 113. Expansion of definition of public communication.

Sec. 114. Expansion of definition of electioneering communication.

Sec. 115. Application of electioneering communication requirements to online communications.

Sec. 116. Political record requirements for online platforms.

Sec. 117. Preventing contributions, expenditures, independent expenditures, and disbursements for electioneering communications by foreign nationals in the form of online advertising.

TITLE II—CLOSING LOOHPHLES ALLOWING SPENDING BY FOREIGN NATIONALS IN ELECTIONS

Sec. 201. Clarification of prohibition on participation by foreign nationals in election-related activities.

Sec. 202. Clarification of application of foreign money ban to certain disbursements and expenditures.

Sec. 203. Audit and report on illicit foreign money in Federal elections.

Sec. 204. Prohibition on contributions and donations by foreign nationals in connection with ballot initiatives and referenda.

Sec. 205. Expansion of limitations on foreign nationals participating in political advertising.

TITLE III—DETERRING FOREIGN INTERFERENCE IN ELECTIONS

Subtitle A—Deterrence Under Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971

Sec. 301. Restrictions on exchange of campaign information between candidates and foreign powers.

Sec. 302. Clarification of standard for determining existence of coordination between campaigns and outside interests.

Subtitle B—Prohibiting Deceptive Practices and Preventing Voter Intimidation

Sec. 311. Short title.

Sec. 312. Prohibition on deceptive practices in Federal elections.
Subtitle A—Establishing Duty to Report Foreign Election Interference

SEC. 101. FEDERAL CAMPAIGN REPORTING OF FOREIGN CONTACTS.

(a) INITIAL NOTICE.

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 304 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30104) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(i) Disclosure of Reportable Foreign Contacts.—

"(I) Committee Obligation to Notify.—Not later than 1 week after a reportable foreign contact, each political committee shall notify the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Commission of the reportable foreign contact and provide a summary of the circumstances with respect to such reportable foreign contact.

"(ii) Individual Obligation to Notify.—Not later than 3 days after a reportable foreign contact:

"(A) each candidate shall notify the treasurer or other designated official of the principal campaign committee of such candidate of the reportable foreign contact and provide a summary of the circumstances with respect to such reportable foreign contact; and

"(B) each official, employee, or agent of a political committee shall notify the treasurer or other designated official of the committee of the reportable foreign contact and provide a summary of the circumstances with respect to such reportable foreign contact.

"(III) Reportable Foreign Contact.—In this subsection:

"(A) In General.—The term ‘reportable foreign contact means any direct or indirect contact or communication that—

"(i) is between—

"(II) an individual who is a member of the United States Senate, a member of the United States House of Representatives, or any national of the United States;

and

"(ii) the person described in clause (i)(II) knows, has reason to know, or reasonably believes to be a covered foreign national; and

"(D) the person or an agent, employee, or official of any committee or political action committee established, maintained, controlled, or directed by such individual or committee, or by whom any of whose activities are directly or indirectly supervised, directed, controlled, financially, or subsidized in whole or in part by any principal described in clause (I) or (II).

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendment made by this section shall apply with respect to political committees which file a statement of organization under section 303(a) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30103(a)) on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) TRANSITION RULE FOR EXISTING COMMITTEES.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, each political committee shall—

"(A) certify that—

"(B) authorized committees.—With respect to an authorized committee, the candidate shall make the certification required under subparagraph (A) of section 309(d)(1) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 shall file a certification with the Federal Election Commission that the committee is in compliance with the requirements of section 309(d)(1) of such Act (as amended by this section).

SEC. 102. FEDERAL CAMPAIGN FOREIGN CONTACT TO CITIZENS OF THE UNITED STATES.

(a) In General.—Section 309(d)(1) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30109(d)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(I) the date, time, and location of the contact; and

"(ii) the identity of individuals involved; and

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this paragraph (1) shall apply with respect to reportable foreign contacts which occur on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) INFORMATION INCLUDED ON REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, each political committee shall establish a policy that provides for the retention and preservation of records and information related to online political advertising in order to enhance the transparency and accountability of such advertising.

(2) RULES.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal Election Commission may establish rules to implement the amendment made by this section.

SEC. 103. CRIMINAL PENALTIES.

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

(1) to impede legitimate journalistic activities; or

(2) to impose any additional limitation on the right to express political views or to participate in public discourse of any individual who—

(1) Retention and Preservation of Records.—Each political committee shall establish and maintain a policy that provides for the retention and preservation of records and information related to online political advertising in order to enhance the transparency and accountability of such advertising.
uphold the Supreme Court’s well-established standard that the electorate bears the right to be fully informed.

SEC. 113. EXPANSION OF DEFINITION OF PUBLIC COMMUNICATION.

(a) In General.—Paragraph (22) of section 301 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30101(22)) is amended by striking “or satellite communication” and inserting “satellite, paid internet, or paid digital communication”.

(b) Treatment of Contributions and Expenditures.—Section 301 of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30101) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3)(B)(v), by striking “on broadcasting stations, or in newspapers, magazines, or other types of general public political advertising” and inserting “in any public communication”; and

(2) in paragraph (9)(B)(iv), by inserting “the following new subsection:

``(i) any news story, commentary, or editorial distributed through the facilities of any broadcasting station or any print, online, or digital newspaper, magazine, blog, publication, or periodical, unless such broadcasting, print, online, or digital facilities are owned or controlled by any political party, political committee, or candidate;”.

(h) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to communications made on or after January 1, 2020.

SEC. 115. APPLICATION OF DISCLAIMER REQUIREMENTS TO ONLINE COMMUNICATIONS.

(a) CLEAR AND CONSPICUOUS MANNER REQUIRED.—Section 301 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30120(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking “shall clearly state” each place it appears in paragraphs (2) and (3) and inserting “shall state in a clear and conspicuous manner”; and

(2) by adding at the end the followingflush sentence: For purposes of this section, a communication does not make a statement in a clear and conspicuous manner if it is difficult to read or hear or if the placement is easily overlooked.

(b) SPECIAL RULES FOR QUALIFIED INTERNET OR DIGITAL COMMUNICATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 318 of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30120) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

``(e) SPECIAL RULES FOR QUALIFIED INTERNET OR DIGITAL COMMUNICATIONS.—

(1) SPECIAL RULES WITH RESPECT TO STATEMENTS.—In the case of any communication to which this subsection applies which is a qualified internet or digital communication (as defined in section 304(f)(3)(D)) which is disseminated through a medium in which the provision of all of the information specified in this section is not possible, the communication shall, in a clear and conspicuous manner—

“(A) state the name of the person who paid for the communication; and

(B) provide a means for the recipient of the communication to obtain the remainder of the information required under this section with minimal effort and without receiving or viewing any additional material other than such required information.

“(2) SAFE HARBOR FOR DETERMINING CLEAR AND CONSPICUOUS MANNER.—A statement in a qualified internet or digital communication (as defined in section 304(f)(3)(D)) shall be considered to be made in a clear and conspicuous manner if it is difficult to read or hear or if the placement is easily overlooked.

“(f) TEXT OR GRAPHIC COMMUNICATIONS.—In the case of a text or graphic communication, the statement—

“(i) appears in letters at least as large as the majority of the text in the communication; and

“(ii) meets the requirements of paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (c).

“(g) AUDIO COMMUNICATIONS.—In the case of an audio communication, the statement is spoken in a clearly distinguishable manner at the beginning or end of the communication and lasts at least 3 seconds.

“(h) VIDEO COMMUNICATIONS.—In the case of a video communication which also includes audio, the statement—

“(i) is included at either the beginning or the end of the communication; and

“(ii) is made both—

“(I) a written format that meets the requirements of subparagraph (A) and appears for at least 4 seconds;

“(II) an audible format that meets the requirements of subparagraph (B).”.

“(i) shall be presented in a clear and conspicuous manner as is necessary for the online platform to provide the online platform with such information; and

“(j) REQUIREMENTS FOR QUALIFIED INTERNET AND CONSPICUOUS MANNER.—A communication does not make a statement in a clear and conspicuous manner if it is difficult to read or hear or if the placement is easily overlooked.

“(k) DISCLOSURE OF CERTAIN ONLINE ADVERTISEMENTS.—

“(l) IN GENERAL.—

“(A) REQUIREMENTS FOR ONLINE PLATFORMS.—An online platform shall provide the online platform with such information as is necessary for the online platform to comply with the requirements of subparagraph (a).

“(B) CONTENTS OF RECORD.—A record maintained under paragraph (1)(A) shall contain—

“(i) a digital copy of the qualified political advertisement; or

“(ii) a description of the audience targeted by the advertisement, the number of views generated from the advertisement, and the date and time that the advertisement is first displayed and last displayed; and

“(C) information regarding—

“(i) the average rate charged for the advertisement; and

“(ii) the name of the candidate to which the advertisement refers and the office to which the candidate is seeking election, the election to which the advertisement refers, or the national legislative issue to which the advertisement refers (as applicable);”.

“(ii) if the case of a request made by, or on behalf of, a candidate, the name of the candidate, the authorized committee of the candidate, and the treasurer of such committee; and

“(iii) if the case of any request not described in clause (iii), the name of the person purchasing the advertisement, the name and address of a contact person for such person, and a list of the chief executive officers or members of the executive committee or of the board of directors of such person.

“(m) ONLINE PLATFORM.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘online platform’ means any public-facing website, web application, or digital application (including a social network, ad network, or search engine) which—

“(A) sells qualified political advertisements; and

“(B) has 50,000,000 or more unique monthly United States visitors or users for a majority of months during the preceding 12 months.

SEC. 116. POLITICAL ADVERTISEMENT REQUIREMENTS FOR ONLINE PLATFORMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 304 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30104), as amended by section 101(a), is further amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking “which is transmitted through radio or television” and inserting “which is in an audio format”;

(B) by striking “By Radio” in the heading and inserting “AUDIOMATIC”;

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking “which is transmitted through radio or television” and inserting “which is in video format”;

(B) by striking “By Television” in the heading and inserting “VIDEO FORMAT”;

(3) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking “transmitted through radio or television” and inserting “made in audio or video format”;

(B) by striking “through television” in the second sentence and inserting “‘video format’.”

October 23, 2019
"(4) QUALIFIED POLITICAL ADVERTISEMENT.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘qualified political advertisement’ means any advertisement (including search engine marketing, display advertisements, video advertisements, native advertisements, and sponsorships) that—

(A) is made by or on behalf of a candidate; or

(B) communicates a message relating to any political matter of national importance, including—

(i) a candidate;

(ii) any election to Federal office; or

(iii) a national legislative issue of public importance.

(5) TIME TO MAINTAIN FILE.—The information required under this subsection shall be made available as soon as possible and shall be retained by the online platform for a period of not less than 4 years.

(6) SAFE HARBOR FOR PLATFORMS MAKING BEST EFFORTS TO IDENTIFY REQUESTS WHICH ARE SUBJECT TO RECORD MAINTENANCE REQUIREMENTS.—In accordance with rules established by the Commission, if an online platform shows that the platform used best efforts to determine whether or not a request to purchase a qualified political advertisement was subject to the requirements of this subsection, the online platform shall not be considered to be in violation of such requirements.

(7) PENALTIES.—For penalties for failure by online platforms, and persons requesting to purchase a qualified political advertisement on online platforms, to comply with the requirements of this subsection, see section 309.’’.

SEC. 117. PREVENTING CONTRIBUTIONS, EX- PLORATORY EXPENSES, AND DISBURSEMENTS AND ACTIVITIES OF FOREIGN NATIONALS IN ELECTIONS.

SEC. 201. CLARIFICATION OF PROHIBITION ON PARTICIPATION BY FOREIGN NATIONALS IN ELECTION-RELATED ACTIVITIES.

(a) CLARIFICATION OF PROHIBITION.—Section 319(a) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30121(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking ‘‘(2) any election to Federal office; or’’ after the second period in paragraph (2); and

(2) by striking ‘‘or’’; and

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect upon the expiration of the 180-day period which begins on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 202. CERTIFICATION OF APPLICABILITY OF FOREIGN MONEY BAN TO CERTAIN DISBURSEMENTS AND ACTIVITIES.

(a) APPLICABILITY TO DISBURSEMENTS AND ACTIVITIES.—Section 319(a) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30121(a)(1)(A)) is amended by striking the semi-colon and inserting the following: ‘‘, including any disbursement to a political committee which accepts donations or contributions that do not comply with the limitations, prohibitions, and reporting requirements of this Act (or any disbursement made by a foreign national to a political committee which is established for the purpose of accepting such donations or contributions);’’.

(b) CONDITIONS UNDER WHICH CORPORATE PACS MAY MAKE CONTRIBUTIONS AND EXPENDITURES.—Section 316(b) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30118(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

‘‘(8) A separate segregated fund established by a corporation may not make a contribution or expenditure if the fund is not under the decisionmaking authority of the corporation who is a foreign national under section 319 participates in any way in the decisionmaking processes of the fund with regard to contributions or expenditures made by the fund.’’

SEC. 203. AUDIT AND REPORT ON ILlicit FOR- EIGN MONEY IN FEDERAL ELEC- TIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title III of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30101 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 319 the following new section:

‘‘SEC. 319A. AUDIT AND REPORT ON DISBURSE- MENTS BY FOREIGN NATIONALS.

(a) AUDIT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall conduct an audit after each election cycle to determine the incidence of illicit foreign money in such Federal election cycle.

(2) PROCEDURES.—In carrying out paragraph (1), the Commission shall conduct random audits of any disbursements required to be reported under this Act, in accordance with procedures established by the Commission.

(3) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the end of each Federal election cycle, the Commission shall submit to Congress a report containing—

(1) a summary of the results of the audit required by subsection (a)(1); and

(2) recommendations to address the presence of illicit foreign money in elections, as appropriate.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section:

(1) The term ‘‘Federal election cycle’’ means the period beginning on the day after the date of a regularly scheduled general election for Federal office and which ends on the date of the next regularly scheduled general election for Federal office.

(2) The term ‘‘Illicit foreign money’’ means any disbursement by a foreign national (as defined in section 316(b)) prohibited under such section.”
Federal election cycle that began during November 2018, and each succeeding Federal election cycle.

SEC. 204. PROHIBITION ON CONTRIBUTIONS AND DISBURSEMENTS BY FOREIGN NATIONALS IN CONNECTIONS WITH BALLOT INITIATIVES AND REFERENDA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 310(a)(1) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30121(a)(1)) is amended by striking “election” and inserting the following: “election, including a State or local ballot initiative or referendum.”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply with respect to elections held in the succeeding year.

SEC. 205. EXPANSION OF LIMITATIONS ON FOREIGN NATIONALS PARTICIPATING IN POLITICAL ADVERTISING.

(a) DISBURSEMENTS DESCRIBED.—Section 319(a)(1) of the Federal Election Campaign 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) for a communication which is placed or promoted on a website, web application, or digital application that contains or facilitates a video or the functional equivalent of express advocacy or the functional equivalent of express advocacy or the functional equivalent of express advocacy or the functional equivalent of express advocacy;”.

(b) IN GENERAL.—Section 304(j)(3)(C) is amended—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 304(j)(3)(C) is amended—

(2) by striking “any website, web application, or digital application, 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;” and

(3) by striking “whether the communication contains express advocacy or the functional equivalent of express advocacy)” and inserting “whether communication contains express advocacy or the functional equivalent of express advocacy;”.

SEC. 301. RESTRICTIONS ON EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION BETWEEN CANDIDATES AND FOREIGN POWERS.

“SECTION 204. PROHIBITION ON DECEPTIVE PRACTICES AND PREVENTING VOTER INTIMIDATION.

(a)(5) For purposes of paragraph (7), an expenditure or disbursement may be considered to have been made in cooperation, consultation, or concert with, or coordinated with, a person with a political purpose, if the person has engaged in cooperation, consultation, or coordination carried out pursuant to agreement or formal collaboration.”.

Subsection B—Prohibiting Deceptive Practices and Preventing Voter Intimidation

SEC. 311. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Deceptive Practices and Voter Intimidation Prevention Act of 2019”.

SEC. 312. PROHIBITION ON DECEPTIVE PRACTICES IN FEDERAL ELECTIONS.

(a) PROHIBITION.—Subsection (b) of section 2004 of the Revised Statutes (52 U.S.C. 10101(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking “No person”; and

(2) by inserting at the end the following new paragraphs:

“(1) Whenever any person”; and

(b) PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (c) of section 2004 of the Revised Statutes (52 U.S.C. 10101(c)) is amended—

(1) Whenever any person”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

“(1) by striking “Whenever any person” and inserting the following:

“(1) by striking “Whenever any person”; and

(2) by inserting at the end the following paragraphs:

“(1) Whoever any person aggreed by a violation of subsection (b)(2), (b)(3), or (b)(4) may institute a civil action for preventive relief, including an
application in a United States district court for a permanent or temporary injunction, restraining order, or other order. In any such action, the court, in its discretion, may allow the prevailing party reasonable attorney’s fees as part of the costs.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—(A) Subsection (e) of section 2004 of the Revised Statutes (52 U.S.C. 10101(e)) is amended by striking “subsection (c)” and inserting “subsection (c)(1)”.

(B) Subsection (g) of section 2004 of the Revised Statutes (52 U.S.C. 10101(g)) is amended by striking “subsection (c)” and inserting “subsection (c)(1)”.

(C) MODIFICATION OF PENALTY FOR VOTER INTIMIDATION.—Section 594(a)(1) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking “fined under this title or imprisoned not more than one year” and inserting “fined not more than $100,000, imprisoned for not more than 5 years”.

(3) SENTENCING GUIDELINES.—(A) REVIEW AND AMENDMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and pursuant to its authority under section 994 of title 28, United States Code, and in accordance with this section, the Attorney General shall review and, if appropriate, amend the Federal guidelines and policy statements applicable to persons convicted of any offense under section 594 of title 18, United States Code, as amended by this section.

(B) AUTHORIZATION.—The United States Sentencing Commission may amend the Federal Sentencing Guidelines in accordance with the procedures set forth in section 2(b) of the Sentencing Act of 1987 (28 U.S.C. 994 note) as though the authority under that section had not expired.

(4) PAYMENTS FOR REFRAINING FROM VOTING.—Subsection (c) of section 11 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10007) is amended by striking “either for registration to vote or for voting” and inserting “for voting, or for not voting”.

SEC. 313. CORRECTIVE ACTION.

(a) CORRECTIVE ACTION.—(1) IN GENERAL.—If the Attorney General receives a credible report that materially false information has been or is being communicated in violation of paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 2004(b) of the Revised Statutes (52 U.S.C. 10101(b)), as added by section 312(a), and if the Attorney General determines that State and local election officials have not taken adequate steps to promote communication of accurate information to correct the materially false information, the Attorney General shall, pursuant to the written procedures and standards under subsection (b), communicate to the public, by any means, including by means of written, electronic, or telephonic communications, accurate information designed to correct the materially false information.

(b) COMMUNICATION OF CORRECTIVE INFORMATION.—Any information communicated by the Attorney General under paragraph (1) shall—

(i) be accurate and objective;

(ii) consist of only the information necessary to correct the materially false information that has been or is being communicated; and

(iii) to the extent practicable, be by a means that the Attorney General determines will reach the persons to whom the materially false information has been or is being communicated.

(2) MODIFICATION OF PENALTY FOR VOTER INJURIES TAKING CORRECTIVE ACTION.—(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall publish written procedures and standards for determining when and how corrective action will be taken under this section.

(a) INADMISSIBILITY.—Section 212(a)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(3)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(H) IMPROPER INTERFERENCE IN A UNITED STATES ELECTION.—Any alien who a consular
officer, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Secretary of State, or the Attorney General knows, or has reasonable grounds to believe, is seeking admission to the United States to engage in improper interference in a United States election, or has engaged in improper interference in a United States election, is inadmissible.”.

(b) DEPORTABILITY.—Section 237(a) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1227(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(8) IMPROPER INTERFERENCE IN A UNITED STATES ELECTION.—Any alien who has engaged, is engaging, or has engaged in improper interference in a United States election is deportable.”.

(c) DEFINITION.—Section 101(a) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(53) The term ‘improper interference in a United States election’ means conduct by an alien that—

“(A)(i) violates Federal criminal, voting rights, or campaign finance law, or
“(ii) is performed by any person acting as an agent of or on behalf of a foreign government or criminal enterprise, and

“(B) includes any covert, fraudulent, deceptive, or unlawful act or attempted act, undertaken with the purpose or effect of undermining public confidence in an election process or State election institutions, or influencing, undermining confidence in, or altering the result or reported result of, a general or primary Federal, State, or local election or campaign, including—

“(i) the campaign of a candidate; or
“(ii) a ballot measure, including an amendment, a bond issue, an initiative, a recall, or a referendum or a referenda.

TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. EFFECTIVE DATES OF PROVISIONS.

Each provision of this Act and each amendment made by a provision of this Act shall take effect on the effective date provided under this Act for provisions or amendments or amendment without regard to whether or not the Federal Election Commission, the Attorney General, or any other person has promulgated regulations to carry out such provision or such amendment.

SEC. 402. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this Act or any amendment made by this Act, or the application of a provision of this Act or an amendment made by this Act for provisions or amendments, or amendment without regard to whether or not the Federal Election Commission, the Attorney General, or any other person has promulgated regulations to carry out such provision or such amendment, be invalid or unenforceable, such invalidity or unenforceability shall not affect the other provisions or amendments of this Act.

SEC. 403. AUTHORITY TO INVESTIGATE.

The Chair. Pursuant to House Resolution 650, the gentleman from California (Mr. DESAULNIER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Chairman, as the first amendment, I don’t want to belabor many of the points that have been brought up in the general debate. The President, and my very good friend from the Bay Area, I do want to say, as someone who has been in elected office in the San Francisco Bay Area for a long time, where so many of the innovations around social platforms and communications have taken place—much of it in Ms. LORCEN’s district—how proud I have been of them. But how now—appropriately I think—skeptical I am of their ability to unilaterally, or merely by themselves, enforce the proper protections for American democracy. That is why I think this bill and this discussion are so very important.

We know from the Mueller report that 126 million Americans were contacted, either directly or indirectly, just on accusations. We also know the outcome of the Presidential election was based on less than 80,000 votes in three key States in the electoral college. We know that Mr. Mueller said that this was a systematic attempt by the Russians. And we know also that the President’s appointed FBI director has said recently, “Russia attempted to interfere with the last election and continues to engage in malign influence operations to this day. This is a threat we need to take extremely seriously and to tackle and respond to with fierce determination and focus.”

Mr. Chairman, we also have talked a lot, in the last few years, about the role of the Federal Government, State governments, and local jurisdictions, and I agree and with how diffused our historic relationships are. But here is an instance in my amendment. It is a simple one. It is to give the States and local jurisdictions the information they need to be aware of some of these influences that are affected by this bill.

My amendment is very simple. It requires that when the FEC is made aware of credible targeted disinformation campaigns, that affected States must be notified within 30 days. I think that is a fairly simple amendment. I would hope, in the spirit of bipartisanship, my colleagues would agree with that.

Thomas Jefferson famously said that, “We in America do not have government by the majority. We have government by the majority who participate.”

We know that disinformation hurts participation when done effectively, as it was just a short time ago in the recent Presidential election. And we also know that effective oversight and this government’s engagement of both parties at the Federal level, the State level, and the local level, when we are open, honest, and afford transparency to American voters, they will participate at a higher rate and also at a more knowledgeable rate.

It is our responsibility to recognize that disinformation is a threat to the participation that is vital to our continued success as a democracy, and it is our responsibility to prevent it.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this simple amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the core function of the Federal Election Commission is to be the independent regulatory agency charged with administering and enforcing Federal campaign finance law. The FEC has jurisdiction over the financing of campaigns for the U.S. House, the Senate, the Presidency, and the Vice Presidency.

We do think States should be notified of disinformation by foreign actors. The FEC is not equipped to investigate, much less make a final determination, that foreign nationals have meddled in an election. This is better left to law enforcement and intelligence agencies.

One way the FEC is not equipped is that FEC commissioners do not have the authority to obtain clearances to access certain classified information, which would make it impossible for any commissioner or the FEC to make such a notification to States, not to mention the fact that the FEC chair is too busy attacking the President to spend time on additional notification requirements.

It is also worth noting that the majority of the committee’s position has been that the FEC is dysfunctional, even to the point that they voted to make it a five-member partisan commission in H.R. 1.

The Department of Justice, FBI, DHS, and other national security agencies are better suited to address the problem of foreign meddling in our elections, which is exactly what we allow the CHAIR in the Honest Elections Act—my bill—that I would certainly hope come on the other side of the aisle would cosponsor.
Mr. Chairman, for these reasons, I urge a "no" vote, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my friend from Illinois' baseball metaphor earlier, and I would say to the metaphor, I disagree. I think his call is wrong.

I think this amendment is a simple strike. As he knows, the bill requires other agencies to give the information to the FEC. They are merely a collector, in many instances, of the information, and then they are the appropriate body to disseminate that information.

That is what my amendment does. I don't disagree or think that it is appropriate to debate the gentleman's other aspects, which may be true or not, based on his perspective. The amendment is basically consistent with the bill that the information goes here, and it should be disseminated to the States.

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my colleague from California offering an amendment and participating in this process. It is not every time that we have disagreement on the appropriate legislation, but amendments like this.

I believe that this amendment needs to be clarified before it should be put into law. And just as with the SHIELD Act, I believe it should go back to the drawing board and we ought to be able to have more hearings to find out the effect on free speech in the United States of America, but also give us a chance in a bipartisan way to question the social media platforms that we want to work with us to protect this Nation from foreign meddling.

For the reasons I mentioned above and for the reasons that I stated just now, I am going to urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DESAULNIER).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIR. Amendment No. 2 offered by Mrs. LESKO.

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 116–253.

Mrs. LESKO. 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:

Strike section 313 (and redesignate the succeeding sections accordingly).

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 58, the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Arizona.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to H.R. 4617, which would strike from the bill a section that gives the U.S. Attorney General unprecedented power to involve him or herself in State and local elections. This should be a concern for all Americans as it says Washington knows best when it comes to our local elections.

Not only does this section represent a massive Federal overreach, it is also vague.

For example, the section requires the Attorney General to determine whether State and local election officials have taken “adequate steps” to communicate information to address misinformation.

What are adequate steps? It doesn’t say.

What is misinformation? This bill turns the United States Attorney General into a fact-checker.

This section also requires the Attorney General to communicate to the public “by any means” to address misinformation.

Taken together, this language would grant the United States Attorney General power over elections and courts and we, as Congress, should find this concerning.

In addition to the troublesome substance of this section, it also arrived on the floor through a deficient process.

As a member of the Judiciary Committee, I have an interest in ensuring legislation under my committee’s jurisdiction is considered in the Judiciary Committee. This did not happen here as the time, space, or manner I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment. I think the amendment strikes what is really a commonsense section of the underlying bill.

Section 313, beginning on page 49, line 11, comes from the Deceptive Practices and Voter Intimidation Act. It first gives deference to State and local officials to combat deceptive practices in their localities if there is a credible report made that materially false information has been communicated to the public regarding Federal elections such as the day, place, or manner of holding an election.

Section 313 provides that the responsibility first falls on State and local officials to correct the materially false information. It is only if State and local election officials fail short of making a correction that the Attorney General would ensure that voters do not fall victim to deceptive practices.

I don’t believe this is an example of Federal interference or overreach. It is an example of putting to use all levels of government to protect voters in our democracy.

Let’s be clear, section 313 is, at its core, about enhancing transparency and disclosure. The sort of activity we are talking about here is merely providing factual information to voters to ensure they are not deceived, that they are adequately informed, and that they have a fair chance of participating in their democracy.

Section 313, page 51, directs the U.S. Attorney General to work in partnership with the Election Assistance Commission, State and local officials, and others to come up with procedures and standards for how to take corrective action if there is an instance of materially false information regarding voting. It is not just whatever he or she thinks at the time. This is going to be said in advance.

The procedures in the partnership determines exactly how the AG could step in when there is materially false information being spread. The information communicated by the AG also should be designed not to favor or disfavor any particular candidate, organization, political party.

I think this is an example of how local, State, and Federal levels of government could work together to protect voters in our democracy. This is not an academic issue. We have seen situations where online, or elsewhere, information has been spread to people that certain people—for example, one party or the other—would be allowed to vote on a day that wasn’t election day. Well, that needs to be corrected or people will be disenfranchised if they believe it because they saw it on the internet.

Mr. Chairman, I think, though I am sure well-intended, this amendment is a mistake. I urge its defeat, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS), my good friend.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I thank my good friend from Arizona (Mrs. Lesko) for yielding.

This amendment is a very well-intended amendment. I agree with my colleague from California that it is a very well-intended amendment that is going to actually correct, I believe, what would be an unintended consequence if this bill were to ever become law.

This section that is being amended today provides unprecedented power to the Attorney General to intervene in Federal races when he or she believes State and local officials have not taken
“adequate steps” to correct “misinformation.”

Madam Chair, the Attorney General is a partisan official. They are not a nonpartisan official. Imagine if Attorney General Barr was given broad authority to take adequate steps.” This is the language in the bill.

These are the facts, Madam Chair. If Attorney General Barr was given broad authority to take adequate steps in correcting the record in any Democratic districts, imagine that. Imagine the uproar. There would be a public uproar. The same could be said for a Democratic Attorney General.

The section not only gives broad authority to the AG, but it is extremely vague and will also leave State and local election officials struggling to comply with this section.

To make matters worse, we have not heard from a single State or local election official about how this might impact their ability to conduct elections. This is the very thing we have hear-

ings. This is the reason why we call people into Congress to listen to them about the impact of legislation that we are debating in this House.

And we did not have a single hearing before this. Materially to the floor. This is not regular order. This is not what the Democratic majority promised when they were given the majority by the American people to run this in-

stitution. This is a broken promise that they made to the American people, and I think we need to pass this amendment.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Chair, I would note that this bill is supported by a broad spectrum of civil rights groups, including the Leadership Con-

ference on Civil and Human Rights, the NAACP, as well as the Brennan Center for Justice. And there is a reason for that.

A lot of the mischief that goes on try to suppress different people from voting. They have a racial impact. We have seen the sup-

pression of the vote, the efforts that have been undertaken to suppress the vote through confusion and through lies, where a piece of information would go into a minority community—“the vote is now on Wednesday, not on Tuesday”—so that people will be con-

fused and not show up to vote.

That is simply wrong. We need to take steps that are reasonable, as this is, to confront that.

This bill will help. That is why so many groups support it.

I urge defeat of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Chair, I agree that it is wrong if somebody pulls out false information about an election, like the date or time, but I certainly don’t agree that the United States At-

torney General should get involved in local elections.

On the other hand, other bills, I think there is a fundamental difference be-

 tween the way some of my Democratic colleagues believe and what fellow Rep-

cubans and I believe. They believe

the U.S. Government should know every-

thing and should do everything. I think local control is better, that they know better what is going on.

Madam Chair, I ask my colleagues to support the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. DEGETTE). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO).

The question was taken; and the Act-

ing Chair announced that the noes ap-

peared to have it.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further pro-

cession of the amendments offered by the gentlewoman from Arizona will be post-

poned.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. LYNNCH The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 116-253.

Mr. TUCKER. 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 fol-

lows:

Page 54, insert after line 14 the following:

Subtitle C—Prohibiting Use of Deepfakes in Election Campaigns

SEC. 321. PROHIBITION ON DISTRIBUTION OF MA-

TERIALLY DECEPTIVE AUDIO OR VISUAL MEDIA PRIOR TO ELECTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title III of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30101 et seq.), as amended by section 208, is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 325. PROHIBITION ON DISTRIBUTION OF MAT-

TERIALLY DECEPTIVE MEDIA PRIOR TO ELECTION.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsections (b) and (c), a person, political committee, or other entity shall not, within 60 days of a general election at which a candidate for elective office will appear on the ballot, distribute, with actual malice, materially deceptive audio or visual media on or through a website that the intent to in-

jure the candidate’s reputation or to deceive a voter into voting for or against the candi-

date.

“(b) EXCEPTION.—

“(1) REQUIRED LANGUAGE.—The prohibition in subsection (a) does not apply if the audio or visual media includes—

“(A) a disclosure stating: “This has been manipulated.”; and

“(B) filled in the blank in the disclosure under subparagraph (A), the term ‘image’, ‘video’, or ‘audio’ as most accurately de-

scribes the media.

“(2) VISUAL MEDIA.—For visual media, the text of the disclosure shall appear in a size that is easily readable by the average viewer and no smaller than the largest font size of other text appearing in the visual media. If the visual media does not include any other text, the disclosure shall appear in a size that is easily readable by the average viewer. For visual media that is video, the disclosure shall appear for the duration of the video.

“(3) AUDIO-ONLY MEDIA.—If the media con-

stitutes satire or parody.

“(f) MATERIALLY DECEPTIVE AUDIO OR VIS-

UAL MEDIA DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘materially deceptive audio or visual media’ means an image or an audio or video recording of a candidate’s appearance, speech, or conduct that has been inten-

tionally manipulated in a manner such that both of the following conditions are met:

“(1) The image or audio or video recording would falsely appear to a reasonable person to be authentic.

“(2) The image or audio recording would cause a reasonable person to have a fundamentally different understanding or impression of the expressive content of the image or audio or video recording than that

SEC. 322. PROHIBITION ON DISTRIBUTION OF MA-

TERIALLY DECEPTIVE AUDIO OR VISUAL MEDIA PRIOR TO ELECTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title III of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30101 et seq.), as amended by section 208, is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 325. PROHIBITION ON DISTRIBUTION OF MAT-

TERIALLY DECEPTIVE MEDIA PRIOR TO ELECTION.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsections (b) and (c), a person, political committee, or other entity shall not, within 60 days of a general election at which a candidate for elective office will appear on the ballot, distribute, with actual malice, materially deceptive audio or visual media on or through a website that the intent to in-

jure the candidate’s reputation or to deceive a voter into voting for or against the candi-

date.

“(b) EXCEPTION.—

“(1) REQUIRED LANGUAGE.—The prohibition in subsection (a) does not apply if the audio or visual media includes—

“(A) a disclosure stating: “This has been manipulated.”; and

“(B) filled in the blank in the disclosure under subparagraph (A), the term ‘image’, ‘video’, or ‘audio’ as most accurately de-

scribes the media.

“(2) VISUAL MEDIA.—For visual media, the text of the disclosure shall appear in a size that is easily readable by the average viewer and no smaller than the largest font size of other text appearing in the visual media. If the visual media does not include any other text, the disclosure shall appear in a size that is easily readable by the average viewer. For visual media that is video, the disclosure shall appear for the duration of the video.

“(3) AUDIO-ONLY MEDIA.—If the media con-

stitutes satire or parody.

“(f) MATERIALLY DECEPTIVE AUDIO OR VIS-

UAL MEDIA DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘materially deceptive audio or visual media’ means an image or an audio or video recording of a candidate’s appearance, speech, or conduct that has been inten-

tionally manipulated in a manner such that both of the following conditions are met:

“(1) The image or audio or video recording would falsely appear to a reasonable person to be authentic.

“(2) The image or audio recording would cause a reasonable person to have a fundamentally different understanding or impression of the expressive content of the image or audio or video recording than that
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The Congressional Research Service similarly warns that hostile state actors could release digitally altered videos of government officials or candidates making incendiary comments or engaged in inappropriate behavior to erode public trust, degrade our public discourse, and support particular candidates, and sway elections.

The proliferation of deepfake technologies presents a serious threat to the integrity of U.S. elections, considering that our Nation’s 17 intelligence agencies already determined that our most fundamental democratic process has come under attack by foreign adversaries. With high confidence, the U.S. intelligence community found that Russian President Vladimir Putin ordered an influence campaign aimed at the 2016 election that included clandestine intelligence operations and blatant meddling by state-owned agencies, state-funded media outlets, third-party intermediaries, and paid social media trolls. The final report issued by Special Counsel Robert Mueller augmented this assessment.

According to the “2019 Worldwide Threat Assessment of the U.S. Intelligence Community,” our adversaries will continue refining their interference capabilities and add new tactics to dramatically alter the threat landscape for 2020 and future elections. In the interest of enhancing election security, campaign law must adapt to these evolving technologies. A prohibition on the use of deepfake technology in Federal elections is a great first step in the right direction.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle 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 amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. LEVIN OF MICHIGAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part B of House Report 116–233.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. 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 36, insert after line 22 the following:

SEC. 206. PROHIBITION OF CORPORATION TO CONCEAL ELECTION CONTRIBUTIONS AND DONATIONS BY FOREIGN NATIONALS.

(a) PROHIBITION.—Chapter 29 of title 18, United States Code is amended by adding at the end the following:

“612. Establishment of corporation to conceal election contributions and donations by foreign nationals

“(a) OFFENSE.—It shall be unlawful for an officer, owner, attorney, or incorporation agent of any corporation or other entity to establish or use the corporation, company, or other entity with the intent to conceal an activity of a foreign national (as defined in section 319 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30121)) prohibited under such section 319.

“(b) PENALTY.—Any person who violates subparagraph (a) shall be fined not more than 5 years, fined under this title, or both.

(b) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sections for chapter 29 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 611 the following:

“612. Establishment of corporation to conceal election contributions and donations by foreign nationals.”
The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 650, 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. Madam Chair, my bipartisan amendment cracks down on foreign influence in our elections. I would like to begin by thanking my friend, the Chairman of the House Administration Committee, Mr. LEVIN, for his kind words, and my colleagues who have cosponsored this amendment, especially Representatives ROUDA, SLOTKIN, and SPEIER.

I also thank Chairwoman LOFGRIN for her inspiring leadership and for working with me on this provision. I came to Congress to strengthen our democracy, and that is the fundamental purpose of this truly bipartisan amendment that I am proposing today.

Current campaign finance laws prohibit foreign nationals from making campaign contributions or conducting political activity. But because of a loophole shut by promoting shell companies to engage in political activity, this is not enough. Our bipartisan amendment will nail down that loophole.

We must keep our democratic process safe from all bad actors, including foreign actors, and strengthen our democracy. That is what this amendment does.

Specifically, this amendment will make it a felony for an owner, officer, attorney, or incorporated agent of a corporation, company, or other entity to establish or use a corporation, company, or other entity with the intent to conceal the political activities of foreign actors. Put simply, our passing our amendment will ensure serious consequences for anyone who starts or operates a shell company, or anyone who helps start or operate a shell company, for the purpose of concealing political activities of bad foreign actors.

I am proud to partner with the gentleman from Michigan in proposing this bipartisan amendment to defend our elections against foreign interference. Our elections are a sacred cornerstone of our democracy, and we must do everything in our power to protect them. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I am particularly pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUDA), my good friend.

Mr. ROUDA. Madam Chair, I thank my friend from Michigan, Representative LEVIN, for yielding.

Madam Chair, preventing foreign election interference is a bipartisan issue. This amendment is proof of that statement. I am proud to support this amendment, a commonsense measure to close a loophole that is allowing illegal political spending by foreign nationals in United States elections.

In the 2016 election, millions of Americans saw and engaged with political advertisements paid for by foreign nationals. Last year, Facebook CEO Mark Zuckerberg confirmed in sworn testimony before Congress that foreign nationals were purchasing campaign ads and issue ads through American shell companies.

As elected officials, we took an oath to defend the Constitution of the United States of America against foreign and domestic adversaries and threats. That includes the cornerstone of our democracy, free and fair elections.

This amendment and the underlying bill seek to end a dangerous and well-documented form of foreign election interference.

I thank Representatives LEVIN and McCaul for offering this important amendment, and I look forward to continuing to work with them to address this critical issue.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to this amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I support this amendment.

I want to thank my colleagues, Mr. LEVIN, Ranking Member McCaul, Mr. ROUDA, Ms. SPEIER, and Ms. SLOTKIN, for offering this very thoughtful amendment. I would like to note that, even though the issue of using shell corporations to make contributions is covered under the existing straw donor prohibition, I do believe more clarity is needed on this issue.

Madam Chair, I want to thank my colleagues. I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Madam Chair, I will close by thanking the gentleman from Illinois for his kind words on this. We really have worked hard as a team. It is a truly bipartisan effort.

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I thank, again, my good friend from the great State of Michigan for offering this amendment.

The only thing that I wish I could have happened is I wish we could have had some hearings on this bill so that we could have brought experts in on shell corporations that are making straw donor donations to Federal campaigns that are prohibited so we could find out the best way to ensure that doesn’t happen in the future, especially from nefarious foreign actors.

Madam Chair, I urge a ‘yes’ 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 Michigan (Mr. LEVIN). The amendment will be placed at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in part B of House Report 116–253. Mr. LANGEVIN. 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 28, insert after line 12 the following:

SEC. 118. INDEPENDENT STUDY ON MEDIA LITERACY AND ONLINE POLITICAL CONTENT CONSUMPTION.

(a) INDEPENDENT STUDY.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Federal Election Commission shall commission an independent study and report on media literacy with respect to online political content consumption among voting-age Americans.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The study and report under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) an analysis of the effects of media literacy education and particular media literacy skills on the ability to critically consume online political content, including political advertising;

(2) Recommendations for improving voting-age Americans’ ability to critically consume online political content, including political advertising;

(c) DEADLINE.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the entity conducting the study and report under subsection (a) shall submit the report to the Commission.

(d) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 30 days after receiving the report under subsection (c), the Commission shall submit the report to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Administration of the Senate, together with such comments on the report as the Commission considers appropriate.

(e) DEFINITION OF MEDIA LITERACY.—The term ‘media literacy’ means the ability to:

(1) access relevant and accurate information through media;

(2) critically analyze media content and the influences of media;

(3) evaluate the comprehensiveness, relevance, credibility, authority, and accuracy of information;

(4) make educated decisions based on information obtained from media and digital sources;

(5) operate various forms of technology and digital tools; and

(f) Effect of Use.—Reflect on how the use of media and technology may affect private and public life.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 650, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island.
Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, it is quite evident that our democracy is under attack from concerted foreign influence campaigns, and disinformation is one of our enemies’ most potent weapons.

Starting in 2013, Russian operatives associated with the Internet Research Agency waged a robust and systematic influence campaign on Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, and YouTube that reached millions of users in the United States. These operatives used political advertisements and falsified news articles and other content in an attempt to deceive social media users, widen our political and social divisions, and weaken our confidence and participation in the democratic process.

Their efforts, particularly surrounding the 2016 election, were disturbingly successful.

About 60 percent of Americans who prefer getting their news through social media say they have shared false information. Additionally, public confidence in the press is low, and we are perhaps more polarized than ever before.

With the 2020 elections right around the corner, we must act now to build up our resilience to these efforts and ensure Americans are informed, critical consumers of online content. Voters must view online political advertising with a discerning eye and be able to make educated decisions based on the content that they consume.

The Senate Select Committee on Intelligence released a bipartisan report late last month and said that the public needs to be informed and understand disinformation.

A functioning democracy depends on informed citizens who can responsibly participate in the political process, and the unquestioning consumption and sharing of disinformation online undermines the integrity of this system. My amendment will help shed light on the skills Americans need to resist these malicious campaigns.

Recently, the director of Media Education Lab in Rhode Island and a professor at the University of Rhode Island, puts it plainly: “Learning to recognize and resist propaganda and disinformation is an essential portion of education in a digital age. After all, it is the only long-term strategy that embodies our country’s vital democratic traditions of robust dialogue and debate in the marketplace of ideas.”

Prof. Shatter-Bohle is right, and as more and more Americans rely on social media to get their news, media literacy is becoming ever more important.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment so we can explore how best to build up our citizens’ resilience to foreign online influence campaigns.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized.

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

Madam Chair, I thank my colleague, Mr. LANGEVIN, for offering this amendment. As a good friend as he is, it somewhat pains me to have to stand up and be opposed to it.

Again, the FEC, the Federal Election Commission, is the independent regulatory agency charged with administering and enforcing the Federal campaign finance law. They have jurisdiction over the financing of campaigns for us here in the House, our colleagues in the Senate, the President, and the Vice President. They are not the fake news police, much to the chagrin of the current FEC Chair.

This amendment requires an independent report from the FEC, and I am not convinced that the FEC Chair is capable of issuing any independent report, any independent guidance, or any independent legal interpretations; and, frankly, I don’t think she is capable of offering any independent tweets.

I think it is noteworthy that every single House Democrat voted to make the FEC a partisan agency earlier this Congress in H.R. 1 and has lamented how dysfunctional they believe the FEC is. If the FEC were a partisan agency, wouldn’t we want determining which news was fake news and which news was legitimate?

I agree we need to understand and improve media literacy with respect to political content in this country, but the FEC is not the entity to lead that endeavor.

Let’s take a look at the danger of overregulating online ads and misinterpreting political content. The ad I have behind me and the ones behind it are already being labeled as political ads on Facebook. These came straight from the Facebook ad library.

First off, we have my favorite. As the proud dad of two Yorkies at home in Taylorville, Illinois, this political ad for hotdog collars—I would love to get my two Yorkies some new dog collars. I don’t know—maybe the American flag dog collar—how political that is.

Next up is the very political ad Facebook is now categorizing under current law and under their current regulations as a political ad—Pizza Crave. Hey, it’s Halloween season, it is almost upon us, $10 pizza pies. I don’t know why that is categorized as political, but let’s do.

Do we really want the FEC to figure out that they are the agency to correct that? No. Facebook ought to correct it. Lastly, Stone Bridge Pizza & Salads: We always crave the classic—obviously a political ad. I don’t know anybody who would eat pizza like that, but clearly this is not a political ad.

I think we need to take a step back. We need to realize that the current FEC that is dysfunctional is the last place for independent review of anything. We need to make sure that the FEC does its job in a nonpartisan way.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Rhode Island has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Chair, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Rhode Island has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Chair, if only my colleague had actually read and understood the bill, he would know that it is an independent study. I think that would make a difference in how, perhaps, he felt about the bill.

Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. Slotkin).

Ms. SLOTKIN. Madam Chair, I rise today in support of this amendment to the SHIELD Act, the digital citizenship and media literacy amendment.

We have said it before. No matter who we are, Democrats, Republicans, or Independents, we should all agree that we don’t want foreigners manipulating our citizens, sowing discord in our society, and playing in our political process.

We know that foreign entities continue to target social media ads and disinformation at voters, particularly in swing States like mine, Michigan. These ads are horrible. They seek to divide us and influence our political process.

The Senate Select Committee on Intelligence released a bipartisan report late last month and said that the public needs to be informed and understand disinformation.

We need education. Education is critical. This study helps us get at this so that we can all understand how to identify propaganda and flag it.

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

Madam Chair, I appreciate the comments from my good friend from Michigan. I, too, am in a swing district. We don’t want misinformation.

To address comments made by my good friend from Rhode Island, I understand that what the gentleman is asking for is an independent report. I don’t believe the FEC can offer an independent assessment of anything right now.

Madam Chair, you have an FEC that is completely dysfunctional. You have a Chair of the FEC who is doing nothing but taking partisan shots at our
President. That is not what the FEC should be.

The FEC is incapable of offering any independent review of anything. That is my concern. That is why I believe if we could work together and come up with a more viable solution to get a true independent study, I think we could do that.

Madam Chair, I am ready to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Madam Chair, to address my colleague’s point, again, it is not the FEC that is going to do the study. It is an independent study that will be done, be commissioned to be concluded, and that would be the final product, not the FEC.

So, with that, Russia’s election interference efforts in 2016 were sweeping and damaging, and we know that social media was one of their greatest weapons. As the 2020 elections approach, and for future elections, we must ensure that our citizens are resilient to foreign influence companies by arming them with the skills to be critical consumers of online political content.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment to study media literacy and its impact on American voters—again, an independent study that will be commissioned.

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, to clarify, I don’t think the FEC is capable of actually commissioning an independent study. I would be happy to work with the gentleman from Rhode Island to find another agency that we believe could offer a fair assessment.

Madam Chair, I will urge a “no” vote on this amendment for those reasons, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. SWALWELL OF CALIFORNIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in part of House Report 116-233.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk, No. 6, made in order under the rule.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 15, insert “and each immediate family member of a candidate” after “each candidate”.

Page 4, line 9, insert “an immediate family member of the candidate,” after “a candidate.”

Page 7, line 9, strike the closing quotation mark and the second period.

Page 7, insert after line 9 the following:

“(4) IMMEDIATE FAMILY MEMBER.—In this subsection, the term ‘immediate family member’ means, with respect to a candidate, a parent, parent-in-law, spouse, adult child, or sibling.”

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 650, the gentleman from California (Mr. SWALWELL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I urge in support of the underlying bill and my amendment, which would include a candidate’s immediate family members to those whose direct or indirect contacts or communications with a foreign national may amount to a reportable foreign contact.

I also think it is very fitting that we are doing this legislation in the same week that we will honor Oversight and Reform Committee Chairman, Elijah Cummings, someone who I have had the privilege of not only working with but being represented by when I was a law student in Baltimore.

But Elijah, the gentleman from Maryland, and I worked to write the Protecting Our Democracy Act immediately after the Russian interference campaign.

Every member of the Democrat Caucus and members from the Republican Caucus signed on to that. I still believe that is the best way to address what the Russians did in 2016 and to harden our systems so they don’t do it again.

But I believe that this effort, the SHIELD Act, led by Chairwoman LOFGREN will go a very, very long way in protecting our elections, and I thank the chairwoman for her leadership in this effort.

American elections should be decided by Americans. Ms. LOFGREN’s bill will go a long way to stopping secret foreign attempts to influence our democracy, as we saw in 2016.

We know that as a part of Russia’s attack on us, it purchased social media advertisements.

Madam Chair, 3,500 advertisements on political or public policy topics were purchased using rubles. To combat this conduct, I had introduced in May, H.R. 2853, the Corporate Duty to Report Act. Part of my bill would require companies distributing political communications, including social media companies, to take the small but important step in at least asking if the purchaser is a foreign national. I thank Chairwoman LOFGREN for including this concept in the SHIELD Act.

We also learned in June 2016 that Donald Trump, Jr., was told over email that the Russian Government was offering “official documents and information that would incriminate Hillary and her dealings with Russia,” which “in part, was Russia with its government support for Mr. Trump.”

Don Jr., replied in part, “If it’s what you say, I love it, especially later in the summer.” Then he accepted the offer of assistance. He told a lot of people about the offer, including his brother-in-law and the chairman of the campaign, he had a meeting around the offer, but he never told law enforcement.

This is the part of the honor code that most candidates in America follow. It is just the right thing to do. Unfortunately, Donald Trump, Jr.’s conduct highlights that we have to take this issue of the honor code good people usually just follow and codify them into law.

I wrote the Duty to Report Act last Congress with Senator RICHARD BLUMENTHAL, who sponsored it in the Senate, that also would include immediate family members, not just the candidate to tell law enforcement, but the parent, parent-in-law, spouse, adult child, or sibling.

I am afraid that someone like Don Jr., who didn’t have an official role in the Trump campaign, would not be included in the SHIELD Act as written, and that is the reason I am offering this amendment.

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, this amendment amends the underlying duty to report section.

The goal of this underlying section is something I share with my friend across the aisle. If a foreign national would approach me with an offer of assistance in my campaign, I would absolutely alert the FBI.

My colleague from California mentions an instance with the President’s son. I mean, clearly, I know that he is a Democrat. They look at this, this is not about what is going to happen to many of the colleagues here, because, likely, we are never going to be approached by a foreign national. But if we are, I think we all agree, it is a pretty bipartisan consensus, we would call the FBI.

This is a partisan attack on the President. But rarely are instances as blatant as what I mentioned before about being contacted and I would call the FBI. What this underlying section is asking of political committees is for them to serve as immigration officials, where they will be in a position to determine the citizenship of anyone that their campaign comes into contact with.

But, again, I believe through bipartisan negotiations, we could make this work. The underlying duty to report section was already vague to begin with, and adding in additional parties, as this amendment does, that must comply only adds to our concern that we are setting up campaign committees, as well as their families, we are setting them up for failure.
It is also worth noting that this amendment would affect family members; the candidate has no control over. My family members own fast food restaurants. So are they going to have to ask— if this becomes law— every customer if they are a foreign national representing a foreign government? Do they have a duty to report?

That is something that needs to be clarified. We have to do a little bit more work. I think we can fix this out, but again, the secretive nature of how this bill was written and forced onto the floor with zero hearings doesn’t give us a chance, or frankly, the majority a chance to ask these questions and address our concerns.

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

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Madam Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I appreciate the gentleman’s concerns and I accept that the gentleman would report, if he was contacted by a foreign national. And I want to clarify, in the legislation under section (c)(1), the term “foreign national,” which means a foreign principal who would fall subject to the Foreign Agents Registration Act. So it is not an immigrant. It is not any person born outside the United States. It is someone acting on behalf of a foreign agent.

And it also has a “knowing standard,” meaning that you would have to have some knowledge that this person is acting on behalf of a foreign agent. And the Donald Trump, Jr., example, it was represented that the individuals were working with the prosecutor general of Russia, so clearly, that would be notice that this is on behalf of a foreign agent.

Now, I also want to just point out that, there is an honor code that we all follow, and I believe most of my colleagues would tell the FBI. And, of course, in 2000, when the Gore campaign received debate prep materials for the Bush campaign, the Gore campaign went to the FBI because it was provided by a foreign national.

However, what we learned in 2016 is not everyone is as honorable, and so we have to codify this. And I do believe that we will be judged by what we do as our leadership on this important issue and not only what we do, but what we learn from the vulnerabilities that have been exposed.

And that is why I think it is so important that Ms. Lofgren’s legislation is voted for and passed on this floor. And that we include this amendment to make sure it is not just candidates, but also the family members.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I agree with my colleague from California. We will be judged on how we actually impact foreign interference in our elections. We will be judged on the chilling effect to free speech that this legislation, if put into law, would have on our system that is so much different from those nefarious countries and leaders who want to meddle in our election process. But my point earlier still stands. I agree that somebody who would fall under FARA, the Foreign Agent Registration Act, would be the ones that we would have a duty to report, if they came to our campaign. But at the same time, how do we know? Are they going to wear a badge that says,Hey, I am a FARA-registered individual from another country, and I am coming to talk to you since you are a Member of Congress in a political campaign?

I mean, am I going to have my kids who are in college, am I going to have to ask them everyone they come into contact with, “Are you registered under the Foreign Agent Registration Act in Washington, D.C., because I have a duty to report?”

How are we going to know? That is why we have to take a step back. We have to sit down. We have to work this together. There are too many unintended consequences that, yes, Madam Chair, I agree that somebody who would fall under FARA, the Foreign Agent Registration Act, would be the ones that we would have a duty to report.

However, what we learned in 2016 is not everyone is as honorable, and so we have to codify this. And I do believe that we will be judged by what we do as our leadership on this important issue and not only what we do, but what we learn from the vulnerabilities that have been exposed.

And that is why I think it is so important that Ms. Lofgren’s legislation is voted for and passed on this floor. And that we include this amendment to make sure it is not just candidates, but also the family members.

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

Mr. MUELLER of Maryland. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF MARYLAND

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in part B of House Report 116-253.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment by its number.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 11, insert after “foreign contact,” the following: “The Federal Bureau of Investigation, not later than 1 week after receiving a notification from a political committee under this paragraph, shall submit to the political committee, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate written or electronic confirmation of receipt of the notification.”

Page 11, insert after line 23 the following (and redesignate the succeeding section):
are contacted by other nations seeking to influence or interfere with our elections. The President’s remarks mirrored one given by his son-in-law, Jared Kushner, who also said he was not sure he would call the FBI if a foreign government offered damaging information about a political foe.

That is why it is critical that we pass this legislation, to protect the integrity of our elections. The underlying bill requires public officials, campaigns, and campaigns to report to the FBI when foreign governments and their agents contact them and holds them responsible when they fail to report.

Madam Chair, my amendment strengthens this legislation by requiring the FBI to confirm receipt of any notification of possible foreign interference operations. Additionally, the FBI must also notify both the House and Senate Intelligence Committees guaranteeing that Congress, as a coequal branch of government, is made aware when foreign agents and stateless nations are attempting to undermine our democracy. Finally, my amendment would require the FBI to submit an annual report to Congress related to all the notifications it has received and the corresponding actions the Bureau has taken in response.

The FBI cannot be passive to these threats to our national security but must take decisive action to respond to election interference.

Madam Chair, I strongly encourage my colleagues to support this amendment and this underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. My amendment fights against these well-intended goals of preventing foreign influence and is overbroad and puts the responsibility on campaigns. Cam-panies are ill-prepared to interpret this legislation, is that it is overbroad and puts the responsibility on campaigns. Campaigns are ill-prepared to interpret this language. I am also concerned that requiring the FBI to not only notify Congress, but detail how they are managing and responding to notifications from political committees will inevitably lead to selective leaks and will politicize the well-intended goal of preventing foreign influence.

Madam Chair, for those reasons, I oppose this bill. And since my colleague yielded back, 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 is as follows.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. DELGADO
The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in part B of House Report 116–253.

Mr. DELGADO. 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 33, line 7, strike “and”... Page 33, insert after line 7 the following (and redesignate the succeeding provision accordingly):

“(2) an analysis of the extent to which illicit foreign money was used to carry out disinformation and propaganda campaigns focused on depressing turnout among rural communities and the success or failure of these efforts, with recommendations to address these efforts in future elections; and”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 650, the gentleman from New York (Mr. DELGADO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DELGADO. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Today, I rise in support of my amendment to the SHIELD Act, which is meant to keep foreign influences from depressing voter turnout in rural communities.

Protecting our democracy and up-holding the sanctity of our elections is of critical importance.

Madam Chair, the SHIELD Act is urgently needed legislation. Americans will go to the polls in a matter of weeks, and every day, we are presented with more data that our foreign adversaries are working to influence our elections and undermine our democracy.

These destructive tactics, as we have seen in previous election cycles, continue to get more sophisticated, with outside parties now manipulating our elections through the ballot box, social media, and spreading misinformation.

My amendment fights against these tactics and requires an analysis, following each Federal election, into whether or not illicit foreign money was used to carry out disinformation or propaganda campaigns focused on depressing turnout among rural communities.

The amendment also requires a breakdown of the successes or failures of these efforts and recommendations for how we can address these tactics in future elections.

Americans in rural communities face many hurdles to exercising the right to vote, including the distance to the nearest poll. We cannot add additional hurdles of foreign disinformation and its influence on voter turnout.

There is nothing more important than protecting our democracy and ensuring every American has the ability to vote and the opportunity to make their voices heard.

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 the amendment.

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I, too, like my colleague from New York, represent a district with a very large rural population. I want to see rural turnout as high as possible.

But the mission of the FEC is to administer and enforce Federal campaign finance law. I mean, if this becomes law, along with some of the other previous amendments and amendments after this, I don’t know when the FEC is going to have any time to actually enforce campaign finance violations that are happening right now. The FEC is not equipped to receive all these mandates from Congress.

This is an extremely important job, a job some on the Commission, including the Chair, are ignoring by spending all their time attacking the President. I think we need to let the FEC focus on their day job.

There are many groups, within and outside government, that could produce a report on misinformation, such as the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, maybe even the Brennan Center. Let’s let them do it.

Help us help the FEC to be able to do the job that we have required it to do.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DELGADO. Madam Chair, I would note to my friend that in order for the FEC to enforce the law as you suggest, which I certainly believe they ought to, it would help if they had more data and the information to do so and be able to track down attempts to break the law.

This would be exactly what we are trying to do with this amendment. To speculate on who might—when, where, and how—be able to do this is a waste of time when we know at this point that we are under siege.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I look forward to working with my colleague from New York to address many issues regarding rural America. I would love to be able to sit down and find a workable solution.
The problem is, the solution that is being offered in this amendment is being taken on to a bill that is never going to become law. So we are either going to talk about amendments that are going to remain talking points or we can sit down together and work in a bipartisan fashion to get a law passed that is going to have the impact that my colleague from New York and I want it to have.

Let’s sit down, without having to write the rules that the FEC would have to follow. Let’s work together and send a letter to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. Let’s send a letter to the Brennan Center and see if they can study it.

Why do we have to wait so long? This is a much easier way to address the problem that I think he and I agree ought to be addressed. Let’s do that.

When this bill passes on a partisan rollcall today and goes nowhere when it moves into the Senate, let’s commit to working together to see what we can do to get this done because rural America is too important to be affected by partisanship here in Washington, D.C.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DELGADO. Madam Chair, I would be more than happy to work with my colleague to do whatever we can to deal with protecting our elections and ensuring that they remain free and fair.

As I am sure the gentleman understands, representing a rural district, too many folks in our communities are being left behind, and they should not be left behind in the least bit when it comes to the sanctity of our elections.

While we might be in a position where, unfortunately, partisanship gets in the way of these issues, I will note that to simply say these things won’t become law is part of the problem. I think it is also important to deconstruct why these things are not making their way into law in the first place.

When people become overly partisan in this environment, we are at an impasse, unfortunately. I am here to work beyond that.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, again, I agree with my colleague. This place becomes overly partisan. This entire process, this bill, with both the House Administration Committee before it was forced to markup through our committee, without us to have a chance to ask experts what they can and cannot do to address many of the problems that my colleague from New York actually fought for solutions for, that is the problem of partisanship.

We can’t just blame the Senate. I was told by many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle we were in the majority. So what if the Senate is not going to accept it? We’ve fought to work together in the House.” I agreed then, and I agree now. We ought to find solutions.

Unfortunately, partisanship has overtaken this process. The unfortunate result of that is that good ideas like the one my colleague has are going to stop in their tracks when this amendment passes on a partisan rollcall vote for this amendment, and then it is not going to become law.

Again, I can’t wait to work with my colleague on finding a way to get this information into the right hands and have those who can study it without having to go through a dysfunctional Federal Election Commission and also have them study why we had historic turnout not just in urban America but in rural America during the 2018 midterm. Let’s talk about what we have done right to make sure that voters have a chance to get to the polls at historic turnout numbers like we saw during the 2018 election cycle, which allowed many of my colleagues to get elected to this institution.

Madam Chair, I urge a “no” vote on this amendment. Forward to working with my colleague in the future to address the problem of access and voter access in rural America, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DELGADO. Madam Chair, I would like to add to the discussion back full circle, when my friend says that the FEC is dysfunctional but began this conversation saying that it has the responsibility to enforce election laws, those two points don’t really go hand in hand.

I think it is important that if we are going to make the FEC able and capable of enforcing the laws that we know are critical to protecting our democracy, then we should operate on the assumption of how we could make the FEC as functional as possible and give the FEC data and information to achieve its stated purpose.

I thank Chairwoman LOFGREN for her leadership on this issue and urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to put the protection of our democracy over partisan division and pass both my amendment and the underlying bill.

Madam 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. DELGADO). The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MS. HOULAHAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in part B of House Report 116–253.

Ms. HOULAHAN. 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 40, insert after line 6 the following:

SEC. 303. PROHIBITION ON PROVISION OF SUBSTANTIAL ASSISTANCE RELATING TO CONTRIBUTION OR DONATION BY FOREIGN NATIONALS.

Section 319 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30122), as amended by section 117, section 201(a), section 201(b), and section 301, is further amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “or” at the end of paragraph (2);

(B) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (3) and inserting “; or”;

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) a person to knowingly provide substantial assistance to another person in carrying out the activity described in paragraph (1), (2), or (3);”;

and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsections:

“(f) KNOWLINGLY DESCRIBED.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of subsection (a)(4), the term ‘knowingly’ means aware of, had knowledge of, or awareness of pertinent facts that would lead a reasonable person to conclude there is a substantial probability, or awareness of pertinent facts that would lead a reasonable person to conduct a reasonable inquiry to establish—

“(A) with respect to an activity described in subsection (a)(1), that the contribution, donation, expenditure, independent expenditure, or disbursement is from a foreign national;

“(B) with respect to an activity described in subsection (a)(2), that the contribution or donation solicited, accepted, or received is from a foreign national;

“(C) with respect to an activity described in subsection (a)(3), that the person directing, dictating, controlling, or directly or indirectly participating in the decision making process is a foreign national.

“(2) PERTINENT FACTS.—For purposes of paragraph (1), pertinent facts include, but are not limited to, that the person making the contribution, donation, expenditure, independent expenditure, or disbursement, or that the person from whom the contribution or donation is solicited, accepted, or received, or that the person directing, dictating, controlling, or directly or indirectly participating in the decision making process

“(A) uses a foreign passport or passport number for identification purposes;

“(B) provides a foreign address;

“(C) uses a check or other written instrument drawn on a foreign bank, or by a wire transfer from a foreign bank, in carrying out the activity; or

“(D) resides abroad.

“(g) SUBSTANTIAL ASSISTANCE DEFINED.—

As used in this section, the term ‘substantial assistance’ means, with respect to an activity prohibited by paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of subsection (a), involvement with an intent to facilitate successful completion of the activity.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 650, the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. HOULAHAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania. Ms. HOULAHAN. Madam Chairwoman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank Chairwoman LOFGREN today for having supported such an amazing body of work and for also supporting this amendment.

Ms. HOULAHAN. I rise today in support of my amendment to H.R. 4617, which helps secure our elections by holding Americans who help foreigners funnel money into our elections more accountable.

Throughout our history, people have fought for the right to vote, and our men and women in uniform have died to protect that right. Being an American is a privilege, and the right for
every American to cast their ballot is sacred. It is part of our duty, and it is part of our duty in Congress, to protect that right. That is why I am encouraging my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support my amendment.

Foreign money in our elections is an assault on our American electorate and on the democracy that our forefathers built. Americans who help foreign actors meddle in our elections must be held accountable under the law.

To vote against my amendment is, therefore, the actions of Americans who act against the interests of our country and who help foreigners undermine our elections.

I believe I speak for my colleagues on both sides of the aisle when I say this body is committed to defending our country’s democratic processes. This need not be partisan because there is nothing more fundamentally American than protecting our most sacred right, the right to vote, from all foreign interference.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition, although I am not opposed to this amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I thank my good friend from the great State of Pennsylvania for offering this amendment.

However, I would like to add, this is an incredibly wonky amendment to an already complicated, convoluted, and confusing bill. I don’t think you should confuse the actions of Americans who help foreign interference.

If they didn’t believe it was dysfunctional, they wouldn’t have voted, in H.R. 1, to make it a partisan agency. If they think it is great now, why did they try to make it into an even more partisan agency?

So, I think we all agree it is dysfunctional. We may have different reasons why.

But my bill doesn’t empower a dysfunctional FEC to address the problem of foreign nationals meddling in our elections. My bill empowers the Department of Justice, which has jurisdiction over enforcing the Foreign Agents Registration Act. That is a better option.

Clearly, I am not going to get an option because this bill was brought to the floor without any hearings, without any opportunity for us to have input, and that is a problem. That is a problem with legislating in this institution.

That is a broken promise that this Democratic majority made to the voters who sent them here and put them in the majority. They said they were going to do things differently, right? I heard from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, in my terms before this one, how things were ramrodded through, how regular order wasn’t followed, how they weren’t given a chance to sit down and come up with solutions. Well, I find it ironic that the same folks who lost the majority of the Republican majority in the 115th Congress of investing $380 million in election security funds, where we saw historic turnout in the 2018 midterms—we saw historic turnout, and we saw success.

That is what a Republican majority gave. The Democratic majority have given us hearings—well, wait, no. No hearings before this bill was put to the floor, that is a problem.

I really want to say thank you to my colleague from Pennsylvania for offering this amendment. It is a common-sense amendment. But, again, the FEC is not the place. I am not going to be opposed to this amendment. The DOJ is the place.

Madam Chair, I am going to make sure I reserve my time. If I had a challenge flag, I thought my colleague last time yielded back, but I believe the judgment from the referees up there was that he did not yield back. Maybe we could check the replay a little later, so I will go ahead and reserve this time.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. HOULAHAN. Madam Chair, I will take it as the deepest compliment from my colleague, Mr. Davis, that he says that my amendment is wonky since I believe that is our responsibility here in Congress, to legislate and to develop good policy.

I will also take that back to the working group that was a bipartisan working group that developed this amendment with me, the bipartisan Task Force Sentry, which really worked very hard to find a way to make sure that we would codify what was already being practiced by the FEC.

This doesn’t give the FEC any more power. It simply gives the power to us to be able to actually criminalize people by defining what it means to support foreign interference.

I believe that this amendment does speak for itself, and I am very, very grateful for the compliments of how this is a policy wonk’s dream. I will go ahead and interpret the gentleman’s words.

I very much would encourage Americans to understand why we need to prevent funneling foreign money into our elections.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Ms. HOULAHAN).

The amendment was agreed to. □ 1700

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MS. SLOTKIN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in part B of House Report 116–253.

Ms. SLOTKIN. 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 54, insert after line 14 the following:

Subtitle C—Assessment of Exemption of Registration Requirements Under FARA for Registered Lobbyists

SEC. 321. ASSESSMENT OF EXEMPTION OF REGISTRATION REQUIREMENTS UNDER FARA FOR REGISTERED LOBBYISTS.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct and submit to Congress an assessment of the implications of the exemptions provided under the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended (22 U.S.C. 611 et seq.), for agents of foreign principals who are also registered lobbyists under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.), and shall include in the assessment an analysis of the extent to which revisions in such Acts might mitigate the risk that foreign governments or foreign political money influencing elections or political processes in the United States.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 650, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. SLOTKIN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Ms. SLOTKIN. Madam Chair, I rise today in support of an amendment to the SHIELD Act, which takes a step toward solving a tough, complicated, outstanding challenge in preventing foreign influence in our elections, and that is closing loopholes that currently allow lobbying firms to contribute to U.S. campaigns.

Again, no matter who we are or what party we are from, we can all agree that we don’t want foreigners playing in our political process.

I am very proud that the SHIELD Act includes legislation—we have discussed it earlier—that closes loopholes so that foreigners cannot buy ads for or against a candidate in an American election. That idea was very simple. Particularly on social media, this is important.

So why, then, if we are not letting foreign entities buy ads in our political process is it okay that lobbyists for foreign governments are able to contribute to candidates, campaigns, and otherwise influence U.S. elections?

There is some work to be done on this. It is, admittedly, complicated. But in order to properly close these loopholes, we need to first understand what those loopholes are and how they impact foreign entities’ ability to influence our elections.

My amendment directs the Government Accountability Office to assess
The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Jersey.

Ms. SHERRILL. Madam Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment to strengthen protections from deceptive practices in Federal elections.

We know that the run-up to the 2016 election, our adversaries employed multiple systematic efforts to spread disinformation and sow confusion among American voters. In one particularly egregious example, Russian bots called down voters and tell them that they could “vote from home” by simply texting a code or going online.

On the eve of the 2018 election, Facebook deleted many accounts—including those with links to the Russian Government—that were engaged in coordinated, deceptive behavior.

Today, we know that our adversaries are not only working to hijack our political system just before an election, they are interfering in our democracy on a continuous basis.

Madam Chair, election security is not about Democrats or Republicans. Election security is about all Americans coming together to defend our shared democracy—our democracy—enshrined in the Constitution.

I have prioritized election security since arriving in Washington 10 months ago. As chairwoman of the House Science Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight, I held a hearing on disinformation and the threat posed by online imposters and deep fakes.

I have worked with a group of colleagues on both sides of the aisle on election security, and we have heard over and over again from experts on the need for more robust protections to combat this new era of coordinated disinformation efforts.

As a proud Representative of the great State of New Jersey, I will always defend our right as Americans to have a free and fair election, particularly when it comes to what matters to us in the run-up to our elections.

One of the things I love about my district is, while we don’t always agree on the path forward, we agree on the need for honest and respectful debate. That is what our democracy is all about. It is what I signed up to defend when I joined the United States Navy.

So it is essential that we stand together as Americans to strengthen our laws and our institutions. Our foreign adversaries are not able to dictate the outcomes of our elections.

I offer this amendment to prohibit any attempts to deceive voters 90 days before a Federal primary and general elections. This includes knowingly providing false information about the time or place of voting, what qualifications a voter must have in order to vote, or public endorsements of candidates.

Excluding the provisions in the Deceptive Practices and Voter Intimidation Act from 60 days before an election to 90 days will better protect our democracy from hostile foreign actors trying to disrupt the voices and votes of Americans. It also protects against longstanding efforts to disenfranchise communities of color, women, and other marginalized groups.

In my home State of New Jersey, early voting across 45 days before an election. In fact, 39 States across the country have some form of early voting. That is why we need this critical amendment to extend protections and prohibit disinformation before any American casts their ballot.

I urge my colleagues to pass this important amendment, safeguard our democracy, and ensure that the American people, not our foreign adversaries, determine the results of our elections.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

Madam Chair, I appreciate my new colleague from New Jersey offering this amendment and participating in this process. I look to work with her and many of my colleagues when the majority party finally comes to the table and wants to put a bipartisan solution together.

Everyone here is against deceptive practices. This includes providing false information about the time or place of voting and qualifications for voting.

But the underlying section here presents numerous questions because of its vagueness. Some of the situations this would apply to seem pretty ridiculous.

Do you want to know how ridiculous this section of the SHIELD Act is? Let’s talk about public endorsements.

Recently, former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton said about current Presidential candidate, our colleague, Congresswoman Tulsi GABBARD:

I think the Russians have got their eye on somebody and are grooming her to be a third-party candidate. She’s a favorite of the Russians.

So Secretary Clinton is suggesting the Russians endorse Congresswoman GABBARD. Is that not a false endorsement? Would Hillary Clinton not be subject to 5 years in prison for making such a statement?

Let the RECORD show, nobody is chanting “Lock her up.”

This is another ridiculous section of the bill. It is not surprising, given the warp speed with which this bill is being rushed to the floor.

I have to commend my colleague from New Jersey because this amendment is right about the amount of wonkiness that we need in amendments and pieces of legislation.

But I will stand and say, as a Member of this institution, that we can never get so wonky with our jobs and our writing of bills that it has a chilling effect on the First Amendment
rights to free speech that every American in this country deserves.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Ms. SHERRILL).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. CUNNINGHAM

The Acting CHAIR. The It is now in order to consider amendment No. 12 printed in part B of House Report 116–253.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. 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 33, line 7, strike “and”
Page 33, insert after line 7 the following (and redesignate the succeeding provision accordingly):

“(2) an analysis of the extent to which illicit foreign money was used to carry out disinformation and propaganda campaigns focused on depressing turnout among African-American and other minority communities and the success or failure of these efforts, together with recommendations to address these efforts in future elections; and”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 650, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Madam Chair, I rise today in support of my amendment to help protect our Nation’s veterans and servicemembers from targeted disinformation campaigns bankrolled by foreign governments.

Earlier this month the Republican-led Senate Intelligence Committee released its report on Russia’s attempts to interfere with the 2016 U.S. Presidential election. In that report, the committee described how Russian-influenced operatives created fake online personas to target specific groups, including veterans, with the goal of sowing discord in the American political system.

To that end, operatives created social media pages impersonating congressionally-chartered veteran service organizations, or VSOs, to push their divisive message. In one such case, a page impersonating Vietnam Veterans of America run by a troll farm in Bulgaria grew to nearly 200,000 followers before it was shut down.

After learning of this illicit account, VVA launched their own 2-year investigation into the issue, and they found more than 150 similar efforts across every major social media platform.

And while I think their actions are reprehensible, I have to admit that their approach makes sense. Numerous studies have shown that veterans vote at higher rates than those who haven’t served. And those votes are especially concentrated in swing states. In my South Carolina district, veterans make up nearly 13 percent of the voting population, so I for one prefer my chances against a fellow American, rather than a campaign run out of a troll farm in Saint Petersburg.

Joking aside, it is unacceptable that we are allowing those same men and women who have served our Nation overseas to be susceptible to these malign influences. That is why I am proud to support the underlying bill, which would prohibit federal funds from sponsoring influenced campaigns designed to affect the outcome of a Federal election.
But since we know that foreign advertisers aren’t interested in playing by our own rules, my amendment would require the FEC to investigate those foreign influence campaigns after each election so we can put a stop to them.

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, even though I am not opposed to it.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, as much as I would like to have some fun with my good friend and colleague from South Carolina and oppose this amendment and have great debate back and forth, it is a pretty darn good amendment.

I think we need to do everything we can in a bipartisan way to make sure that our Nation’s heroes have the right to vote not only here at home, but abroad.

I look forward to working with you—after this bill that will pass today on a partisan roll call but will go nowhere—to make sure that our Nation’s heroes are not adversely affected by any propaganda or any attempts to stop them from exercising that right.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Madam Chair, in closing, I want to thank Chairwoman LOFGREN for her leadership on the House Administration Committee and all the members of the committee for their work on this critical legislation. I also want to thank Chairman MCGOVERN and the members of the Rules Committee for allowing my amendments to come to the floor. I want to thank Mr. DAVIS, across the aisle for his work. And I hope that all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join me in supporting my straightforward, commonsense amendment, as well as the underlying bill.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CUNNINGHAM).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MS. SPANBERGER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 14 printed in part B of House Report 116-253.

Ms. SPANBERGER. 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 23, line 8, strike “and a list” and insert “list.”

Page 23, line 11, strike the period and insert the following: “; and, if the person pur}

chasing the advertisement is acting as the agent of a foreign principal under the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended (22 U.S.C. 611 et seq.), a statement that the person is the agent of foreign principal and the identification of the foreign principal involved.”

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 650, the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. SPANBERGER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Virginia.

Ms. SPANBERGER. Madam Chair, I rise in support of my amendment to H.R. 4617, the SHIELD Act.

Today the House is discussing and debating how we can safeguard the integrity of our elections, the bedrock of our democracy. How do we protect our electoral systems from foreign threats? And how do we prevent foreign influence over our electorate?

As we stand here today, the number of countries engaged in active campaigns to mislead the electorate, the American people.

According to a new report from the University of Oxford, the number of countries engaged in disinformation campaigns has more than doubled in the last 2 years. Additionally, at least seven countries have used their intelligence or military apparatuses to deploy disinformation on social media to influence a foreign country and its people.

As a former intelligence officer, I recognize the risks that these potential attacks, yes, attacks, pose as we head into the next year’s Federal, State, and local elections. There is a legitimate fear across our intelligence community that foreign governments will build on Russia’s extensive information warfare strategy. Foreign actors from Russia to China to North Korea to Iran are eager to undermine the foundations of our democracy.

Leading up to the 2016 Presidential election Facebook disclosed that it had found more than $100,000 worth of ads on divisive issues purchased by a Russian company linked to the Kremlin, and the potential return on investment is extremely high. As we approach 2020, we have every reason to follow this playbook again and to strengthen their disinformation operations.

In the context of these threats, we need to take a serious look at how we build resiliency against foreign interference across platforms. Digital advertising can be a far less expensive and time intensive as a tool for propaganda, and it can spread disinformation, confusion, hate, and division at an alarming rate.

The SHIELD Act takes real steps to require large online platforms to keep records of qualified political advertisements, and I would like to thank my colleagues for their hard work on this critical issue.

The SHIELD Act would require online companies to keep publicly available records about online digital political advertisements. It would require information about the contents of a specific advertisement, its target audience, and the issue it addresses.

Additionally, it would require disclosure information about those purchasing the advertisement. Disclosure sheds light on corporate influence. And it stops our democracy from becoming vulnerable to foreign governments, nonstate actors, and shadowy influence groups constantly working to distract and mislead the American people.

My amendment would strengthen this disclosure requirement.

My amendment would add that online platforms need to include a statement when the person purchasing a political advertisement is acting as the agent of a foreign principal.

Not only would it include language making it clear that they are acting on behalf of a foreign entity, but it would put those purchasing our elections in clear violation of our Nation’s laws.

As Congress acts today to restore the trust of those we serve in our system of government, my amendment to H.R. 4617 would strengthen our efforts to prevent the spread of foreign influence in our democratic system.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment to H.R. 4617 to increase transparency in online advertisements, something that should not be controversial.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I thank my colleague from Virginia for offering this amendment, but this amendment shares the same flaw as the main text of the bill, putting media platforms in charge of enforcing our Nation’s laws.

They are not doing a good job right now. I don’t know if Mr. Zuckerberg is still across the street testifying in front of the Financial Services Committee, but if they were doing a good job, he wouldn’t have been here so long.

Rather, we need to strengthen FARA and help the Department of Justice do the job, he wouldn’t have been here so long.

Additionally, it would require disclosure information about those purchasing the advertisement. Disclosure sheds light on corporate influence. And it stops our democracy from becoming vulnerable to foreign governments, nonstate actors, and shadowy influence groups constantly working to distract and mislead the American people.

My amendment would strengthen this disclosure requirement.

My amendment would add that online platforms need to include a statement when the person purchasing a political advertisement is acting as the agent of a foreign principal.

Not only would it include language making it clear that they are acting on behalf of a foreign entity, but it would put those purchasing our elections in clear violation of our Nation’s laws.

As Congress acts today to restore the trust of those we serve in our system of government, my amendment to H.R. 4617 would strengthen our efforts to prevent the spread of foreign influence in our democratic system.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment to H.R. 4617 to increase transparency in online advertisements, something that should not be controversial.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I thank my colleague from Virginia for offering this amendment, but this amendment shares the same flaw as the main text of the bill, putting media platforms in charge of enforcing our Nation’s laws.

They are not doing a good job right now. I don’t know if Mr. Zuckerberg is still across the street testifying in front of the Financial Services Committee, but if they were doing a good job, he wouldn’t have been here so long.

Rather, we need to strengthen FARA and help the Department of Justice do...
its job. I do not understand why the Democrats want the social media companies to have more responsibilities when they failed miserably in 2016. I strongly urge a "no" vote. I also urge every Member, both Republicans and Democrats, to take a look at my bill. It is a bipartisan bill.

I don’t want to empower the media platforms or restrict speech by American citizens. I want to give the DOJ the resources to do its job.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SPANBERGER. Madam Chair, the purpose of this amendment is, in fact, to ensure that the American people are aware when an agent of a foreign principal under FARA parameters purchases a political advertisement. We, as Members of Congress, have the ability to set the parameters under which the transparency and information is available to the American public. And in doing so, we need to make sure that not only do the American people know when there is a foreign individual purchasing advertisements meant to influence them, but when someone else is also purchasing those advertisements on behalf of a foreign entity as described by FARA.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I appreciate the gentlwoman’s willingness to want to help fix a bill that my colleagues have never had a chance to have an open debate about, never had a chance to have hearings about.

When it doesn’t pass, I look forward to working with my colleagues. When it doesn’t pass into law—it will pass here on a partisan roll call—when it doesn’t pass into law, I look forward to working with my colleagues.

But I do have a bill that would address this situation. FARA, let’s work together to get the DOJ to have the resources and the ability to do their job. The SHIELD Act is not allowing that to happen. FARA, let’s work together to let the DOJ have the resources to do its job. I do not understand why the resources to do its job. I don’t want to empower the media platforms or restrict speech by American citizens.

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

Ms. SPANBERGER. Madam Chair, I also support increasing the enforcement of FARA.

But this, in particular, is about transparency and the transparency that it brings as it relates to the underlying aspect of the Honest Ads Act, which is a bipartisan bill, Republicans and Democrats in equal amounts. This is about transparency. This is about allowing the American people to know who, in fact, is purchasing the ads that are meant to influence them.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Ms. SPANBERGER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MRS. LESKO

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, the unfinished business is the request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 116-233 offered by the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by vote of the Yeas.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignates the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were 180, noes 231, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 581]
Mr. T HOMPSON of Mississippi, Acting DEGETTE) having assumed the chair, and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. THOMAS of Georgia) having assumed the chair, as amended.

The question is on the amendment that follows and insert the following:

"(h) with the following amendment:

"The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT
Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If so, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT
Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The motion to recommit. The Clerk will report the motion to recomm. The Clerk reads as follows:

Mr. Rodney Davis of Illinois moves to recommit the bill H.R. 4617 to the Committee on House Administration with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Strike subsection (b) of section 1 and all that follows and insert the following:

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

TITLE I—FOREIGN AGENTS REGISTRATION REFORM

Sec. 101. Clarification of coverage of activities directed within the United States by agents outside of United States.

Sec. 102. Application of press exemption to other forms of media for purposes of engagement in political activities.

Sec. 103. Treatment of activities to influence public opinion on elections as political activity.

Sec. 104. Effective date.

TITLE II—DISCLAIMER REQUIREMENTS FOR ONLINE POLITICAL ADVERTISEMENTS

Sec. 201. Clarifying disclaimer requirements for online political advertisements.

TITLE III—REDUCING ILLICIT FOREIGN MONEY IN ELECTIONS

Sec. 301. Report on illicit foreign money in Federal elections.

Sec. 302. Prohibitions and donations by foreign nationals in connections with ballot initiatives and referenda.

TITLE IV—PROHIBITING PAYMENT OF ELECTION ASSISTANCE FUNDS TO STATES ALLOWING BALLOT HARVESTING

Sec. 401. Prohibition on payments to States allowing the transmission of ballots by certain third parties.

TITLE V—PROHIBITING PAYMENT OF ELECTION ASSISTANCE FUNDS TO STATES ALLOWING VOTING BY NON-CITIZENS

Sec. 501. Prohibition on payments to States allowing voting by non-citizens.

TITLE VI—INADMISSIBILITY AND DEPORTATION OF ALIENS ENGAGING IN IMPROPER ELECTION INTERFERENCE

Sec. 601. Inadmissibility and deportability of aliens engaging in improper interference in United States elections.

TITLE I—FOREIGN AGENTS REGISTRATION REFORM

Sec. 101. Clarification of coverage of activities directed within the United States by agents outside of United States.

(a) TREATMENT OF AGENTS ENGAGED IN ACTIVITIES DIRECTED WITHIN THE UNITED STATES BY AGENTS OUTSIDE OF UNITED STATES.

(1) Any newspaper, magazine, or periodical.

(2) Any broadcast, satellite or cable television or radio station.

(3) Any Internet-based website, application, or platform.

SEC. 101. TREATMENT OF ACTIVITIES TO INFLUENCE PUBLIC OPINION ON ELECTIONS AS POLITICAL ACTIVITY.

(a) CLARIFICATION.—Section 318 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30120) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(y) engages outside the United States in political activities for or in the interests of such foreign principal which are directed at the United States or of any State or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, or any bona fide media outlet for which there is on file with the United States Postal Service information in compliance with section 3085 of title 39, United States Code, published in the United States, solely by virtue of any bona fide news or journalistic activities, including the solicitation or provision of paid advertisements, subscriptions, free social media access which is made available to the general public, or other compensation therefor, so long as it is at least 10 per centum beneficially owned by, and its officers and directors, if any, are citizens of the United States, and such media outlet is not owned, directed, supervised, controlled, subsidized, or financed, and none of its policies are determined by, any foreign principal defined in subsection (b), or by any agent of a foreign principal required to register under this Act.''.

(b) DEFINITION.—Section 1 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 611) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(q) The term 'media outlet' means any of the following:

"(1) Any newspaper, magazine, or periodical.

"(2) Any broadcast, satellite or cable television or radio station.

"(3) Any Internet-based website, application, or platform.

SEC. 102. APPLICATION OF REQUIREMENTS TO ONLINE COMMUNICATIONS.

(a) CLARIFICATION.—Section 318 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30120) is amended by adding at the end following new subsection:

"(e) APPLICATION OF REQUIREMENTS TO ONLINE COMMUNICATIONS.

"(1) Method of provision of information.—Except as provided in paragraph (2) or paragraph (3), a covered Internet communication shall provide the information required under this section on the face of the communication.

"(2) Authorizing use of alternative mechanisms.—

"(A) In general.—In the case of a covered Internet communication described in sub-subparagraph (C) of paragraph (4), the communication may provide the information required under this section through the use of a technological mechanism described in subparagraph (B), so long as the communication presents an indicator described in subparagraph (C).

"(B) Technological mechanism described.—A technological mechanism described in this subparagraph is, with respect to a communication, any technology which enables the individual, observing, or listening to the communication to read, observe, or listen to the information required under this section without navigating more than one step away from the information itself. Such mechanism may take any form, including hover-over, mouse-over, voice-
over, rollover, pop-up screen, scrolling text, rotating panels, or click-through or hyperlink to a landing page.

(C) INDICATOR DESCRIBED.—An indicator described in paragraph (b) of this subsection with respect to a communication, any clear and conspicuous visible or audible element of the communication that gives notice to the individual regarding the information required under this section, any communication that the individual may read, observe, or listen to the information required under this section through a technological mechanism, an indicator may take any form, including words such as ‘Paid for by’, ‘Paid by’, ‘Sponsored by’, or ‘Ad by’, a website URL, an image, a sound, a symbol, or an icon.

(3) WAIVER.—A disclaimer shall not be required for any covered Internet communication that cannot provide a clear and conspicuous statement of the information required under this section either on the face of communication or through the use of a technological mechanism under paragraph (2).

(4) COVERED INTERNET COMMUNICATION DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ‘covered Internet communication’ means any communication required to include information under this section and which is any of the following:

(A) Any electronic mailing of more than 500 substantially similar communications which is disseminated by a political committee.

(B) Any communication disseminated on a publicly-available website of a political committee.

(C) Any communication placed for a fee on another person’s website or Internet-based application or platform.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to elections held in 2020 and any succeeding year.

TITLE IV—PROHIBITING PAYMENT OF ELECTION ASSISTANCE FUNDS TO STATES ALLOWING BALLOT HARVESTING

SEC. 401. PROHIBITION ON PAYMENTS TO STATES ALLOWING COLLECTION AND TRANSMISSION OF BALLOTS BY CERTAIN THIRD PARTIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title III of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 30101 et seq.) is amended by striking ‘‘election, including a State or local ballot initiative or referendum’’.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply with respect to elections held in 2020 or any succeeding year.

TITLE V—PROHIBITING PAYMENT OF ELECTION ASSISTANCE FUNDS TO STATES ALLOWING VOTING BY NON-CITIZENS

SEC. 501. PROHIBITION ON PAYMENTS TO STATES ALLOWING VOTING BY NON-CITIZENS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle D of title II of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21001 et seq.), as amended by section 401, is further amended by adding at the end the following new part:

‘‘PART 7—PROHIBITION ON PAYMENTS TO STATES ALLOWING BALLOT HARVESTING.

SEC. 297. ELIGIBILITY FOR PAYMENTS OF STATES ALLOWING COLLECTION AND TRANSMISSION OF BALLOTS BY CERTAIN THIRD PARTIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—A State is not eligible to receive funds under this Act unless the State allows an individual who is not a citizen of the United States to vote in an election for public office.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for such Act, as amended by section 401, is further amended by inserting after the item relating to section 297 the following new item:

‘‘PART 7—PROHIBITION ON PAYMENTS TO STATES ALLOWING BALLOT HARVESTING (52 U.S.C. 21001 et seq.).’’.

TITLE VI—INADMISSIBILITY AND DEPORTABILITY OF ALIENS ENGAGING IN IMPROPER ELECTION INTERFERENCE

SEC. 601. INADMISSIBILITY AND DEPORTABILITY OF ALIENS ENGAGING IN IMPROPER ELECTION INTERFERENCE.

(a) INADMISSIBILITY.—Section 212(a)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(3)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

‘‘(8) The term ‘improper interference in a United States election’ means—’’.

(b) DEPORTABILITY.—Section 237(a) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1227(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

‘‘(1) The term ‘inadmissible alien’ means—’’.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to elections held in 2020 or any other succeeding year.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there unanimous consent to dispense with the reading?

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

There was no objection.
Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYDOR DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I demand a record vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

Mr. ROYDOR DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I demand a record vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

Mr. ROYDOR DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I demand a record vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

Mr. ROYDOR DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I demand a record vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

Mr. ROYDOR DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I demand a record vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.
Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 227, noes 181, not voting 23, as follows:

AYES—227

Banks 8
Barr 7
Bengs 3
Bishop (NC) 4
Bishop (UT) 7
Buck 8
Burwell 5
Budd 4
Burton 5
Byrne 2
Carnera (CA) 4
Carter (GA) 2
Carter (TX) 6
Chatfield 8
Cheney 5
Cheney 7
Cline 11
Cook 4
Crawford 8
Crenshaw 2
Curts 5
Davis (OH) 3
Davis, Rodney 5
DeSaulnier 3
DeSaulnier 8
DeSaulnier 7
DeSaulnier 3
DeSaulnier 8
DeSaulnier 7
DeSaulnier 3
DeSaulnier 8
DeSaulnier 7
DeSaulnier 3
DeSaulnier 8
DeSaulnier 7
DeSaulnier 3
DeSaulnier 8
DeSaulnier 7
DeSaulnier 3

NOT VOTING—24

Amodei 1
Armstrong 1
Bilirakis 1
Blumenauer 1
Braun 1
Brady 1
Brooks (AL) 1
Brooks (IN) 1
Buchanan 1
Bucco 1
Buchman 1
Buchman 1
Buchman 1
Buchman 1
Buchman 1
Buchman 1
Buchman 1
Buchman 1
Buchman 1
Buchman 1
Buchman 1

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The Speaker Pro Tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEBBIE SMITH REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2019

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 777) to reauthorize programs authorized under the Debbie Smith Act of 2004, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended. This is a 5-minute vote. The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 402, nays 1, not voting 28, as follows: 

(Roll No. 586) TEAS—402

Abraham
Adams
Adler
Affeld
Allred
Amash
Balduin
Balderson
Banks
Barrera
Baxi
Bean
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Barbarragán
Bassy
Bergman
Becker
Beltran
Borum
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle
Bucy
Buchon
Bucholtz
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Carbalajal
Cardenas
Carson (IN)
Carson (FL)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Cassie
Carter (TN)
Cass (FL)
Cesar
Chabot
Cheney
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clay (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cline
Cloud
 Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Comer
Conaway
Connolly
Correa
Costa
Courtesty
Cox (GA)
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crist
Crow
Cummingham

Meadows
Meeke
Meng
Moolenaar
Mooney (NV)
Moore
Morellite
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (NC)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Nesbitt
Norton
Notley
O’Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
O’Neill
Omar
Palazón
Palmer
Panetta
Paradise
Payne
Perlmutter
Perry
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Posey
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Raines
Rayburn
Rogers (VA)
Roe, David P.
Amash

NOT VOTING—28

Amodei
Armstrong
Bass
Bitarakis
Cleaver
Collins (GA)
David (KY)
E遐se
Gabbard
Groatman

□ 1831

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PETERS. Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted: "yea" on rollcall No. 579, "yea" on rollcall No. 580, "nay" on rollcall No. 581, "nay" on rollcall No. 582, "yea" on rollcall No. 583, and "yea" on rollcall No. 584.

MOUMENT OF SILENCE HONORING 241 AMERICAN HEROES KILLED IN 1983 BEIRUT BARRACKS BOMBING

(Mr. PENCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PENCE, Madam Speaker, friends, colleagues, and distinguished guests in the gallery, we are gathered here today on the 36th anniversary of the 1983 Beirut barracks bombing to honor 241 American heroes who made the ultimate sacrifice.

The 241 names—220 of which are my fellow Marines—will be forever etched in our hearts and on the walls of the Beirut Memorial in Jacksonville, North Carolina. Although you may not recognize these names, they are the names of sons, brothers, fathers, and friends. They are the names of true American patriots who came in peace and were stolen from us by an act of pure evil. They are the heroes who gave their lives so we could keep ours.

Semper fidelis means “always faithful.” It is the motto of the United States Marine Corps. Today, we remember the 241 fallen heroes of Beirut. Today, we remain faithful.

Madam Speaker, I ask that all Members and distinguished guests in the gallery take a moment of silence.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TUESDAY, OCTOBER 22, 2019, TO MONDAY, OCTOBER 28, 2019

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow; and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet on Monday, October 28, 2019, when it should convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROUDA). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland? There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader the schedule for next week. I would be happy to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished majority leader of the House.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Louisiana for yielding.
On Monday, Mr. Speaker, the House will meet at 12 p.m. for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business, with votes postponed until 6:30 p.m.

On Tuesday and Wednesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate, and 12 p.m. for legislative business.

On Thursday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business; the last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m.

We will consider several bills under suspension of the rules. The complete list of suspensions will be announced by close of business on Friday.

The House will consider H.R. 823, the Colorado Outdoor Recreation and Economy Act; H.R. 2981, the Chaco Cultural Heritage Area Protection Act; and H.R. 1373, the Grand Canyon Centennial Protection Act. These three bills all recognize the need to protect some of America’s most iconic and important landscapes.

The House, Mr. Speaker, will also consider H.R. 4695, the Protect Against Conflict by Turkey Act. This bipartisan legislation, cosponsored by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, provides strong, targeted response to the crisis caused by Turkey’s invasion of Northern Syria.

It sanctions senior Turkish officials involved in the decision and those committing human rights abuses, and penalizes Turkish financial institutions involved in perpetuating President Erdogan’s practices.

Lastly, the House will consider H.Res 296 affirming the United States’ record on the Armenian Genocide.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his response. I would like the gentleman to walk through, if he could, the scheduling process for how the House will further proceed with the impeachment inquiry.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCALISE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I cannot respond to that at this point in time. We haven’t made that decision to move ahead. The committees, as the gentleman knows, are considering it, and if they decide that the House should move forward, then we will make that decision.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I again, ask the question I had asked last week: Are we currently in an impeachment inquiry, as the Speaker said we were a few weeks ago?

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I will respond as I responded last week. We are doing our constitutional duty of oversight of the administration and the actions of the President of the United States to determine whether or not there have been violations of law, whether the President has committed high crimes and misdemeanors. And when those hearings are concluded, obviously, they will make some determination and make recommendations to the House, as they do with other matters that the committees consider.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. As this determination moves forward, there is a growing cry for retrenchment. We’ve had a little bit about that last week, but we saw it again this week with more closed hearings, more hearings where both sides were not allowed the same equal rights that have always been provided in impeachment inquiries.

And, as you look through our Nation’s history, fortunately, there are not that many instances where Congress had to try to impeach or inquire about impeaching a President—three times.

In fact, in all three cases, it started with a vote of the full House, and it started with a fair set of rules. And in the last two that were the most public, where you saw the proceedings on television, you saw both sides vote for Nixon, and the President of the United States?

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. As this determination comes forth to testify, as opposed to an open process, as has always been the case in our country’s history.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. SPEAKER. Mr. Speaker, I, again, respond as I have responded. I do not form a conclusion about the gentleman’s question. We have not heard a determination as to whether there is a case. And, again, it has only been done three times, but in each of those cases, there were fair sets of rules used, so that you could actually find out what was happening. And if there was something that reached the level of high crimes and misdemeanors, it was not based on what one opined, but based on everybody being able to present the evidence, everybody being able to bring witnesses forward. That is not happening right now, and it ought to change.

I would hope, and ask the gentleman, if this is going to continue moving forward, if there is going to be any credibility to whatever report would come out of it.

There is much less credibility if it is done in secret with one person and one person only getting to choose who comes forth to testify, as opposed to an open process, as has always been the case in our country’s history.

Mr. SPEAKER. Mr. Speaker, I appeal to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, no matter how many times the gentleman from Louisiana, the Republican whip, says that these are unfair hearings, that they are secret hearings, something that Republicans can’t participate, no matter how many times he says, it will not be true.

He talks about secret hearings. I will show you the front page of The Washington Post about the hearing yesterday. It is on the front page.

Now, I know your Members can read. Three over 105 Members, 40 or so of your Members, who are authorized to sit in the committee.

The President, Mr. Speaker, called the Republicans, and he has tweeted about how they need to be tougher.

What I want to ask, Mr. Speaker, is: When are they going to focus on defending the Constitution of the United States?

I ask the gentleman: Does he believe that the President is above the law?

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I would imagine the gentleman would also agree that the chairman of the Intelligence Committee should also not be above the law. He should not be able to write his own rules of impeachment, his own rules of engagement, in secret.

These meetings are being held in secret. In fact, when some of us went into the room today, he ran out with the witness.

What are you trying to hide when, as any kind of secret hearing, people run out of the room as soon as the lights come on? What is really going on?

If you want to talk about numbers—

Mr. HOYER. Read the paper.

Mr. SCALISE. The sad part is, the only way you can find out what happens in those secret hearings is reading the newspaper, because the majority staff is, against the direction of the chairman, selectively leaking information to the press.

And, again, it has only been done three times, but in each of those cases, there were fair sets of rules used, so that you could actually find out what was happening. And if there was something that reached the level of high crimes and misdemeanors, it was not based on what one opined, but based on everybody being able to present the evidence, everybody being able to bring witnesses forward. That is not happening right now, and it ought to change.

I would hope, and ask the gentleman, if this is going to continue moving forward, if there is going to be any credibility to whatever report would come out of it.

There is much less credibility if it is done in secret with one person and one person only getting to choose who comes forth to testify, as opposed to an open process, as has always been the case in our country’s history.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.
The press knows more about this impeachment inquiry than voting Members of Congress. Mr. Speaker, 75 percent of this Congress is denied access to those hearings, 75 percent.

Maybe you can read what was leaked by somebody on your majority staff, Mr. Speaker. Maybe that is where you can get your information because that is the only place to get information. That shouldn't be where Members of Congress have to go to find out what happened.

By the way, you talk to some of the people who were in the room, and they were directed by the chairman not to say anything. He can say something or somebody on his staff can say something, and he hasn't done anything to control the leaks. But then they say, actually, there was a lot of other testimony that contradicted what was leaked to the paper. But nobody really knows about the truth. You are denied access.

Do you know, if you take the voting Members of Congress who are not allowed in that room, it represents over 230 million American citizens who are denied representation in those impeachment proceedings, over 230 million Americans who are denied access because 75 percent of voting Members of Congress are not allowed in the room?

You can talk about who is allowed in the room. Everybody should be allowed in the room. The press should be allowed in the room. Cameras should be in the room, like in previous impeachments.

If you want to try to remove a President—maybe you don't agree with the 2016 election result, and you are concerned about what might happen next year. That is not why you impeach a President, by the way.

But if you really do want to search for the truth, you can search for the truth in public. The people of this country ought to be able to see what is happening. It shouldn't be a selected story in the newspaper that was leaked by somebody on your majority staff, Mr. Pompeo, and Mr. Trey Gowdy, who was a Member of this body.

Let me ask the gentleman, Mr. Speaker: Does he believe it appropriate that the Congress appropriates $391 million to help confront Russia—which I understand Mr. Putin probably wasn't for—but does he believe that the President should have withheld that money from Ukraine to defend itself on its eastern front?

Mr. SCALISE. The law requires the President to verify that there is not corruption involved with the taxpayer money that is in question. That is a law we passed. I believe the gentleman from Maryland voted, as I did vote, for that law. It is a good law to say that if we are going to send taxpayer money to a foreign country, we ought to make sure that there is no corruption.

There were claims of corruption in Ukraine. In fact, a lot of the interference in our election by the Russians went through Ukraine in 2016. Now, President Trump wasn't the President back then when this country was allowing Russia to interfere with the election.

Mr. HOYER. He has no evidence of that. If the gentleman will yield, he has no evidence of that.

Mr. SCALISE. But he is looking into it, as he should be.

Mr. HOYER. He makes a bald-faced assertion that he has no way to back up.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. It is not true, in my opinion, but he has no way to back up that statement, and I think the gentleman must know that.

Mr. SCALISE. Again, we can talk about why we needed to root out corruption, why we want to find out what happened in the 2016 election where the Russians tried to interfere, because we don't want it to happen again.

We also know, as it was discussed on that phone call, that President Trump sold Javelin missiles to Ukraine so they could protect themselves against the Russians, the aggression that the gentleman was talking about on the eastern front, where the previous President allowed the Russians to come into Crimea when Ukraine was asking us to help them.

Ukraine, back when President Obama was in office, was asking us to sell them those same Javelin missiles, and President Obama wouldn't do it. He has now pronounced why he wouldn't do it, but it is a fact that he didn't sell the Javelins. But President Trump did and allowed Ukraine to defend themselves against the Russians.

In fact, they talked about maybe not because they were already allowed to buy what they needed to defend themselves, and I am glad they were. It helped a friend.

You talk about all of those things that are going on right now with impeachment. The real issue is what is not happening here in this Congress.

I will refer you to a different newspaper, as you want to talk about newspaper, the front page of The Washington Times. Donald was writing more subpoenas than laws. Impeachment inquiries sidestep Pelosi's agenda.

In fact, if you look at the difference between subpoenas and bills that came out of this House that are actually signed into law, you have produced 56 subpoenas. You have produced only 46 laws. That is 20 percent more subpoenas that you have produced than laws to help people across this country.

Mr. HOYER. Would the gentleman like to know the reason for that?

Mr. SCALISE. I would be happy to yield when we talk about all the things that this House could be doing that it is not, like lowering drug prices, like getting better trade deals with our friends in Mexico and in Canada, and in all the other countries that are lined up that would love to come behind USMCA that can't right now.

They can't because there is this infatuation with impeachment, in a one-sided way, in a closed way, in a Soviet-style Star Chamber.

But that is not happening right now. This is what is not happening; this is what is happening. It is not what the American people expected out of this majority.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. It is a wonderful poster.

Mr. SCALISE. It is factual. Mr. HOYER. We passed over 250 bills. The Senate won't take them up, particularly one bill that says what 90 percent of the American people want done: a comprehensive background check to make our communities safer.

They won't bring it up. No wonder it can't be signed, because they won't bring up any of our bills.

The Republican leadership in the Senate stops our bills from going to the Senate. They are not even being considered.
Then they have a poster that says you haven’t passed any bills? Oh, no, we passed them, and the American people support them.

Yes, we had an election in 2018, and the people spoke, which is why I am the majority leader and you are the minority leader.

Yes, we honor those elections. And when you were in the majority, you passed bills you wanted to pass.

So, I tell my friend, it is an interesting talk about it is a reflection of the refusal of the Republicans in the United States Senate to consider legislation supported by the overwhelming majority of the American people. How sad.

But, let me ask you again: Are you saying it was right to keep the $391 million, to refuse to have a meeting with Mr. Zelensky at the White House until he agreed to conduct a political investigation that would advantage the President of the United States? Do you believe that was right?

Mr. SCALISE. Well, first of all, the gentleman is making an assertion that has been disputed—in fact, disputed by the President of Ukraine, this alleged quid pro quo that didn’t happen. Zelensky himself said it didn’t happen. In fact, he got the money. He got the money.

Now, we had to check to make sure, like the law says, in two different places. We have two different sets of law that require the administration to ensure that there is no corruption before they send the money.

I can assure the gentleman from Maryland that, if he would have sent the money over and there was corruption involved, you would be going after him for breaking the law, for not following the law.

You voted for the law. I voted for the law. Again, it is a good law. But then he ultimately released the money.

You talk about the Javelin missiles. He sold that to them before the phone call even happened because it was a friend saying protect us against Russia.

President Obama wouldn’t stand up to Russia when Ukraine made that same phone call, yet President Trump did. President Trump said: I will sell you those missiles so you can protect yourself and can defend yourself against the Russians.

And on that phone call, was thanking the President, again, for selling those missiles to them. It has allowed them to push back the Russian aggression and to root out—ultimately, they talked about rooting out and getting to the bottom of the corruption and the intrigue that happened with Russia in our 2016 election, which I hoped we would be more vigilant to root out together.

It shouldn’t just be President Trump wanting to stop it from happening again. All of us should want to make sure that that doesn’t happen again.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Of course, the Acting Chief of Staff, who is, I think, also the acting head of OMB—not technically but actually, in my view—he said there was a quid pro quo. Now, he tried to clean it up. I get that; I get that.

But he said, yes, there was a quid pro quo.

And you read the transcript—which is not a transcript but a report of the substance of the conversation—in which the President brought a number of things, including Joe Biden and Hunter Biden.

And, yes, we now have testimony that says there was a quid pro quo. There was going to be no meeting at the White House. There was going to be no sending of the $391 million that we thought was essential for our Ukrainian friends defending democracy in Ukraine from Putin.

Now, we have had a more recent action where a telephone conversation that was tape recorded was reported in the press on that same page: Russia and Turkey reach deal on Syria. America in retreat. America no longer a factor in the public.

So I ask the gentleman, do you think that was right?

Mr. SCALISE. I get that.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has made an assertion that the gentleman is making an assertion that has been disputed by the President of Ukraine, yes, yes.

And the gentleman himself said it didn’t happen. Zelensky himself said it didn’t happen.

Mr. HOYER. And if you didn’t have more than circumstantial evidence, he would have brought it forward.

Mr. SCALISE. No, no. We are talking about the Mueller investigation, but it didn’t happen. So the collusion argument was supposed to go to yield some kind of ability to go and impeach the President didn’t turn out to be true.

So, instead of stopping and moving on to the business of the American people, instead of more subpoenas—not laws. No lower drug prices because it is an impeachement infatuation. Instead of moving on, they went to this because there was this whistleblower.

And let’s go back to the memo of the whistleblower, before the whistleblower complaint. The whistleblower actually wrote a memo. Admittedly, they never even listened to the phone conversation, but they talked to other people.

And if it was so dangerous what those other people heard, they had a legal ability and authority to go and file their own whistleblower, but they didn’t. So someone with a political bias, by the inspector general’s own admission, a person with a political bias who had access to information that was classified, in violation of law, heard what they wanted to hear, writes a memo saying it was crazy; it was disturbing. Those were the words that the whistleblower wrote about the phone conversation.

And before the hold, the phone conversation gets released by the President. It was unprecedented. He didn’t have to do it. I might have preferred if he didn’t do it because you don’t want a pattern where every conversation between world leaders is going to be out in public.

But, okay, it is now. And all of those assertions that were made were false. It wasn’t a crazy conversation. It wasn’t a disturbing conversation. It was two people talking about one conversation, the other his elevation. One talking about how he got elected on a platform of rooting out corruption, which he is doing, and we are...
I don’t think it was dirt. It was the use of a computer which, by the way, some of the Trump family is doing the same thing—somewhat irrelevant.

What is relevant is not all this stuff about fairness and this, that, and the other. We are following the Constitution. We are following the rules of this House. We are following the law, and every legal scholar that I have read asserts that. The only people who don’t assert that are the people who are afraid of the facts, afraid of what has been done.

I asked the gentleman questions: Do you think this is right? Do you think the President is above the law? He mentions the Mueller report.

What he fails to mention and he just ignores is the Mueller report said there was evidence to suggest that there was the failure to follow the law and cooperate with the law, in other words, obstruction of justice. But he said Justice Department rules, of which he was an employed individual, that the ability to indict a President of the United States. That did not mean that there wasn’t obstruction of justice.

But what he said was this is the body to deal with this matter. So we are following constitutional duty, and we are going to continue to do so, and there are going to be public hearings. There is going to be debate. There is going to be a vote on the rule if something is brought to the floor and full opportunity to debate on both sides of the aisle.

Right now, of course, there are members of the committee—you would think this was somehow Mr. Schiff and the Democrats meeting in some secret room. They are meeting with the Republican members of the committee.

And, by the way, I asked the gentleman the question about Mr. Nunes. But Mr. Nunes apparently, comes sometimes and he doesn’t come sometimes. And Mr. Meadows is apparently always there, so he can always tell you what is going on. This is an endless debate.

If the Republicans think we are violating the law, of course they can go to court, as we have been forced to do by this President who has instructed people not to cooperate with Congress, not to testify before the Congress because he feels aggrieved.

He will have his day in court. That is how these kinds of events in America: under our Constitution, under our laws. And, yes, he will have due process.

But right now we are trying to find out whether there is probable cause to believe the President of the United States committed high crimes and misdemeanors and abused the power of his office, as Hamilton said the purpose of the impeachment provision was designated to address. Hamilton said that in two of the Federalist Papers.

But we are going to endlessly talk about fairness, with Republicans sitting in the committee. He asserts, with no knowledge, that somehow the Democratic members of the committee released this information.

I am not sure how the paper got this information. I know they get almost all the information on all these networks. But this was the testimony that was prepared by the witness who was there—who was there.

He talks about the whistleblower and hearsay, but what he doesn’t talk about: Does he believe the President is above the law? Does he believe it is appropriate?

And then transcript—I could read it again. I keep saying ‘transcript.’ It is not a transcript. A report of the phone call that the President thought was okay, that is why he released it. He thought it was perfect.

In addition, he said: The other thing, there is a lot of talk about Biden’s son, but just roll over you and then back up the car again. That is not what Trey Gowdy did. He was the chairman, but he didn’t sit there and say: Mr. SCALISE, I will ultimately yield, but you mentioned all of these things, and so I want to clear up the things that the gentleman mentioned.

So the Trey Gowdy committee, where four Americans died and we were trying to get to the bottom of that—not to impeach anybody, but to find out how four Americans died when people should have known that there was danger over there and the proper precautions weren’t taken. So he had a committee.

Do you know, I would ask the gentleman from Maryland, that Chairman Gowdy allowed the minority to call witnesses? He didn’t sit there and say: Hey, I won and you lost, and so I can just roll over you and then back up the car again. That is not what Trey Gowdy did. He was the chairman, but he let the ranking member, the minority leader of the committee, call their witnesses.

That is not happening right now. Not one witness has been allowed by our side. Closed hearings to the public.

If this is something that you are so concerned about, if you are concerned about corruption, why root it out in secret, behind closed doors, with a one-sided set of rules that represents and reflects more how the Soviet Union would conduct something like this as opposed to how the United States of America has conducted impeachment inquiries? We are talking about impeachment inquiries in secret, behind closed doors.

So, yes, the gentleman raised a lot of issues, and I wanted to go back to each of those.

So what we have asked for is the same fairness that has always been allowed, both sides—not just the winning side, both sides, This is America.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

What he didn’t mention was the Benghazi Gowdy commission was the eighty Republican-led investigation of that matter. They all reached the same conclusion and found no evidence of wrongdoing; eight Republican-led, and they kept after it, over and over and over again.

What did the minority leader said, on television, well, no, we got something out of it. We got some dirt on Hillary Clinton.
And we are going to be fair, and I am sure the Senate will be fair if we take action here. And I don’t know that we are going to take action. That hasn’t been decided. But we are going to continue to try to find the truth, to try to get to the bottom of what has happened.

I, frankly, think what we did in Turkey in that Erdogan phone call is as damaging to the interests of the United States of America. And the President talks about the public. The public ought to know.

I want any Member of the Congress I will yield to to tell me what the deal was between Putin and Trump when they met in private and refused to tell anybody.

Mr. Trump is great at disclosure. He says, I have nothing to hide in my tax returns. I will show my tax returns. That was 3 years ago. We have, by law, requested those returns. It has been denied. It has been denied.

No witness. No, Mr., and Mrs. America, this is what my interests are. I am acting in your interests, not in mine. Doral. He decided that was too much. He is repulsed. Republicans criticized him.

And on Turkey we had a vote in this House. He was really angry about that vote. 354 people of this House said this is wrong, Mr. President, this is harmful to our allies. You are exposing allies that we asked to participate and to confront terrorists. You are leaving them, you are letting them out perhaps to be murdered and slaughtered. 354-to-60. We voted on that.

We need to deal with the facts. And we are going to find out the facts no matter how hard the Republicans want to pound on the table and talk about process and ignore any discussion on the substance of what is being disclosed.

So, Mr. Speaker, we can conclude this colloquy because it is not going to come to any end. I understand the gentleman’s perception. I think he is misrepresenting each time he says that this is not a fair procedure or that this is not a procedure consistent with the rules that the Republicans adopted in their rules package when they were in the majority.

And so I hope that we can move on, decide what the facts are, have a committee recommendation as is the process of this House, and then have a vote on the floor of the House, if such is required, and the committees decide that moving forward is appropriate under the facts adduced by those committees.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, if we really are about getting to the facts, to think that you can suggest it is a fair process when only one side gets to choose who the witnesses are—again, the gentleman references Trey Gowdy’s committee. Chairman Gowdy allowed both sides, Republican and Democrat, to bring witnesses because he wanted to get the facts. If you really wanted to get the facts, would the chairman of the committee, literally, take the witness and run out of the room as soon as other voting Members of Congress showed up? That happened today.

If the chairman really wanted to get the facts out, would he literally close the meetings? Tell all Members, Republican and Democrat, not go talk to the press. And then somebody mysteriously, selectively leaks things to the press that are negative, in many cases disputed by other testimony that was given in secret, so it can’t get out. And so you say the story.

I guess if you are okay with having only one side of a story told, that might be your prerogative because you are in the majority, but don’t call that fair. It is clearly not fair if only one side gets to tell their story and the other side doesn’t get to bring their witnesses.

The President who you are accusing of possibly committing some crime so high, high crime and misdemeanors is the standard, if you are accusing him of that, you can’t lay it out yet, you are hoping and looking around for something, which isn’t the process, by the way, that has been used in the past.

If you don’t like the results of the election, there is an election next year. And if you don’t trust the people of this country to make that decision, do you really go into a Star Chamber and run a Soviet-style set of hearings where only one side gets to tell their side of the story?

Mr. HOYER. Mr. SCALISE, watch your words. Watch your words, Mr. SCALISE. You and I both know it has no analogy to what you have just said. You ought to know that. If you don’t know it, you ought to sit down with your counsel and find out about it. That is an allegation that is absolutely untrue and very offensive.

Mr. SCALISE. What is the allegation that is untrue?

Mr. HOYER. It is very offensive.

Mr. SCALISE. Who can call the witnesses? Just your side. You think it is fair that only you can call the witnesses, and then you want to get the truth? Are you going to get the facts when you shut out the other side? When you don’t let the President have his own legal counsel there, like has always been done.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. SCALISE, I know you are not a lawyer. Do you have any idea what a lawyer is?

Mr. SCALISE. This is not a grand jury. This is the United States House of Representatives.

Mr. HOYER. Of course it is.

Mr. SCALISE. If you want to run a grand jury, you don’t have a lawyer.

This is the United States Congress. Voting Members of Congress are being shut out of the room, Mr. Speaker. Voting Members of Congress are being shut out of this process. You want to call that fair? Good luck. But it is not fair.

It is a one-sided process to create a document with a determined outcome. It is going to be a tainted document, because it only tells one side of the story. The old saying is, a grand jury can indict a ham sandwich, if they want to. There is a reason for that because only one side can call witnesses.

When we have had impeachment inquiries in the past, we have to reinvent the wheel. It has only happened three times. And in modern times they have used the exact same standard.

The standard is: Both sides get to call witnesses. That is not going on right now.

It was done in public. That is not being done right now.

It is going on in secret. The press can’t go in. You can’t go in. I can’t go in, unless they run out with the witness.

That is not a fair process. Maybe that is the process that you want to conduct, but don’t call it fair, because it is not.

And, ultimately, it is not going to result in a fair document that is going to be determining whether or not a President of the United States is impeached.

Members of this body that are 70 percent of the Members of this body, Republican and Democrat, are going to be asked to cast a vote on something that they can’t even go and determine and find out about. They can’t sit in the hearings. They can’t read the testimony. 230 million Americans are represented by those Members of Congress who cannot get access to what is going on in that room. Maybe you can get it from reading leaked press reports.

Isn’t that really how you determine whether or not to impeach a President of the United States? That is not fair. Mr. Speaker. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman for yielding. I hesitate to respond because this is a circular discussion.

Mr. SCALISE and the Republican party, at the behest of Mr. Trump, need to be tougher. They can’t mention the facts. The facts are known by the transcript the President sent down here. Again, not a transcript, a report of a telephone call, the statement of the ambassador, I think, a former U.S. marine.

They don’t want to talk about the facts. I get that. So we can go around and around in circles.

And I will tell you, to have eight hearings on Benghazi? Don’t give me that Trey Gowdy and that Gowdy kind of thing. There is no way to happen and that to happen. It was the eighth hearing you Republicans had on that one subject, eight, and you never got the result you wanted, so you just kept doing it over and over and over. Getting the same result. We all know that quote.

There are going to be public hearings, Mr. Speaker, but they are going to be public hearings when the witnesses can’t check one another, can’t listen to one another, and then parrot the other story that was said.

And Ambassador Sondland, of course. I don’t know that he was our friend. He
HOYER mocked that the process is that. And they are being denied entrance to those rooms right now? It has never happened before. Members really have an idea of all the things that we disagreed with him on, none of those. Even times when he would sign executive orders that circumvented the law, and we would challenge him in the court, and we won a number of those court cases, but that doesn’t mean it rose to the level of high crimes and misdemeanors. And so we never went down that road. But maybe some, in some part of a base, want to see impeachment, no matter what. And some have said that. Some in your party have said they just want to impeach the President because if they don’t, he will get re-elected. That has been said by members of your party.

That is not why you impeach a President, because you think he is going to get re-elected. The American people make that determination next year.

We have had investigation after investigation. Mueller alone had 2,800 subpoenas. He had the full authority to bring charges against the President on collusion, on obstruction. Even the Attorney General said that he had the authority to bring charges, but even if he did have those, he wouldn’t have brought charges on obstruction, because there wasn’t obstruction and there wasn’t collusion. But he had full authority to bring charges on both fronts, and he didn’t. But, again, 222 months of that meandering witch hunt to try to find something. And it wasn’t found because it wasn’t there.

And then you had the whistleblower, the so-called whistleblower. Who, if you are worried about who is talking to somebody to try to get their stories straight in the whistleblower—who, again, was identified to be somebody with a political bias—went and met with Chairman SCHIFF’s staff prior to filing the whistleblower complaint.

Yes, somebody did collude. Real interesting how that happened. Before the whistleblower complaint was filed, they actually sat down with the staff of the majority leader, Chairman SCHIFF, and lo and behold, you get a political document that comes out with allegations, disproven in many cases, but that is where we are. That is the basis for starting an impeachment inquiry.

That is not really an impeachment inquiry, because we are not following the same rules that have always been followed under an impeachment inquiry, but that is the genesis of this, and that is where we are.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman keeps misstating the facts and the law and the process. Every Member is going to have access to all the documents, all the testimony before they are asked to vote on it, period.

Mr. SCALISE. When?

Mr. HOYER. When they have concluded their private sessions, which are trying to get at the facts and not having been tainted by some circus. Everybody is going to have the right to see what evidence is adduced.

That is the fear, of course, and I again suggest the gentleman think of this: If he saw these headlines and it was a Democratic President and Turkey and Russia were deciding what is happening in the Middle East and deciding whether they are going to go after ISIS, our ally, and then this other headline replete with the aid to Ukraine was conditioned on a quid pro quo or they weren’t going to be in the White House, they may not get the $391 million, he would be outraged. He would be on this ceiling.

Mr. SCALISE. I would if it was true, but it is not.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, do I still have time?

Mr. SCALISE. You can only read it in the press because of selective leaking. And so that is how Members of Congress are supposed to make a determination on impeachment of the President, based on selected leaks to the press?

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman wasn’t here during the Clinton impeachment with Starr. Starr might as well.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, here is another headline: “Democrats Writing More Subpoenas Than Laws.” That is a headline. That is what angers people who want to see their prescription drug prices lowered, but they can’t because of this infatuation with impeachment. That is what is holding this country back. That is what is holding this House back from doing the people’s work.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask if the gentleman has anything else. If not, I would be ready to yield back.

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

150TH BIRTHDAY OF SANTA ANA, CALIFORNIA

(Mr. CORREA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in celebration of the city of Santa Ana’s 150th birthday.
My hometown was founded on October 27, 1869, on just 70 acres of land in Orange County; and today, Santa Ana is the second largest city in Orange County.

It is home to veterans of World War II, the Vietnam war, and the last few conflicts.

It is also home to the largest Hispanic population, percentagewise, in the country. It is essentially the new Ellis Island of the United States.

Congratulations to the city of Santa Ana on their 150 years. Congratulations to their constituents and to the council and to the mayor.

IMPEACHMENT INQUIRY BEHIND CLOSED DOORS

(Mr. WRIGHT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle seem to think it is appropriate to conduct an impeachment inquiry behind closed doors, shutting out the American people.

They have denied Republican Members of Congress the right to fully participate in the inquiry process but expect them to cast a vote to impeach a duly elected President of the United States without seeing all the facts.

In addition to all that, Democrats denied us the right to vote on a resolution to censure Chairman SCHIFF for his deception of Americans day in and day out.

This morning, I joined dozens of my colleagues as we stormed into the SCIF demanding transparency, shedding light on this corrupt process. Instead of having a conversation, Chairman SCHIFF abruptly ended the deposition, taking the witness with him out of the room.

The Speaker of this House is putting her hatred of the President above what is best for her constituents. She is harming the entire Nation by conducting this inquiry in such a manner.

Mr. Speaker, enough is enough. We are better than this; our country is better than this; and the American people certainly deserve better than this.

They deserve better than this; our country is better than this; harming the entire Nation by conducting this inquiry behind closed doors.

He also knew what it meant to fight for a man’s right to live free. He fought in the 38th Infantry of the 2nd Infantry Division in World War II. He went on to land on Omaha Beach during the invasion of Normandy, and with his unit, he liberated the first city in France.

Colonel Morris married his high school sweetheart, and they were married for 77 years.

Colonel Morris celebrated his 109th birthday this August. When asked about the secret to living a long life, Colonel Morris said, “Do your best.”

We could improve from adhering to such sage, simple advice.

Colonel Morris, thank you for your service and for leading a life worthy of an example. May you rest in peace now. God bless you, sir.

HONORING THE 63RD ANNIVERSARY OF THE 241 MARINES LOST IN BEIRUT, LEBANON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the topic of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, we are here today to honor the 241 American heroes who made the ultimate sacrifice on this very day 36 years ago in Beirut, Lebanon.

For my family and so many families, today is deeply emotional.

When I enlisted in 1979 as a young man, I wanted to serve and be part of something bigger. That led me to the United States Marine Corps and, like every marine, I took an oath to God, country, and to the Corps.

Semper fidelis is not just a slogan or a creed; it is a way of life that only those who have earned the eagle, globe, and anchor can fully understand. Semper fidelis is part of the very fabric of every marine, past and present.

I served as a first lieutenant in the 3rd Battalion, 3rd Marines. In 1983, my battalion was ordered to Beirut, Lebanon, in support of the 1st Battalion, 8th Marine Regiment and the 24th Marine Amphibious Unit.

I vividly remember the evenings we sat on the roof of the Marine barracks with the American flag flying over our head. The barrage of small arms gunfire and mortar rounds made it very clear that we were in harm’s way every day.

On this very day 36 years ago, a terrorist affiliated with Hezbollah and financed by Iran drove a truck bomb into the barracks we called home.

241 American servicemen were killed, 220 of which were my fellow marines. 241 sons, brothers, fathers, and friends never returned home. 241 came in peace, and 241 lives were stolen from us by an act of absolute pure evil.

It was the deadliest day for the Marine Corps since the Battle of Iwo Jima.

It is by the grace of God that I was able to come home to my wife, Denise, who was expecting our first child. My battalion had shipped out 19 days before the bombing.

Mr. Speaker, today is not about me. People may not recognize the 241 names listed here, but they are the names of the 241 who answered the call of duty 36 years ago.

Today is about those 241 soldiers, sailors, and marines who laid down their lives to protect our freedoms, and today is about every veteran who has nobly worn the uniform of our Armed Forces.

On this somber day, I look out at the flag flying above the U.S. Capitol and feel the same reverence I felt standing below the Stars and Stripes on the roof of the Beirut barracks in 1983. Though I will never know exactly why I was spared when so many were not, I understand that our first duty is to remember and be faithful.

Mr. Speaker, three of my fellow marines, Representatives GALLAGHER, CARBAJAL, and MOULTON, joined me to offer legislation to remember the faith and loyalty of the 241.

Fellow marine, Representative GALLEGLO, joined me to offer legislation to provide a sliver of justice for the Gold Star families who lost their loved ones. Our bill, the OORAH Act, passed both the House and Senate, and for that I am very grateful.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is still work to be done here. Terrorists and those who support them financially must be held accountable for their terrible actions.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for participating in this Special Order to remember the sacrifice of those who answered the call of duty to defend our freedom in conflicts across the globe.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BAIRD) to thank Hoosier and decorated Vietnam veteran.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.
Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleague in remembering the 36th anniversary of the appalling terrorist attack on American troops stationed in Beirut, Lebanon, on October 23, 1983.

This horrific attack took the lives of 241 U.S. troops and injured countless others. This inexcusable attack marked the highest single-day death toll for the United States Marine Corps since the Battle of Iwo Jima.

My friend and fellow Hoosier, Greg Pence, was stationed in Beirut just 10 days before this terrorist attack and lost many fellow marines in the bombing.

Here with us today, seated in the gallery, are a few of the Gold Star families who lost their loved ones and family members on that fateful day.

Mr. Speaker, freedom truly is not free, and I thank them for their sacrifice and pay tribute to the brave service members who paid the ultimate sacrifice and pay tribute to the brave service members on that fateful day.

Mr. Speaker, freedom truly is not free, and I thank them for their sacrifice and pay tribute to the brave service members who paid the ultimate sacrifice and protect the United States.

Mr. Pence. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. Miller), my friend and colleague.

1945

Mrs. Miller. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in honor of those who lost their lives in the Beirut terrorist attacks.

The men and women of our Armed Forces are true American heroes. They demonstrate bravery, courage, and an unmatched sense of duty to us all. They fight each day to preserve our great Nation and defend us from enemies we can and cannot see.

Our veterans have fought for our independence and liberty countless times throughout our history. They have fought off tyranny to defend freedom around the world. They have defended the innocent who cannot defend themselves. We would have worked to preserve peace for all. Because of them, we are here in this Chamber today. And because of them, our Star-Spangled Banner waves proudly above.

This is what the valiant men and women were doing in Beirut in 1983. They were part of an important peacekeeping mission when Lebanon was facing a violent civil war.

In a single moment, 220 marines, 18 sailors, and 3 soldiers lost their lives, and 129 Americans were wounded.

Two hundred and forty-one Americans gave their lives that day. This was the largest number of casualties lost in one day since the Tet Offensive in the Vietnam war. This event is one of the darkest in our history.

As a wife, a mother, and a grandmother, I cannot imagine the pain 241 families have endured since that fateful day 36 years ago.

Today, I would like to honor those who made the ultimate sacrifice in Beirut, for their fearless service and for working toward the more peaceful world that we all want. They will never be forgotten.

Mr. Pence. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Bergman), my friend, colleague, and fellow marine.

Mr. Bergman. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, colleague, and fellow marine, Greg Pence, for the honor to speak before this body tonight on such a—you don't call an occasion like this important, but I think we call it relevant.

It is relevant because Marines, for a long time since 1775, have fought to defend freedom, and we go to the fight to win, but we also go to the fight to help others.

On Sunday, 23 October 1983, you have heard the story told already, how 220 marines, 18 sailors, and 3 soldiers lost their lives when a terrorist's truck bomb exploded at a barracks compound in Beirut, Lebanon.

The same day, 58 of our French brothers in arms lost their lives in an additional attack by Hezbollah.

In Beirut, 111 marines and sailors were Michiganders, including Lance Corporal David Bousum of Fife Lake, Michigan.

I remember that day very vividly. At the time, I was a KC-130 pilot stationed at Naval Air Station Glenview, Illinois, flying the KC-130 refuelers. We used to fly all around the world, in and out of the Middle East doing our mission.

Five days after the bombing was the annual Marine Corps Birthday Ball for our unit and our greater Chicago marines. And that year, we had as our guest of honor then-Major General Al Gray, commander of the 2nd Marine Division, who a couple years after that became the commandant of the Marine Corps.

The Marines are full of tradition and pageantry. And I will tell you what, the only thing we do more than celebrate is celebrate birthdays. Roughly 50 years of birthday balls that I have attended, that one was heavy with grief. We had lost our brothers through a hellish act, and a cowardly act. It took us a while to get over it at that time, but, in the end, you really never get over it. All you do is set your course for the future fight to make sure that does not happen again.

The loss of life will always have an impact on our entire armed services community and our Nation. Our mission, as the Marine Corps, is to be the most ready when the Nation is least ready, and we will always be that, whether it be in the 1770s or in the 2070s and beyond.

Today, we honor the fallen, we honor their lives, their legacies, and their families.

We will never forget the sacrifices made by Michigan's own that day. We lost the following warriors, marines, and sailors:

Lance Corporal David Bousum from Fife Lake.
Lance Corporal Johansen Banks from Detroit.

Sergeant Anthony K. Brown from Detroit.
Hospital Corporals 2 Michael H. Johnson from Detroit.
Sergeant Michael R. Massman from Port Huron.
Sergeant William H. Pollard from Flint.
First Lieutenant William A. Zimmerman from Grand Haven.

We will never forget.

In the Marines' Hymn, the third stanza ends with: "If the Army and the Navy ever look on Heaven's scenes, they will find the streets are guarded by United States Marines."

I would suggest to you that some of those marines are on duty today. We honor their service, we honor their sacrifice, and we honor our country by remembering. God bless you all and Semper Fidelis.

Mr. Pence. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friends, colleagues, and distinguished guests in the gallery for their participation in my Special Order.

As a Beirut veteran, I am deeply moved by their remarks, and I know their words will comfort the Gold Star Families across this Nation.

Today, on the 36th anniversary of this horrific attack, and every day, we must strive to ensure that all are remembered, and all are honored. We remember their loyalty, their selflessness, and their courage. We are humbled by their tremendous sacrifice.

We must hold them closely in our hearts and hometowns. We must live in gratitude for the precious gift they have given to us here today.

Most of all, we must uphold our promise to honor our fallen. We must remain always faithful.

Mr. Speaker, I will always remain faithful. God bless America, and Semper Fi.

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

Mr. Bergman. Mr. Speaker, in the morning of October 22, 1983, a suicide bomber drove a truck full of explosives into a Marine compound in Beirut, Lebanon, killing 241 U.S. service members. This was the deadliest attack against our U.S. Marines since Iwo Jima.

These Marines were stationed in Beirut to assist with the Palestinian withdrawal during the Lebanese civil war—they were protecting those who were being persecuted and fought to keep peace in the area.

There is a memorial at Camp Lejeune for those who lost their lives and friends. "They came in Peace." I do not think I could say it any better. Our service men and women go overseas to ensure war does not reach our shores. They selflessly put aside their fears, and without hesitation say bravely, "I will serve, send me."

Some may know that my dear friend, Congressman Greg Pence, was serving that day in Beirut. I am thankful that my friend's life was spared on that day.

For those who perished that day we will never forget your ultimate sacrifice to your country. On those who passed away, eight were from Texas:

Leland E. Gann, Matilde Hernandez Jr. and Timothy R McMahon from Austin; Rodolfo...
Hernandez from El Paso; Michael S. Fulton from Ft. Worth; Marcus E. Coleman from Dallas; Johnnie D. Caesar from El Campo; and David W. Brown from Conroe.

We must never forget this day and those who were murdered because of what the freedoms they believed in so fiercely they were willing to put their life on line.

TRIBUTE TO LEON G. FELT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK) for 30 minutes.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to tell a remarkable story of the unacknowledged patriotism and heroism of a 23-year-old Army scout, who, on December 3, 1944, was immersed in the horror and peril of some of the worst of the fighting in the bloody nightmare of the Philippines campaign. At Cabunganan, Technician 5th Class Leon G. Felt heroically engaged the enemy.

His family keeps the steel helmet he wore that day. The back half of that helmet is riddled with shrapnel holes from shrapnel exploded beneath him, and the deadly shrapnel blew up his left side, blowing off his helmet from below with enough force to pierce it.

Now, Leon never talked much about what happened that day. The war ended, and he came home after months in Army hospitals dealing with his grave injuries. The only thing his family really knew, years later, was a brief entry in his journal. It said, "Lieutenant Hanna told me he put me in for a Silver Star for what I did in the attack," but nothing came of it.

His wife told me that the Army’s final orders to Leon and his comrades were: go home, get a job, look after your families. Well, that is exactly what Leon did. He joined the Southern Pacific Railroad, ultimately retiring as a shop foreman. He became deeply involved in his church. He married Lois Wade, his wife of 32 years, until she died in 1976. He then married Nola Pulsipher, who survives him after 42 years of marriage. He raised eight children and today has 41 grandchildren, 110 great-grandchildren with three more on the way, and seven great-great-grandchildren.

The Archives could find no official record of it. Now, Lydean, his daughter, haunted him.

But Lydean remained curious about that entry in his diary, and what seemed to be a confusing note on one Army form that suggested there might be something more, though there was no official record of it. Now, Lydean, who has all of the timidity of a heat-seeking missile, wouldn’t give up. She wrote the National Personnel and Record Center of the National Archives. They had no record of other medals, including the Silver Star. A fire in 1973, they feared, would have destroyed any record if he had. But Lydean persisted.

The archives kept digging, and then they stumbled upon a curious thing: a collection of citations of the most heroic deeds of World War II. In it, they found the citation for Leon G. Felt and what he did that December day in 1944. They were right about one thing: he was never awarded the Silver Star.

On February 12, 1945, as he lay recovering from his wounds in an Army hospital, Leon Felt had been awarded the Nation’s second highest honor, the Distinguished Service Cross, revered more than any other medal, but the Medal of Honor itself. But somewhere along the way, probably because of a clerical error, his service record was never updated, and word never reached him.

Now, here are the words that were supposed to have been spoken as he received our Nation’s second highest military honor:

"Technician Fifth Grade Leon G. Felt, Serial Number 39902244, Cavalry, United States Army. For extraordinary heroism against the enemy at Mount Cabunganan, Leyte, Philippine Islands, on 3 December 1944.

"Advancing through very rugged terrain, his troop encountered the enemy entrenched in a strong position astride a narrow ridge. The enemy were well dug-in, being concealed with top coverings of brush and grass. During an attack by our troops, the advance of the right platoon was temporarily diverted by heavy enemy fire, but upon receiving reinforcing fire, the enemy fire slackened. Seizing this opportunity, Technician Felt, a scout for his platoon, voluntarily rushed the nearest enemy rifle pit, and grasping the top cover, stripped it off, exposing three occupants whom he killed. Continuing his advance, he reached and uncovered a second pit and killed three more enemy. He then advanced toward a third pit but was struck and wounded by the fragments from an exploding hand grenade."

Despite his wound and the warning shouts of his comrades, he continued to push his attack, and reaching the foxholes of the remaining enemy within the position. This attack was successful, and the enemy were driven from the position with heavy losses.

"Technician Felt's prompt, heroic actions in voluntarily attacking the enemy single-handedly were an inspiration to his comrades and reflect the highest traditions of the United States Army. By command of General MacArthur."

Long ago, soldiers coined the term "situation" to describe the Army bureaucracy. It is an acronym that, roughly translated, means, "Situation Normal—All Foul Up!"

Well, in a terrible snafu, the medal was never given to Technician Felt. He was never told of how grateful his country was for the sacrifices he made, for the bravery that saved the soldiers in his unit, and for the exemplary heroism and leadership that turned the tide of battle.

His family arranged to surprise him with a long-overdue presentation about 3 weeks ago on October 5. This was the Saturday before his 80th birthday. They gathered from across the country. They decorated the house and made a cake.

I must do my duty as speaker of the House. The presentation was made a week ago today. In his birthday celebration, Mrs. Felt told me that his face brightened up, and he said, "So, I really am your hero." And his wife replied, "That is what I have been telling you all these years."

The tragedy is that this honor should have followed Leon Felt throughout his life, as Shakespeare said, "to remem- ber all..." He had been so brave, and it should have been recognized.

Instead of feeling guilt, he should have felt pride. For every nightmare he suffered alone, he should have enjoyed the gratitude of his fellow citizens. Instead, Technician Leon Felt, a recipient of the Distinguished Service Cross that he never received, did what he was told, quietly went home, got a job, and looked after his family.

His memorial service will be held in Dixon, California, tomorrow, and he will be buried with full military honors.
at the Sacramento Valley National Cemetery. He will take to his grave pieces of shrapnel from the injuries he sustained at Mount Cabunganan. He will also take the Distinguished Service Cross that he was supposed to have been awarded 74 years ago.

I want to say to his family on behalf of our country that this long-missing medal now attests that the American people finally know what the Felt family has known all along, that he really was and is our Nation’s hero, too.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to tell this story tonight, not for Leon Felt’s sake, but for our country’s sake, to remind us what we owe heroes like him for the sacrifices often unrecognized and unquestioned that they have made, to answer James Michener’s haunting question: “Where do we get such men?”—and also to place in the RECORD in these hallowed Halls an apology, really, for a 74-year-old clerical mistake, a snafu that prevented him from knowing in life the gratitude and respect that our Nation can now express only after his death.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the House observe a moment of silence to honor the memory of Technician Fifth Grade Leon Gustave Felt, United States Army, recipient of the Distinguished Service Cross.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o’clock and 6 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, October 24, 2019, at 9 a.m.
EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

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

2734. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter stating that the last grade Major General Lee K. Levy II, United States Air Force, served satisfactorily, before retirement, was major general, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-516, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-104); Sec. 202(b)(1) (110 Stat. 283); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2735. A letter from the General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administrator’s final rule — Federal Credit Union Bylaws (RIN: 3313-0843) received October 22, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 888); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2736. A letter from the General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration’s final rule — Supervisory Committee Audits and Verifications (RIN: 3313-A090) received October 22, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 888); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2737. A letter from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission’s Major final rule — Revisions to Prohibitions and Restrictions on Proprietary Trading and Certain Interests in, and Relationships With, Hedge Funds and Private Equity Funds [Release No.: BHCA-7; File no.: ST-14-18] (RIN: 3333-A050) received October 22, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 888); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2738. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Outer Continental Shelf Air Regulations; Consistency Update for Virginia [EPA-R03-OAR-2011-0140; FRL-9999-40-Region 3] October 18, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 888); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2739. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Clay Ceramic Manufacturing [EPA-HQ-OAR-2013-0290; FRL-10001-21-OAR] (RIN: 2060-A725) received October 18, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 888); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2740. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Air Plan Approval; Arkansas; Interstate Transport Requirements for the 2010 1-Hour SO2 NAAQS [EPA-R06-OAR-2019-0138; FRL-10000-92-Region 6] received October 18, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 888); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.


2742. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Correction Due to Vacatur of Revisions to Implement the Revocation of the 1997 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards Final Rule [EPA-R05-OAR-2017-0382; FRL-10001-45-Region 3] received October 18, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 888); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2743. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Approval of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Ohio and West Virginia; Attainment Plans for the Steubenville and Ohio-West Virginia 2010 Sulfur Dioxide Nonattainment Area [EPA-R03-OAR-2019-0044; EPA-R05-OAR-2015-0019; FRL-10001-26-Region 5] received October 18, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 888); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2744. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s withdrawal of direct final rule — Air Plan Approval; ID; Update to CERB Fee Billing Procedures [EPA-R10-OAR-2019-0403; FRL-10001-24-Region 10] received October 18, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 888); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2745. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Addition of Certain Entities to the Entity List [Docket No.: D09S-022] (RIN: 0990-1857) received October 22, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 888); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2746. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration’s temporary rule — Fishery of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Hook-and-Line Catcher/Processors in the Central
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. RYAN (for himself, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, and Mr. M. BARRON of Tennessee):

H.R. 4801. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the Healthy Start program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. DEUTCH):

H.R. 4802. A bill to authorize Federal agencies, the Department of the Treasury, and the Department of Defense to enter into agreements with public and private hospitals and other health care facilities to provide health care services in areas with a shortage of health care services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself, Mr. COLINS of Georgia, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. THORNBERRY, Ms. LOFgren, Mr. TED LIEU of California, and Mr. GALLEGO):

H.R. 4803. A bill to facilitate the automatic acquisition of citizenship for lawful permanent residents serving in the Federal National Guard and in the Federal Reserves, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE (for herself, Mr. TED LIEU of California, and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 4804. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to prohibit the taking for a trophy of any endangered or threatened species of fish or wildlife in the United States and the importation of endangered and threatened species into the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. KIM (for himself, Mr. BUCSNY, and Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma):

H.R. 4805. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an exclusion for gross income from certain small business loans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POCAN:

H.R. 4806. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to authorize the debarment of certain registrants, 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 Ms. PINOOGUE (for herself, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, and Miss RICE of New York):

H.R. 4807. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the award of a military service medal to members of the Armed Forces who served honorably during the Cold War, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CLYBURN:

H.R. 4808. A bill to require Community Development Block Grant and Surface Transportation Block Grant recipients to develop a strategy to support inclusive zoning policies, to allow for a credit to support housing affordability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. AXNE:

H.R. 4816. A bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act to modify provisions relating to whistleblower incentives and protection, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, 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. CORRERA (for himself, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. COSTA, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. ROYBAL-ALVAREZ, Mr. NORTON, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. LOPOREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BARAGAN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. ROUDA, Ms. PORTER, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. CARDENAS, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. ESQUERIO, Mr. VILLAZÓN, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. TRAHAHN, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. GARCIA of Illinois, Rep. TRACY, Mr. JATSKY, Mr. ROUZIÈRE, Mr. BARRAGÁN, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. SMITH of California, Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, and Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas):

H.R. 4817. A bill to require the White House and each agency to provide an official website in the five most commonly used languages in the United States other than English as determined by the Census data and any other languages determined to be appropriate by the Director of Management and Budget, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois (for himself, Mr. VAN DER Zwek, Mr. BUCSNY, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mr. LATTA):

H.R. 4818. A bill to prohibit the White House and each agency from providing a definition of short-term, limited duration insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 4811. A bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to provide for a definition of short-term, limited duration insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ROYBAL-ALLARD:

H.R. 4812. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to provide for the modification, transfer, and termination of a registration for a particular entity, control of a controlled substances or list I chemicals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, 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. MATSU (for herself and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio):

H.R. 4814. A bill to improve reporting of the distribution of controlled substances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, 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. GARCÍA of Illinois:

H.R. 4813. A bill to prohibit large platform underwriting from being a corporation or being affiliated with a person that is a financial institution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, 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. MAST (for herself and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio):

H.R. 4815. A bill to provide for joint reports by relevant Federal agencies to Congress regarding incidents of terrorism and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.
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. HASTINGS (for himself, Mr. STEELE, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. COOK, Mr. MOOGLEN, Mr. BANKS, Mr. BISHOP of Hawaii, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. WALTZ, Mr. PENCE, Mr. CRENshaw, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. BOST, Mr. MOUTON, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. MAST, Mr. CASE, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. RHISCENTHALER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. GRIEN of Tennessee, Mr. ALLRED, Mr. WALTMAN, Mr. HOGAN of New York, Mr. GOLDEN, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. BACON, Mr. VISELSKOBY, Mrs. WAUENER, Ms. LURIA, Mr. NAVIGATOR, Mr. MILLER, and Mr. WENSTRUP):

H.R. 4817. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to ensure that certain Department of Veterans Affairs medical facilities have physical locations for the disposal of controlled substances medications; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BARR (for himself, Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina, Mr. HAGEDORN, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. HUIZINGA, Mr. CHAMBERS of Louisiana, and Mr. SHIKSU):

H.R. 4818. A bill to impose sanctions with respect to the provision of certain vessels for the Colombian emigration control pipelines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, Financial Services, Oversight and Government Reform, and Ways and Means, 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. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mr. BUCSHON, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Ms. HAALAND):

H.R. 4819. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to allow States to use funding provided under the surface transportation block grant program and the congestion mitigation and air quality improvement program to develop and implement vision zero plans in eligible localities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BRINDISI (for himself, Ms. CRAIG, and Mr. KATKO):

H.R. 4820. A bill to amend the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 to provide assistance to manage farmer and rancher stress and for the mental health of individuals in rural areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CÁRDENAS (for himself, Mr. RADEWAGEN, Ms. GAHBYARD, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. GILHAVY, Mr. JAY, Mr. SAMBAN, and Mr. SAN NICOLAS):


By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. MOUTON, Mr. LUJAN, Ms. ROBERTS of Tennessee, Mr. FITZGERALD, Mr. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. MOORE, Mr. NORTON, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. HASTINGS):

H.R. 4822. A bill to promote and ensure delivery of grief counseling and related services to students with visual disabilities or who are deaf or hard of hearing or deaf-blind through instructional methodologies meeting their unique learning needs, to enhance accountability for the provision of such services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. CLARKE of New York (for herself, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. GILJALVA, Mrs. DAVIS, Mr. JACKSON LEE, Mr. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. CASE, Mr. SOTO, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Ms. HAALAND, Ms. MOORE, Ms. SCHAOKWESKY, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. BARRAGAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 4823. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to revise the policy of the Agency to ensure consideration of the threats of climate change, to include considerations of climate change in the strategic plan of the Agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Ms. SCHAOKWESKY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. JACKSON LEE, and Ms. MOORE):

H.R. 4824. A bill to authorize the VOW to Hire Heroes Act of 2011, to provide assistance to small businesses owned by veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Reform, Armed Services, Science, Space, and Technology, and 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. COLE (for himself, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. KVIN HERN of Oklahoma, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. CARTER of Texas, and Mr. HUDSON):

H.R. 4825. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for the secure storage of a licensed firearm possessed by a Federal employee, including a Federal employee of the Office of the Attorney General, of the Department of Justice, and of the Department of the Treasury, of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms, and the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. CRAIG:

H.R. 4826. A bill to award career pathways innovation grants to local educational agencies and consortia of local educational agencies, to provide technical assistance within the Office of Career, Technical, and Adult Education to administer the grants and support the local educational agencies with the preparation of grant applications and management of grant funds; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CRIST:

H.R. 4827. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to enhance age-friendly communities for older individuals; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM (for himself, Mr. GRAYVES of Louisiana, Mr. AUSTIN, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. VRASKY, and Mrs. DINGLE):

H.R. 4828. A bill to amend the Dingell-Johnson Sport Fish Restoration Act with respect to sport fish restoration and recreational boating safety, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. DELBENE (for herself and Mr. WILKSON):

H.R. 4829. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that the 50 percent expense does not apply to meals provided on certain fishing boats or at certain fish processing facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DESAULNIER (for himself and Mr. CARTER of Georgia):

H.R. 4830. A bill to provide payment for patient navigator services under title XIX of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. DINGELL (for herself and Mr. YOUNG):

H.R. 4831. A bill to reauthorize and amend the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation Establishment Act; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. FUDGE (for herself and Mr. McKATRO):

H.R. 4832. A bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to establish, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Ways and Means, 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. GOLDEN (for himself and Mr. WRIGHT):

H.R. 4833. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to establish a grant program for multigenerational collaboration; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GOUTTHEIMER (for himself and Mr. PASCRELL):

H.R. 4834. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for an exception to the definition of an off-campus outpatient department of a provider under the Medicare program for certain departments of a provider if such provider was forced to relocate its campus; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, 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 Mrs. HAYES (for herself and Mr. WILD):

H.R. 4835. A bill to provide grants to improve trauma support services and mental health care for children and youth in educational settings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HORNSFORD (for himself, Mr. NORTON, and Ms. KELLY of Illinois):

H.R. 4836. A bill to build safer, thriving communities, and save lives by investing in effective violence reduction initiatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition 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 Mrs. LEE of Nevada:

H.R. 4837. A bill to prohibit Federal agencies from using funds for grants related to the production of wine made from grapes grown in the United States, whether insects are attracted to artificial light, or the levels of...
stress on humans when discussing politics in social situations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.  

By Mr. McGovern (for himself and Mr. Ney):  

H.R. 4836. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to allow payments under the Medicare program for certain items and services furnished by off-campus outpatient departments of a provider to be determined under the prospective payment system for hospital outpatient department services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. Meadows:  

H.R. 4837. A bill to amend part E of title IV of the Social Security Act to require States to provide for the placement of a foster child in a cottage home, and to make a child so placed eligible for foster care maintenance payments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.  

By Mr. O’Halleran (for himself, Mr. Gosar, Mrs. Kirkpatrick, Mr. Schweikert, Mr. Stanton, Mrs. Lescano, and Mr. Galllego):  

H.R. 4838. A bill to modify the boundary of the Casa Grande Ruins National Monument, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.  

By Mr. Phillips:  

H.R. 4841. A bill to require the prudential banking regulators to provide annual testimony to Congress on their supervision and regulation activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.  

By Mr. Phillips (for himself, Ms. Craig, Mr. Emmer, Mrs. Fletcher, Mr. Fitzgerald, Ms. McMorris Rodgers, Ms. Olson, Ms. Omar, Mr. Peterson, Mr. Stauber, and Mr. Yoho):  

H.R. 4843. A bill to authorize the Secretary of State to provide funds for a United States pavilion at Expo 2020 Dubai, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.  

By Mr. Pocan (for himself, Mr. Courtney, Ms. Norton, Ms. Lee of California, Ms. Wild, Mrs. Watson Coleman, Mr. Hice, Mr. Napolitano, Mr. Nadler, Ms. Roybal-Allard, Mr. Grijalva, Ms. Wilson of Florida, Ms. Tlaib, Mr. Levin of Michigan, Mr. Takano, Mr. McGovern, Mr.诈onal, Mr. Kay Hagan, Mr. Leach, Mr. Eshoo, Mr. O’Halleran, Mr. Gottheimer, Mr. Schiff, Mr. Capuano, Mr. DeLauro, Mr. Clarke, Ms. Delong, Mr.答案, Mr. Thompson of Mississippi, Mr. Pittenger, Mr. Lipinski, Mr. Bucshon, Mr. Hill of Arkansas, Mr. Palazzo, Mr. Kilmer, Mrs. Beatty, Mr. Swalwell of California, Mr. Takano, Ms. Kuster of New Hampshire, Mr. Stivers, Mrs. Watson Coleman, Ms. Kendra S. Horn of Oklahoma, and Mrs. Walorski):  

H.R. 4843. A resolution calling on Congress, schools, and State and local educational agencies to recognize the significant educational implications of dyslexia that must be addressed, and supporting the designation of October 2019 as “National Dyslexia Awareness Month”; to the Committee on Education and Labor.  

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.  

By Mr. Ryan:  

H.R. 4801. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  

Article I, Section 8, clause 1 provides Congress with the power to establish a “uniform rule of Naturalization.”  

By Ms. Jackson Lee:  

H.R. 4803. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 3 and 18 of the United States Constitution.  

By Mr. Kim:  

H.R. 4805. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 3 and 18 of the United States Constitution.  

By Mr. Lipatta:  

H.R. 4806. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 3 and 18 of the United States Constitution.  

By Ms. Pingree:  

H.R. 4807. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  

Article I, Section 8, Section 3 provides Congress with the power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.”  

By Mr. Wilson of South Carolina:  

H.R. 4808. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 3 and 18 of the United States Constitution.
The Necessary and Proper Clause, Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. BIGGS:
H.R. 4831.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. GRIFFITH:
H.R. 4813.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GARCIA of Illinois:
H.R. 4813.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I Section 8 Clause 3

By Ms. MATSUI:
H.R. 4814.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the U.S Constitution

By Mr. AGUILAR:
H.R. 4815.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, section 8, clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mrs. AXNE:
H.R. 4816.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the U.S Constitution

By Mr. BAIRD:
H.R. 4817.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, Congress has the authority to regulate foreign and interstate commerce. In addition, Congress has the power to make all Laws necessary and proper to carry out all other of its vested powers pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. BARR:
H.R. 4818.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:
H.R. 4819.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause VII

By Mr. BRINDISI:
H.R. 4820.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8

By Mr. CÂRDENAS:
H.R. 4821.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 1. All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

By Mr. CÅRTWRIGHT:
H.R. 4822.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. CLARKE of New York:
H.R. 4823.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8

By Mr. COHEN:
H.R. 4824.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8

By Mr. COLE:
H.R. 4825.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 gives Congress the authority to make all needful Rules and regulations respecting US Territory.

By Ms. CRAIG:
H.R. 4826.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. CRIST:
H.R. 4827.
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 I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:
H.R. 4828.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I Section 8 Clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. DESAULNIER:
H.R. 4830.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8

By Ms. DINGELL:
H.R. 4831.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. DELBENE:
H.R. 4829.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I Section 8

By Mr. DESaulnier:
H.R. 4830.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8

By Mr. GOLDEN:
H.R. 4833.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. GOTTHEIMER:
H.R. 4834.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18. To make all Laws that 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. ROONEY of Florida:
H.R. 4844.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. ROONEY:
H.R. 4845.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
“Congress shall have Power 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. POCAHONTAS:
H.R. 4843.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. ROONEY of Florida:
H.R. 4844.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8

By Mr. ROSE of New York:
H.R. 4845.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 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.”
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H.R. 4845
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18
By Mr. SIRES.

H.R. 4846
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18
By Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H.R. 4847
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Pursuant to clause 3(d)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee finds the authority for this legislation in article I, section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. GARCIÁ of Illinois.

By Mr. BANKS:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18
H.R. 1425: Mr. BUCSHON, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. WENSTRUP.
H.R. 1729: Mr. BACON.
H.R. 2191: Mr. ROONEY of Florida.
H.R. 2201: Mr. PETERSON, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, and Mrs. ANNE.
H.R. 2207: Mr. SCALON and Ms. SPANBERGER.
H.R. 2214: Mr. KIM, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. CLEAVER, and Mr. MCCAUP.
H.R. 2235: Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 2256: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 2258: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama and Mr. COMMER.
H.R. 2270: Ms. SPANBERGER, Mr. KIND, Mr. SMUCKER, and Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.
H.R. 2282: Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 2311: Mr. NURKOSS.
H.R. 2346: Mr. THOM of California.
H.R. 2411: Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. BEYER, and Mr. ROONEY of Florida.
H.R. 2415: Mr. AOULLAR.
H.R. 2420: Mr. MALINOWSKI, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. COOPER, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. KILDERE, Mrs. DINGELL, Mrs. AXNE, Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma, and Mr. LURIA.
H.R. 2431: Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 2435: Ms. SPANBERGER and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H.R. 2438: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD and Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 2442: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mr. SUOZZI.
H.R. 2476: Mr. COX of California.
H.R. 2497: Mr. STEUBE.
H.R. 2521: Mr. WALDEN and Mrs. AXNE.
H.R. 2540: Mr. SENSIBLENNER, Mr. POSEY, and Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee.
H.R. 2584: Mr. KILMER, Mr. BOST, and Mr. COLE.
H.R. 2586: Mr. SPANO.
H.R. 2645: Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. STEUBE, and Mrs. LURIA.
H.R. 2650: Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee.
H.R. 2683: Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 2694: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois and Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 2772: Mr. CUNSEY.
H.R. 2772: Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 2802: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. MAST, and Mrs. LURIA.
H.R. 2806: Mr. AXNE.
H.R. 2812: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia and Mr. SQUOZZI.
H.R. 2813: Mr. MCKINLEY and Ms. FINKENAUER.
H.R. 2825: Ms. WILD and Mr. HILL of Arkansas.
H.R. 2831: Ms. WAGNER.
H.R. 2913: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H.R. 2932: Mr. TAYLOR.
H.R. 2986: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 2988: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 2996: Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.
H.R. 3036: Mr. CUNSEY and Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 3068: Ms. GARBARD, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LEVIN of California, Mr. TONKO, Mr. POOAN, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. PAPPAS, and Mrs. LURIA.
H.R. 3073: Mr. SABRANES and Mr. GOLDEN.
H.R. 3077: Mr. ALLRED, Mr. Price of North Carolina, Ms. Brownley of California, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
H.R. 3078: Mr. Tipton.
H.R. 3085: Mr. Brownley of California.
H.R. 3103: Mr. Price of North Carolina and Mr. DELGADO.
H.R. 3117: Ms. Spanberger, Mr. Hollingsworth, and Mr. Smucker.
H.R. 3128: Mr. Ted Lieu of California and Mr. STEUBE.
H.R. 3129: Mrs. Napolitano.
H.R. 3131: Mr. Curtis.
H.R. 3165: Mr. Visclosky.
H.R. 3162: Mr. McAdams.
H.R. 3219: Ms. Garcia of Texas.
H.R. 3222: Mrs. Bratton, Mr. Aguilar, and Mrs. Davis of California.
H.R. 3238: Mr. Panetta, Ms. Royal-Allard, and Mr. Quigley.
H.R. 3255: Mr. Keating.
H.R. 3355: Mr. McGovern.
H.R. 3373: Mr. Hastings.
H.R. 3376: Mr. Deutch and Mr. Pappas.
H.R. 3463: Mr. Butterfield.
H.R. 3473: Mr. Smith of Washington.
H.R. 3499: Mrs. Trahan, Mr. Kind, Mr. Payne, Mr. Cook, Mr. King of Iowa, Ms. Wilson of Florida, Mr. Clay, Mr. Johnson of Ohio, Mr. Sean Patrick Maloney of New York, Mr. Lucas, and Mr. Graves of Georgia.
H.R. 3562: Mr. Webber of Florida and Mr. McCaul.
H.R. 3613: Ms. Royal-Allard.
H.R. 3524: Mr. Rush.
H.R. 3529: Mr. Upton.
H.R. 3559: Mr. Pappas.
H.R. 3548: Mrs. Wagner.
H.R. 3632: Mrs. Trahan, Mr. Crenshaw, Mr. Kind, and Mr. Smith of Washington.
H.R. 3665: Mr. Crist.
H.R. 3668: Mr. Pallone.
H.R. 3708: Mr. Kelly of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 3760: Mr. Gomez, Mrs. Carolyn B. Maloney of New York, and Mr. Vargas.
H.R. 3767: Mr. Taylor.
H.R. 3784: Mr. Perlmutter.
H.R. 3815: Mrs. Axne.
H.R. 3820: Mrs. Luria.
H.R. 3870: Mr. Reed.
H.R. 3896: Ms. Kirkpatrick, Ms. Haaland, Mr. Cartwright, Mr. Crist, Mr. Vargas, and Mr. Sires.
H.R. 3934: Mr. Walker.
H.R. 3956: Mr. Yarmuth.
H.R. 3957: Mr. Welch.
H.R. 3960: Mr. Aguilar and Mr. Thompson of Mississippi.
H.R. 3973: Ms. Kuster of New Hampshire and Mr. Serrano.
H.R. 4037: Mr. David P. Roe of Tennessee.
H.R. 4051: Mr. Jackson Lee.
H.R. 4098: Mrs. Hayes.
H.R. 4108: Mr. Yoho.
H.R. 4105: Mr. Kind.
H.R. 4162: Mr. Womack.
H.R. 4228: Mr. Sean Patrick Maloney of New York and Mr. Correa.
H.R. 4230: Mr. Visclosky and Ms. Wasserman Schultz.
H.R. 4247: Mr. Karff and Mr. McCaul.
H.R. 4269: Ms. Lofgren.
H.R. 4276: Mr. Evans and Mr. Cartwright.
H.R. 4297: Mr. Barragán and Mr. Grijalva.
H.R. 4300: Mr. Aguilar.
H.R. 4303: Mr. Welch, Mr. García of Illinois, and Mr. Yarmuth.
H.R. 4304: Mr. Dunn.
H.R. 4305: Mr. Reed, Mr. Sean Patrick Maloney of New York, Mr. Crenshaw, Mr. Nadler, Mrs. Roy, Mr. Womack, Mr. McGovern, Mr. Trauber, Mr. Smith of New Jersey, Mr. Burguess, Mr. Mitchell, Mr. Gottheimer, Mr. Van Drew, Mr. Newhouse, Mr. Brooks of Indiana, Mr. Luján, Mr. Watkins, Mr. Fitzhugh, Mr. Wilson of South Carolina, and Mr. Reschenthaler.
H.R. 4319: Mr. García of Illinois.
H.R. 4333: Mr. Katsko.
H.R. 4334: Mr. Keller.
H.R. 4348: Mr. Visclosky and Mr. Suozzi.
H.R. 4374: Ms. Brownley of California.
H.R. 4386: Mrs. Fletcher, Mr. Cohen, Mr. Casey, and Mr. Soto.
H.R. 4397: Ms. Slotkin.
H.R. 4399: Mr. Wenstrup.
H.R. 4487: Ms. Allred.
H.R. 4487: Mr. Cox of California and Mr. Grijalva.
H.R. 4487: Mr. Maloney of New York.
H.R. 4487: Mr. Gallagher.
H.R. 4560: Ms. Jackson Lee.
H.R. 4566: Mr. Garcia.
H.R. 4558: Mr. Soto and Mr. Crenshaw.
H.R. 4589: Mr. Stauber, Ms. Royal-Allard, Mr. Crenshaw, and Mr. Pappas.
H.R. 4613: Ms. Royal-Allard and Mr. Carson of Indiana.
H.R. 4623: Mr. Kennedy.
H.R. 4638: Ms. Underwood and Mr. Trone.
H.R. 4650: Mr. Malinowski.
H.R. 4670: Mr. Soto.
H.R. 4674: Ms. Frankel, Ms. Castor of Florida, Mr. Higgins of New York, Ms. Haaland, Mr. Panetta, Ms. Judy Chu of California, Ms. Barragán, and Mr. García of Illinois.
H.R. 4686: Mr. Sires and Mr. Stube.
H.R. 4695: Miss Rice of New York, Mr. Lowenthal of California, Mr. Luján, Mr. Kildee, Ms. Bass, Mr. Pallone, Mr. Cleaver, Mr. Lengvin, Mrs. Luria, and Mr. DeSaulnier.
H.R. 4700: Mr. Guthrie, Mr. Carter of Georgia, Mr. Gianforte, Mr. Long, Mr. Saine, Mr. Burguess, Ms. Brooks of Indiana, and Mr. Bilirakis.
H.R. 4701: Mr. García of Illinois.
H.R. 4705: Mr. Omar.
H.R. 4724: Ms. Ocasio-Cortez.
H.R. 4738: Mr. Walberg, Mr. Crenshaw, Mr. Johnson of Ohio, Mr. Hill of Arkansas, Mr. Kinzinger, Mr. Smucker, Mr. Hurd of Texas, Mr. Conaway, Mr. Fitzpatrick, and Mr. Mitchell.
H.R. 4737: Ms. Underwood.
H.R. 4739: Mr. McCaul.
H.R. 4753: Mr. Taylor.
H.R. 4754: Mr. Wilson of South Carolina, Mr. Yoho, and Mr. Kind.
H.R. 4758: Mr. Wittman and Mr. Hagedorn.
H.R. 4764: Ms. Jackson Lee and Mr. Budd.
H.R. 4779: Ms. Schakowsky.
H.R. 4782: Mr. Garcia.
H.R. 4794: Mr. Engel, Ms. Meng, and Miss Rice of New York.
H.J. Res. 38: Mr. Lewis.
H.J. Res. 48: Mr. Malinowski.
H.J. Res. 67: Mr. Smith of New Jersey.
H. Con. Res. 54: Mr. Johnson of Ohio.
H. Res. 49: Mr. Ted Lieu of California, Mr. Sensenbrenner, and Mr. Meeks.
H. Res. 230: Mr. Wittman.
H. Res. 255: Mr. Cook, Mr. Huffman, Mr. Johnson of Georgia, Mr. Cuello, and Mr. Latta.
H. Res. 296: Mr. DeSaulnier, Mr. LaMalfa, Ms. Scanlon, Mr. Thompson of Mississippi, and Mr. Clay.
H. Res. 410: Mr. Sires, Mr. Dusch, Mr. Keating, Ms. Titus, Mr. Bera, and Ms. Wild.
H. Res. 515: Mrs. Luria.
H. Res. 520: Mr. Crist and Mr. Lowenthal.
H. Res. 531: Ms. Bass, Mr. Pappas, Mr. McGovern, and Mr. Jackson Lee.
H. Res. 538: Mr. Mitchell.
H. Res. 546: Mr. Meeks, Mrs. Watson Coleman, Mr. Keating, Mr. Ted Lieu of California, Mr. Gottheimer, Ms. Wild, Ms. Brownley of California, and Mr. Bera.
H. Res. 574: Ms. McCollum, Mr. Connolly, and Mr. Cohen.
H. Res. 629: Mr. Crawford.
H. Res. 633: Mr. Guthrie.
H. Res. 636: Ms. Underwood.
H. Res. 639: Mr. Gohmert, Mr. Guthrie, Mr. Harris, and Mrs. Hartley.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

56. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the City Council of the City of New York, relative to Resolution No. 1947, calling on the United States Congress to pass, and the President to sign, legislation that would prohibit the enactment of the federal rule entitled “Inadmissibility on Public Charge Grounds”; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

57. Also, a petition of the Council of the City of New York, relative to Resolution No. 866-A, calling on the United States Congress to re-introduce and pass, and the President to sign, the 3-D Firearms Prohibition Act; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and the Judiciary.
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 God, give our lawmakers this day the wisdom to know Your words and obey Your precepts. As they follow Your leading, may they remember the many times You have delivered them in the past.
Lord, give them the courage to not retreat from life’s battles but to faithfully keep their hands in Yours.
Guide us, Great Jehovah. We are pilgrims in this land. We are weak, but You are mighty. Guide us with Your powerful hand.
In the time of our distress, console us with Your merciful presence.
We pray in Your Loving 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). The Senator from Iowa.
Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REMEMBERING TED STEVENS
Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, later today, I will attend the portrait unveiling of my former colleague and friend, Senator Ted Stevens, who served in the Senate from 1968 until 2009.
This portrait is being added to the Senate leadership portrait collection because of Senator Stevens’ service as the President pro tempore, a position I now hold.
Senator Stevens was known for his tireless work on behalf of the State of Alaska and its citizens. He had quite a reputation for reaching across party lines to get the job done.
I am honored to attend today’s ceremony adding Senator Stevens’ portrait to the historic walls of the U.S. Capitol.
I yield the floor.
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.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

THE FIRST LADY
Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, first, I want to acknowledge two notable events taking place in the Capitol today.
As we speak, the First Lady of the United States is just down the hall for a special event related to our Nation’s opioid epidemic, marking the progress that Congress and the administration have made in recent years and focusing our efforts on the work still ahead.
I will have more to say on the subject tomorrow, which will mark the 1-year anniversary of President Trump signing our landmark opioid legislation into law.
I want to warmly welcome the First Lady to the Senate this morning and thank her for her continued focus on this crisis, which affects so many of our States. I offer these thanks not only as the majority leader but as the senior Senator from Kentucky, which has been hit hard by this epidemic.

REMEMBERING TED STEVENS
Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, later today, in the old Senate Chamber, family, friends, and former colleagues of our late colleague, Senator Ted Stevens, will gather for the unveiling of the Senator’s leadership portrait.
Senator Stevens’ likeness will join the storied ranks of the leadership portrait collection—images of majority leaders, minority leaders, and Presidents pro tem, which are proudly displayed around the building.
Our distinguished predecessors watch over the corridors they walked, the rooms in which they debated, and the body they served.
It is fitting that Senator Stevens is being recognized for his service as President pro tem. As we all know, unlike the elected party leaders, that is not a job which you can campaign or persuade your way into. The only way to become President pro tem is to persuade your home State, over and over, to rehire you, and Ted Stevens was about the most dogged advocate for his home State that anybody could possibly imagine. He was Alaska’s son and Alaska’s champion 24 hours a day and then some.
I look forward to honoring our former colleague’s memory this afternoon.

H.R. 4617
Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, on another matter, later today, I understand the House of Representatives will vote on H.R. 4617. This is the latest installment in Speaker PELOSI’s campaign to expand government’s control over America’s political speech.
It is a transparent attack on the First Amendment that has united an
unlikely band of opponents across the political spectrum. Everybody from hardcore conservatives to the ACLU is speaking out against this effort to erode Americans' constitutional rights.

The proposal would give the Federal Election Commission unprecedented license to regulate Americans' political speech on the internet and decide what speech qualifies as political in the first place.

If it were not bad enough on principle to fill more Washington, DC, filing cabinets with which citizens hold public beliefs, their bill would also deputize media companies into this effort. They would force publications to keep excessive records for any advertisement they accept not only for political campaigns but on any issue of national importance.

When this regulatory burden has been tried on a smaller scale, it has frightened media platforms into rejecting political ads altogether. It is a textbook example of policy designed to reduce the amount of free speech in our country. Press organizations such as the Washington Post and the Baltimore Sun have already sued over similar regulations on First Amendment grounds and won in court.

House Democrats want to violate the First Amendment and harm journalists in order to give more control to the FEC. That would be the same FEC that Democrats have recently tried to shift from a bipartisan body to a partisan body. It would be like giving the Beast its body and its brains.

A different part of the House bill refers to “legitimate journalistic activities.” I look forward to hearing what Orwellian commission or process House Democrats may have in mind for determining whether Washington, DC, deems a particular journalist legitimate.

These are just a few examples. Even the ACLU—widely viewed as a left-leaning organization that is not known for siding with Republicans—is publicly opposing the Democrats' bill. Here is what the ACLU said:

“The SHIELD Act . . . strikes the wrong balance, sweeping too broadly and encompassing more speech than necessary. . . . The SHIELD Act goes too far . . . to the detriment of the public and the First Amendment.”

That is the ACLU.

Congress has real business to attend to. House Democrats need to stop blocking the USMCA. Senate Democrats need to stop blocking defense funding. Yet, rather than working on these issues, we instead see Democrats continue to fixate—fixate—on chipping away at the First Amendment. It’s a pet project they return to time and again. It is disturbing, especially in light of recent blatant attempts to intimidate Americans into silence.

Just a few months ago, a sitting House Democrat earned national criticism when he tweeted out a list of his own constituents in San Antonio, TX, who had donated to President Trump’s campaign. He listed these private citizens’ names along with their employers or businesses. In this era of political harassment and online mobs, the implication was clear as day.

From Twitter posts to partisan messaging bills, House Democrats’ mission is the same: Chill the exercise of free speech. Senate Democrats’ mission is the same: Intimidate Americans with inconvenient views that speaking up is more trouble than it is worth.

This proposal will not do anything to stop malign foreign actors—something the American people care deeply about. As three former FEC Chairmen recently pointed out, foreign adversaries like Russia are not going to stop their malign operations for fear of an FEC fine. Let me say that again. Adversaries like Russia are not going to stop their malign operations for fear of an FEC fine.

“Campaign-finance law isn’t the tool to prevent foreign meddling . . . . Adversaries won’t be scared off by civil penalties . . . . This is a job for diplomacy, policy more than counterintelligence agencies. [This legislation] is a needless sacrifice to First Amendment rights, not a serious effort to secure elections.”

That is three former Chairmen of the Federal Election Commission. I certainly agree. It was focusing on defense and counterintelligence, not attacking the First Amendment, that made the 2018 elections go more smoothly than the 2016 elections. That is why the hundreds of millions of dollars Congress has set aside for State grants has made a big difference. That needs to remain our focus as we continue our efforts to avoid repeating the mistakes of 2016.

House Democrats have achieved something remarkable here. They have drafted legislation that is so anti-First Amendment that it has united everybody from former FEC Commissioners, to the ACLU, to yours truly in opposition.

I am sorry that Speaker Pelosi deems go-nowhere messaging bills a better use of the House’s time than the USMCA and the 176,000 new American jobs that experts tell us it would create. The American people deserve a House of Representatives that works with the Senate and the President to actually make law and make progress for the families we represent.

TAX REFORM

Mr. McConnell. Mr. President, today Senate Democrats will push forward their own resolution that seeks to undermine part of the historic tax reform we passed in 2017. Remember, back then, Washington Democrats were downright hysterical about our plan to let working Americans send less of their paycheck to the IRS. Speaker Pelosi called the tax cuts “Armageddon.” She said it was “the worst moment in the history of the United States Congress.” That is the Speaker on the 2017 tax reform bill. I guess that shows how much Democrats hate to cut taxes. But tax reform passed, and the results are clear. It has increased Americans’ take-home pay and helped generate one of the best economic moments for working families in a generation.

But today, 22 States, including my State of Kentucky, have set new record-low unemployment rates. The national unemployment rate has set a 50-year low. But, alas, rather than acknowledge that the sky hasn’t fallen, Democrats continue to undermine tax reform—and listen to where they have elected to start. Listen to this. Democrats’ first target is changing the ‘Tax Code so that working families across the country have to subsidize wealthy people in States like New York, New Jersey, and California.’

Here is the background. As part of tax reform, in order to maximize middle-class relief, the deductibility of State and local tax payments was capped. Most middle-class taxpayers will see an offset to this through other tax cuts, but for some wealthy people who elect to live in high-tax States, this represented a partial increase.

Republicans didn’t think it was fair that middle-class working families in States the Obama economy left behind had to subsidize the tax bills of rich people in high-tax States without limit. We didn’t eliminate the State and local tax deduction; we just capped it for high earners. Senate Democrats want to undermine their resolution would help high-tax States—typically governed by Democrats—create workarounds for their high-earners.

Let’s be clear about what would happen if Democrats got their real objective and repealed the SALT cap altogether. According to data from the Joint Committee on Taxation, 94 percent of the benefit would flow to taxpayers who earn more than $300,000 a year. That is what it is all about. Ninety-four percent of the benefit would flow to taxpayers who earn more than $200,000 a year. More than half of it would actually go to people who make more than $1 million a year—cutting taxes for the rich. Repealing the SALT cap would give millionaires an average tax cut of $60,000. Meanwhile, the average tax cut for taxpayers earning between $50,000 and $100,000 would be less than $10. There would be $600,000 tax cuts for wealthy people and $10 tax cut for the middle class. Apparently that sounds like a good trade to our Democratic colleagues. It doesn’t sound like good trade to me.

I am sorry to break it to my Democratic colleagues, but the middle-class Kentuckians I represent care less about zero interest—zero interest—in cross-subsidizing the tax bills of millionaires who live in Brooklyn and the Bay Area.

It is bad enough that my Democratic colleagues want to unwind tax reform, but it is downright comical that their top priority—a top priority—is helping wealthy people in blue States find loopholes to pay even less. They won’t even...
propose to repeal the SALT cap outright because they know it is bad policy and negates all of their talking points about tax fairness. They just want to bless a backdoor workaround. I urge Members on both sides to use common sense and reject Democrats’ resolution when we vote on it later today.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S.J. RES. 59

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand there is a joint resolution at the desk that is due a second reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The leader is correct.

The clerk will read the joint resolution by title for the second time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 59), expressing the sense of Congress on the precipitous withdrawal of United States Armed Forces from Syria and Turkey’s unprovoked incursion into Syria.

Mr. MCCONNELL. In order to place the joint resolution on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to further proceedings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the joint resolution will be placed on the calendar.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER CHAPTER 8 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY, RELATING TO “CONTRIBUTIONS IN EXCHANGE FOR STATE OR LOCAL TAX CREDITS”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S.J. Res. 59, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 59) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, relating to “Contributions in Exchange for State or Local Tax Credits.”

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAMER). The majority whip.

TAX REFORM

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today, Democrats are forcing a vote to repeal the administration’s sensible rule to disallow bogus charitable deductions that are designed to circumvent the SALT, or the State and local tax, deduction cap that was part of the 2017 tax reform bill.

Before that, I would like to welcome this vote and today’s debate. It gives us an opportunity to review all the benefits of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act.

While crafting the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, Congress made a conscious choice to cap the State and local tax deduction, or SALT, at $10,000. Doing so allowed us to provide additional tax relief to the middle class, support families by doubling the child tax credit, and simplify the Tax Code for filers by nearly doubling the standard deduction.

These changes resulted in the average family of four in my home State of South Dakota receiving a tax cut of more than $2,000.

In response to this cap, certain high-tax States adopted—what some would call “creative” but what I would call “bogus”—schemes to try to circumvent the cap. These so-called charities that these States have set up are designed solely as an alternative method of paying State and local taxes so millionaires can shirk their Federal tax obligations. So the IRS did what the tax law directed. It enacted sensible regulations to shut down these bogus tax avoidance schemes. But it did so in a thoughtful and considerate manner—considering more than 7,700 comments and creating a safe harbor for certain donations to avoid unintentionally discouraging actual charitable giving.

It is ironic that Democrats, who uniformly opposed the middle-class tax cuts in the new tax law, are now calling for a tax cut for the most well off Americans. Based on nonpartisan data from the Joint Committee on Taxation, 94 percent of the benefit from this CDTA would flow to taxpayers with incomes of over $200,000. Fifty-two percent of the benefit would go to those with incomes of over $1 million.

In fact, repealing the SALT cap would result in millionaires receiving an average tax cut of nearly $60,000, while the average tax cut for taxpayers with incomes between $50,000 and $100,000 would be less than $10.

If you put that into perspective, the choice is this. Today, we have an opportunity to vote no—to vote no—on the Democrats’ proposed tax cut for millionaires.

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

The Democratic Party has undergone quite an evolution over these past 3 years. Like all political parties, the Democratic Party has always had an extremist fringe, with the far-left wing of the Democratic Party rapidly becoming its mainstream. Democrats have been falling all over each other to see how far left they can go to the left. Socialism, a concept that, in America at least, seemed to have been firmly consigned to the ash heap of history is now being openly embraced by the Democratic Party. Leading Democrats have embraced putting the government in control of everything from America’s energy usage to healthcare.

It is not socialism or government-run healthcare that I want to focus on today. I want to talk about another trend that has been gradually emerging in the Democratic Party but doesn’t always get the coverage that proposals like Medicare for All receive. It is the growing Democratic hostility to religious freedom, which culminated in a couple of weeks ago in a Democratic Presidential candidate’s proposal to selectively tax churches based on whether he agrees with their religious beliefs.

Let me repeat that. Think about that for a minute. A Democratic Presidential candidate proposed that the government should selectively tax churches and synagogues and mosques based on whether their religious beliefs pass muster with the President. That is what he would be, say, a statement.

The idea of taxing churches based on whether their religious beliefs meet with a political party’s approval is antithetical to the fundamental right to freely exercise one’s religion. It is not only antithetical but unconstitutional. Targeting churches for discriminatory treatment based on their theology is a violation of the First Amendment.

It is an understatement to say that it is deeply disturbing to see this proposal emerge from a mainstream candidate. But what might be even more disturbing is that members of the Democratic Party aren’t lining up to reject this onslaught and unconstitutional proposal.

Maybe we shouldn’t be surprised. This is not the first time a Democrat has shown signs of regarding religious people as second-class citizens. During some of the judicial confirmations of this administration, there have been disturbing signs that Democrats believed religious people should be subjected to extra scrutiny.

There was the nomination of Amy Coney Barrett during the first year of this administration. She was an outstanding judicial candidate who received the American Bar Association’s highest rating of “well qualified.” The ABA’s evaluation, as the Democratic leader once said, is “the gold standard by which judicial candidates are judged.”

Yet during the confirmation process, it became clear that some Democrats thought she should be disqualified because she is a practicing Catholic. “The dogma lives loudly within you”—is a quote from the Democratic ranking member on the Judiciary Committee, with the implication that anyone who takes his or her religious faith seriously can’t be trusted to hold public office.

Just last December, Democrats raised questions about another judicial nominee because he is a member of a Catholic charitable organization, the
Knights of Columbus, which participates in such disturbing activities as serving veterans, raising money for the needy, and providing young people with scholarships. The Constitution is very clear on whether being a person of faith can disqualify you from public office. VI, "No religious Test shall ever be required as a Qualification to any Office or public Trust under the United States." "No religious Test shall ever be required as a Qualification to any Office or public Trust under the United States." That is a quote from article VI of the Constitution.

Religious liberty is a foundational part of our system of government. There is a reason it is the very first freedom mentioned in the Bill of Rights. More than one of the 13 original colonies were founded for the express purpose of securing religious freedom. By religious freedom, I don’t mean the right to worship privately as long as you don’t bring your faith into the public square. What people were looking for in America—what they still look for in America—is the freedom to live according to their religion and according to their conscience and beliefs, freely, without interference from the government. That is what the First Amendment was intended to protect.

I want to move away from the Constitution for a minute, though. There is no question that Democrats’ increasingly hostile public attitude toward religion raises some serious questions about constitutionality. I think that is clear. That is not the only disturbing aspect of it. I am also profoundly disturbed by the none-too-subtle implication that religious people are somehow second-class citizens, that we may have to tolerate them, but that we should seek to push them out of public life. That idea is also clear. That would be absolutely antithetical to the Founders.

The Founders didn’t see religion as something to be tolerated. They saw it as an absolute good, and that isn’t just because a number of the Founders were men and women of faith. They didn’t think religion was just a private good—that it kept you in a good place with God. No, they thought religion was good for society. Think of the famous passage from Washington’s Farewell Address in 1796. Washington, literally, every single year in observance of Washington’s birthday.

Let me quote:

Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism, who should labor to subvert these great pillars of happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume might be written on the connection of private and public felicity.

Again, this is from President Washington’s Farewell Address. This is a sentiment that occurs over and over again during the founding—that religion is a benefit not just to individuals privately but to the public, that it makes men and women into good citizens. It encourages them to uphold the law, to live virtuous lives, to take their oaths seriously, to respect the property of others, and to manage their passions like vengeance and avarice.

That is not to say that you have to be religious to be a good citizen, but it does point to the truth that religion is something that adds value to society and that if we respect and women who are a blessing to their neighbors and to their country.

Americans are known for being a generous people. I don’t think it is much of a coincidence that Americans are also known for being a religious people. Again, to be clear, that doesn’t mean you have been to be religious to be generous, but religion encourages generosity. Think about how much of the charitable work in this country would not happen without religion. Churches and religious organizations support food banks and homeless shelters and crisis pregnancy centers. They run tutoring programs and scholarship programs and mentoring programs. They reach out to immigrants and refugees and to struggling parents and struggling families. They serve military members and first responders. They sign up people to vote. They help families looking to adopt. They implement recycling programs. They collect alms in the parking lots of natural disasters. They build houses for those without a home, and I could go on and on and on.

I will provide just one South Dakota example. A few months ago, I visited LifeLight’s new youth center in the Pettigrew Heights area of Sioux Falls. In addition to providing spiritual opportunities, the center is focused on providing a safe place where underprivileged children can come to hang out, play games, have a snack, and do their homework. It is just one of the many tremendous things being done by churches and religious organizations in Sioux Falls and around my State. I doubt there is any area where good work is being done in this country where you won’t find religious people helping out.

I don’t just want to see religious people tolerated. I want to see the Democratic Party rejecting the un-American idea that being religious somehow makes you less qualified to participate in the public square, and I want to see the Democratic Party standing up to condemn unconstitutional ideas like that proposed by one of their Presidential candidates.

Until then, I will keep fighting to ensure that every American’s fundamental right to live in accordance with his or her religious beliefs is protected.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, 3 weeks ago, a small number of U.S. Special Forces were working with our Syrian Kurdish partners to conduct operations against ISIS and hold more than 10,000 detainees, many of them hardened ISIS fighters. It was a product of a decade of hard work by American and coalition forces and the Kurds to degrade ISIS, to put them on the run, and stabilize the postconflict region.

Today, only 3 weeks later, as American troops continue their withdrawal from their bases in northern Syria at the President’s orders, President Putin and President Erdogan have announced a plan to establish Russian and Turkish control of a region that was once occupied by American and Kurdish forces. Our partners, the Syrian Kurds, have been killed and wounded in Erdogan’s invasion and forced to leave their homes in droves. Most importantly, the upper hand we once held over ISIS has been eroded.

We don’t know how many ISIS detainees have escaped from detention facilities or where they have gone. There seems to be no articulable plan on how to get them back. In the blink of an eye, President Trump has undone over 5 years of progress against the Islamic State.

Three weeks after first announcing the troop withdrawal, the President does not seem to have a clear strategy for securing the enduring defeat of ISIS and bringing the mess he created in Syria. Secretary of State Pompeo does not have a clear strategy. Secretary of Defense Esper does not have a clear strategy. Every day it seems like we are going in a completely different direction. One day, reports indicate the administration was considering a residual force in eastern Syria; the next report says the administration planned to target ISIS from Iraq. The next minute, reports said Iraq will not allow our forces to do that.

What is the strategy here? America’s security is at risk. ISIS is dangerous. ISIS is escaping. How will the administration continue to bring the fight to ISIS? What will the President do to prevent Russian and Turkish aggression and the potential slaughter of our allies and friends, the Kurds? When will the administration present its strategy to Congress?

We need answers to these questions right away, but, shockingly, the administration’s top officials, Secretary of State Pompeo and Secretary of Defense Esper, have now canceled two scheduled briefings with the Senate, and there is no new time on the calendar.
Secretary of State Pompeo apparently had time to speak to the Heritage Foundation yesterday, which is four blocks away from the Capitol, but he doesn’t have time to come to Congress, not even to brief us on Syria? Secretary Pompeo is in conflict in his duty. He has an obligation to come here. It is not a question of time if he spoke four blocks away at the Heritage Foundation. He is ducking. We need answers, and if they don’t have answers, we need to have a Q and A, a dialogue, and maybe that will push them to some answers. It is too dangerous for America to sit and do nothing—to run and hide, as Secretary Pompeo is now doing.

Today Senate Democrats are holding a special caucus to hear from Brett McGurk, the former government envoy in charge of countering ISIS under both Presidents Obama and Trump. While I expect Mr. McGurk’s presentation to be helpful to our caucus, it does not replace the need for the Trump administration and its officials to come to Congress and explain their strategy.

At the same time, we should send a message to the President that both parties policy in Syria. The Senate and the House has passed such a resolution on an overwhelming bipartisan vote, including the Republican leaders like Leader McCarthy, Representative Scalise, and Representative Cheney.

I have asked the Senate twice now to take up the House resolution, only to be blocked by a single Republican Member. I continue to believe the quickest and most powerful way to convince the President that he is on the wrong track is for Congress to put a bipartisan, joint resolution on his desk saying so. That is what the House resolution does, and the Senate should take it up and pass it.

We all know it is hard to shake the President from his thoughts and ideas, even when they are creating such disaster. His ego is enormous, but the one thing we can do is our Republican colleagues joining us in a resolution that reaches his desk. When Republican colleagues criticized him about Doral, he backed off. It is the only thing that can get him to change, and America is at risk.

Why aren’t our Republican colleagues stepping forward? Do they care more about the money in the pockets of the elite than protecting America? I hope not.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

COLORADO FARM TOUR

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Montana for his comments on the USMCA.

I come to the floor today to talk about a farm tour that I have done every year that I have been in the Senate. This is a tradition that started when I was in the House of Representatives with the wheat growers in Colorado, where we go around the Fourth Congressional District talking about those issues that matter to our farmers there. In Colorado’s Fourth Congressional District raises the vast majority of wheat in the State of Colorado, and about 87 percent of that wheat gets exported.

Senator Daines’ comments on the USMCA and what that means for Eastern Colorado are incredibly important. I hope that is a bipartisan effort that we can all get behind in the House and the Senate, and, of course, it has to start in the House, and we need the time to act as quickly as possible because those wheat farmers in Eastern Colorado need the certainty of new markets.

Senator Daines’ comments on the USMCA and what that means for Eastern Colorado are incredibly important. I hope that is a bipartisan effort that we can all get behind in the House and the Senate, and, of course, it has to start in the House, and we need the time to act as quickly as possible because those wheat farmers in Eastern Colorado need the certainty of new markets.

Over the last several months, I have been participating in this annual Colorado farm tour that I undertake every year with not only my staff but producers from across Colorado. It is in conjunction with a number of organizations in Colorado, like the Colorado Farm Bureau, Colorado wheat growers, corn growers, cattlemen, and others.
who all come together to show us every aspect of Colorado agriculture, from the production itself to the actual processing and finishing of agricultural products.

We drove hundreds of miles across the State of Colorado, starting in Greeley at a cheese-making plant. Almost all of the milk that is produced in Colorado—Colorado being one of the highest milk-producing States in the country—goes into cheese that every American can enjoy. Whether it is Domino’s pizza or Papa John’s pizza, that cheese most likely comes from Colorado. This is a great opportunity on this tour to connect all four corners of Colorado and the work that we do in agriculture and to hear their concerns.

We ended the farm tour at the State Fair in Pueblo.

What was particularly special about this year’s farm tour, though, was, of course, the economic drivers in the State. We had the 100th year anniversary of the Colorado Farm Bureau, and the fact that it is the 100th year anniversary of the Colorado Farm Bureau. Congratulations to the Colorado Farm Bureau. We will be talking about that more over the next seven days. Congratulations on this very historic anniversary, and thank you so much for joining this tour and making it happen once again.

As Members of Congress, all of us are used to policy topics but keeping farming and ranching at the forefront and keeping rural America at the forefront of those discussions is critically important because we need to focus specifically on those issues facing our farming and ranching communities.

In Colorado, the ag community accounts for more than 170,000 jobs. It is responsible for more than $40 billion in economic activity. It is one of the largest economic drivers in the State that has been transformed by energy jobs and high-tech aerospace jobs. Agriculture remains one of the highest job sectors in the State.

Economic health is so vital to our State, we know how much of a struggle it has been in agriculture over the last several years. According to the Department of Agriculture, 2019 farm income is projected to be down 49 percent from its peak in 2013. Over the last 6 years, we have seen a nearly 50 percent drop in farm income. Debt held by our farmers and ranchers is at $409 billion this year. That is up from $385 billion the year before. There is significant worry in this country about what is happening to our agricultural communities and the future of farming and ranching in this country.

One way to immediately help to provide solutions to solve this problem for farmers and ranchers is to make sure that we implement the 2018 farm bill programs as quickly and expeditiously as we can and that we resolve outstanding trade disputes, that we pass the USMCA, and that we resolve the trade dispute with China so that we can continue to open up new markets, develop new markets, and thrive with existing markets.

When an industry that accounts for nearly 11 percent of our Nation’s employment is struggling like agriculture is, we simply can’t wait any longer to provide help. We must act now to put the ag community back on the path to sustainability, so that not only current farmers and ranchers can continue in operation but new generations of farmers and ranchers can come back to Colorado, North Dakota, and States across this country to make sure they have bright futures in agriculture.

Even in the face of difficult times, we saw on this tour how farmers and ranchers are innovating and looking to address new markets to increase their incomes. They are opening up new markets through the Asia Resurgence Initiative Act, whether that is a trade agreement with ASEAN or Taiwan.

Another example is clean energy opportunities that our farmers have embraced. On one of the stops during the tour, we visited a farm in Eastern Colorado near Limon, CO, to talk about what wind production means for that rancher. The farmer leased the land, the area, to Xcel Energy, which is Colorado’s largest investor-owned utility. Currently, two wind turbines, which provide them with an alternative source of income.

Another rancher in the county talked about how they may earn as much as $5,000 per turbine for the wind operations. This rancher told us about the land—this farmer had 20 turbines on his land—that is $5,000 times 20. That is $100,000 in income that this farmer would not have otherwise had. Farm income is down 50 percent, farm debt has increased, but this wind production, with a very small footprint, may be the difference between keeping in operation this year and next year. We have to welcome that kind of diversified agriculture opportunity.

Another example is diversified income for agricultural producers is in Springfield, CO, in the far southeastern area of the State, where we visited a hemp processing plant. This Chamber has done great work when it comes to hemp, a new value-added opportunity for farmers and ranchers in Colorado. When this hemp processing plant is fully up and running, they are hoping to employ around 50 people. We went to this facility, and there is millions of dollars of equipment being invested in this operation. We will have a store, a shop, a gym, and recreational facilities. They are going to build a lake there and hire 50 employees in Springfield. I remember asking one of the other county commissioners who was on the tour with us in Huer fana County: Did you ever imagine a day when one business would bring 50 employees to Springfield?

The answer was very quick: No, never at all.

This as an incredible opportunity, not only for the farmers in the area but the community that will now benefit from 50 good-paying jobs with benefits. That is just one other source of revenue that we can achieve.

We also had the opportunity to visit Agriculture Research Station in Akron, CO, where they are doing tremendous research on dryland oilseeds and hemp, new technologies that the ranchers are exploring to help make it more effective to produce dryland crops and how we can make oilseed opportunities available for additional value-added opportunities in the future.

We also had opportunities on the farm tour to talk about mental health needs and what is happening in our communities. On too many stops during the farm tour, I heard about the impact that our struggling ag economy is having on the mental health of farmers and ranchers. A 2016 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention study found that agricultural workers have a higher suicide rate than any other occupation.

When we passed the farm bill in 2018, we also included language called the FARMERS FIRST Act, which will help to create mental health opportunities for those involved in agriculture and help to make sure that we have suicide awareness and prevention for mental health assistance and suicide prevention efforts for farm advocates to help create support groups and reestablish the Farm and Ranch Stress Assistance Network. That needs to be something that we all talk about back home with our agricultural community. Because they have provided food and fiber for this country and, certainly, the world, we need to make sure we are supporting them in every way.

We also talked about how we saw a nearly 40-percent increase in admissions for meth addiction in Colorado between 2011 and 2018. While we talk a lot about opiate addictions in this country, it is actually meth that our sheriffs are most concerned about in our rural areas. While we address the opiate epidemic, we also have to be giving and providing new tools and resources to deal with the addiction scourge of methamphetamine.

Alarmingly, a significant number of that meth is coming into Colorado from, basically, industrial-scale manufacturing facilities and sophisticated operations in Mexico and China. We need to make sure that we disrupt those operations. We need to do what we can to advocate more for the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas Program and the anti-methamphetamine task force to help law enforcement prevent cartels from getting these kinds of drugs into the country and continue to work on programs like the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration to focus on recovery resources and prevention.

Everywhere we went on the farm tour we heard about the shortage, whether it was milk, potato shortage, whether it was the cheese-making facility or whether it was the ranch or the hospitals that we visited on the farm tour. They talked about the need
for labor. We need a guest worker program that meets the needs of labor in this country.

Housing issues seem to be something that we don’t talk about when it comes to our rural areas. We talk a lot about it when it comes to our urban areas and the mountain communities and resort communities. Our rural areas are facing housing shortages and needs, as well. We introduced legislation and are working on legislation out of this farm tour to help focus our labor and housing situation.

I have talked about trade and the opportunities we have with trade to open up new markets and to resolve current trade issues, and we need to continue to work on that.

While the agricultural community is currently facing very serious issues, I want to be clear that our farmers and ranchers are as strong as ever.

Growing up on the Eastern Plains of Colorado, living in the heartland of Colorado agriculture, I have always observed the incredible positive impact that agriculture has on our communities—rural communities and urban centers as well. When the Federal Government gets out of the way of farmers and ranchers and growers and allows good things to happen, that is when our rural communities grow and thrive.

A couple of weeks ago, we had the opportunity to celebrate National Farmers Day. It was a day to celebrate the great community that has always been the backbone of this Nation, but we can never express all of our thanks to this industry simply on 1 day of the year.

To all of our farmers and ranchers, to those who make our breakfast, lunch, and dinners possible by providing abundant food and fiber for this country and this world, I am grateful for them and look forward to continuing to work on new solutions and better opportunities in the years to come.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.}

APPROPRIATIONS

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I am here this morning very pleased to be at this point where we are talking about consideration of an appropriations package that includes the fiscal year 2020 bills for the subcommittees on Commerce, Justice, and Science; Agriculture, Rural Development, and Food and Drug Administration; and Transportation and Housing and Urban Development; and the various related agencies.

It may be premature to call this a return to regular order, but I think that is kind of what it feels like. I would note that it is October 23, well past time that we should have finished our appropriations work, but we are advancing with bills that we have moved through the subcommittees and the full committee, and we are now moving packages of these to the floor.

I am pleased that we are here, where we have an opportunity to take up these substantive measures that the full committee has addressed with strong bipartisan support.

In the case of the Interior and Environment Appropriations Subcommittee, we have unanimous support for our bill. Then, there is the opportunity to bring the bills to the floor for consideration, where other Members have an opportunity to debate these appropriations bills, offer amendments, and, then, advance them through the Senate.

I am pleased this morning—particularly pleased—to be able to speak on the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee bill and to be here with my ranking member, Senator Udall. We have worked through this subcommittee account now for several years. It has been a good partnership, a strong partnership, with our teams working side by side. It is not the easiest of bills. We get our fair share of controversy.

In addition to taking care of all of our public lands, we also have oversight of our Native peoples. We also have oversight of the EPA. So we have a range of subject matters that sometimes overlap, and sometimes can cause some bumps along the way. Yet what we have committed to doing, I think, in working collaboratively, in working together, has resulted in a good, strong measure that the Senate needs.

Last year was the first time since fiscal year 2010—9 years now—that the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies appropriations was brought before the full Senate. We have been in a situation in which, for years, we have kind of been at the tail end of the line, the last of those spending bills to move. Now we are debating it in the first package, so we really feel like we have kind of arrived here.

Again, you don’t have the luxury of the first package without having done a great deal of work. You don’t have that and receive unanimous support coming out of the committee for the second year in a row now if you do not demonstrate this commitment that both sides have made to create an environment in which we can work through these issues in a bipartisan manner.

The Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies portion of this minibus includes funding for major Federal land management agencies. This includes the National Park Service, the Bureau of Land Management, the Fish and Wildlife Service, the Forest Service, as well as the Environmental Protection Agency. We also provide funding for essential Indian health, education, and resource management programs through the BIA and the Indian Health Service. Then we also provide funding and oversight for important cultural institutions, like the Smithsonian, the National Gallery of Art, the National Endowment for the Arts, and the National Endowment for the Humanities. This aspect of our oversight is often kind of forgotten because it doesn’t necessarily fit in with the public lands, with the EPA, with the BIA, but it is an important and an integral part of our subcommittee’s work.

Our subcommittee’s allocation for fiscal year 2020 is $35.8 billion. This is $248 million more than last year, with an additional $2.25 billion being made available by the wildfire cap adjustment and wildfire cap issue a little bit later here. Similar to the approach that we took in fiscal year 2019, the bill rejects the proposed budget decreases. We make investments in our highest priorities, such as infrastructure investments for our land management agencies, Indian Country, and wastewater and drinking water improvements.

The Department of the Interior itself is funded at $11.5 billion. This funds infrastructure investments for historic preservation, which is critical to preserving the sites and the stories of our Nation.

On the conservation front, investments in grants programs for species protection, wetlands conservation, and to combat wildlife trafficking are included. We also took a keen look at some of the invasive species that are wreaking havoc in our regions, like the Asian carp, so we provide a lot of good focus there.

Americans love to love our national parks, so this bill provides the funds that are necessary to meet our responsibility at the national park units.

We also focus on the deferred maintenance, which is something we have talked a lot about in committee and on the floor. We invest $127 million for deferred maintenance, increase funding for historic preservation, which is critical to preserving the sites and the stories of our Nation.

The USGS, the U.S. Geological Survey, receives funding for important programs that help our emergency responders during natural disasters like earthquakes or tsunamis. We work within this bill to provide assistance for responses to natural hazards and disasters as well as to inform the public about hazards and hazards the USGS is funded at $13.7 billion. These funds provide a lot of good focus there.
We also fully fund another lands matter, PILT, which is estimated at $500 million, and it maintains our commitment to meeting the needs of local communities for county roads, public safety, and schools. I know many of us in this Chamber hear from our constituents about the significance of adequate PILT funding.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund is something that is near and dear to many in this body. You will see in the increase to the LWCF, which receives $465 million. This is $30 million above the enacted level. This also includes $140 million for the NPS State side program as well as additional funding for recreational access. We focus on how we are able to access our treasured lands and ensure we have a level of conservation that is supported across the country.

In working with Senator Udall over these years, I think it has been important—it has certainly been important for me and a great partnership, a strong partnership when it has come to trying to meet the needs of those within Indian Country and having to fund the critical services. With this bill, I think we are making good progress. The two agencies that deliver services to the Indian community are the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Indian Health Service. They receive a combined increase of $236 million over the 2019 levels. We maintain all critical funding with some important increases for Indian Country.

For the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the BIA, we maintain the substantial increases we have provided over the last 2 fiscal years. We are helping on matters such as the construction, operation, and maintenance of Indian schools. We know, unfortunately, that in so many of the reservations in the lower 48, our schools are simply inadequate. The improvements we are seeing from our schools are not where we need to be. Making sure we are doing right by our Native children around the country is so important when it comes to education.

We also include funding for irrigation systems. We also fully fund contract support costs. We increase funding for public safety and justice facilities construction and programs. Certainly, as I hear from folks in Alaska and those around the entirety in the lower 48, public safety is something by which, again, we are not doing right by those whom we must serve in these areas. This is an effort that I intend to continue to push in my going forward.

I would specifically like to point out to my colleagues that for the very first time, we include a comprehensive look with new funding into those issues related to murdered and missing indigenous women. Many of us have been shocked at what we are coming to understand about the murdered and missing of our Native women around the country. The data we have we know is lacking. We don’t know what we don’t know. Thus, oftentimes it is difficult to respond and to address resources. The fact is that many who live in Tribal communities are often located in rural areas that lack public safety, and even though you have high rates of violence, abuse, murder, trafficking, we simply don’t have the resources there to help to respond to it.

I have been working with several of my colleagues to address these challenges—Senator Udall, Senator Heinrich, and so many, so many—to shine a light in this area. We know it is going to take a lot of coordination and communication among law enforcement agencies to get this right. In this bill, we include $6.5 million for cold case investigations, equipment, training, background checks, and the necessary report language to move us in the right direction.

Attorney General Barr came to the State of Alaska in May. In Anchorage, he had an opportunity to sit and listen to the Native leaders. The two agencies working with the Attorney General and greatly appreciate his efforts there, but we need to do more through these appropriations to look specifically at these issues as well.

For the Indian Health Service, there are also programs we have an obligation to fund that are vital to Indian Country. Many of these programs and the costs associated with them have grown since we enacted the 2019 bill. Among these are leasing and staffing costs that are associated with new healthcare facilities that are operated by the IHS or by Tribes under compact agreements. Our bill funds these new increases. We provide additional funding for renovation and quality improvement as well as providing a $241 million increase for facilities, including an increase for medical equipment.

The Forest Service receives investments in funding for the improved health and management of our Nation’s forests, including for recreation assets, such as the cabins so many of us enjoy, the trails on which we hike, and recreation special use permitting to allow certain businesses to operate in our national forests in order to enhance the recreational experiences and opportunities.

At the beginning of my comments, I mentioned the wildfire cap adjustment. It was back in the 2018 omnibus that we created the wildland fire cap adjustment, and fiscal year 2020 is the first year this is now available. The bill invests $5.167 billion in wildland fire activity, including $2.25 billion in fire cap adjustment funding.

In my State over this past summer, we certainly saw intense and extensive fires. It was a recordbreaking heat year this past summer, and we had some pretty devastating fires. We are still talking about the fires just last year in California. We know the threat is real, and we know we have to respond. So making sure we have the capacity to fight fire is important. In this bill, we not only invest in fire suppression, but we also invest in State and volunteer fire programs as well. The bill provides significant increases in State and Tribal grant programs, which will lead to tangible, on-the-ground cleanup and environment benefits, which was another priority that was strongly supported by many in this Chamber.

The priority that was targeted by many in the waters phase was water infrastructure development. Many of the newly authorized programs in America’s Water Infrastructure Act are strongly supported by my colleagues in the Senate, is the issue of PFAS and PFAS contamination. In this bill, we have provided $25 million in increases to address PFAS, including new funding for State-led cleanup and remediation efforts. We also focus on the research of human health and environmental impacts and related priority regulatory actions. There is a $20 million increase provided for EPA grant programs to support States in their cleanup and remediation efforts of PFAS-contaminated water sources as well as the water systems and the lands.

The remaining $5 million in increases will support the EPA’s priority actions on PFAS and supplement the research that other agencies are currently conducting on the chemicals. So we heard the concerns of so many, and we really worked to respond in this measure.

Lastly, the bill includes important increases for our cultural institutions and our agencies. The Smithsonian Institution, the Gallery of Art, and the National Endowment for the Arts and Humanities all receive increases in our measure.

I think it is so important to make sure that when we think about our treasures—clearly our land, the cleanliness of our water, but we also have national treasures, and we see so much of that reflected in the arts, whether it is the Smithsonian, the galleries, or with the Endowment for the Arts and the Humanities do.

Consistent with fiscal year 2019, we do not include new policy provisions.
that were not in the enacted bill. So we worked with Chairman SHELBY, Vice Chairman LEAHY, and the ranking member, again, with Senator UDALL, to assemble a package that both sides supported in committee.

I want to particularly credit the work Senator UDALL and I put into producing a bipartisan product that invests in programs that we care about—programs that protect our land and our people and enable infrastructure projects to boost the economy and help communities provide vital basic services that many might take for granted. We also worked hard to shape this bill so that it reflects the priorities of Members on both sides of the aisle. I am proud—I am really very proud—of the good, bipartisan work to ensure that this Interior appropriations bill directs the Federal resources to where they are needed most, providing critical investments in communities across the nation.

Of course, this Interior bill is just a part of the effort. We also have Commerce-Justice-Science, Agriculture, and T-HUD. All of these have significant impacts across the country. Certainly in my home State, we are looking at the Commerce-Justice-Science bill to help keep our fisheries healthy and provide assistance for public safety programs.

In the Agriculture bill, there is funding for much needed water infrastructure in our villages, and it helps expand our ever-growing agricultural industries. Of course T-HUD makes sure that rural communities in my State can still receive things like essential air service and helps with our ferry transport system and to provide Tribal housing.

There is so much good in all of these measures. I would commend them to Members’ consideration but would certainly urge passage of this very important Appropriations bill. I am pleased to be here with my colleague, the good Senator from New Mexico.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Sasse). The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, it is great to be here with Senator MURKOWSKI.

I rise to speak in support of the fiscal year 2020 Interior appropriations bill, which is my own priority to speak on because I have already been in committee. I want to start by thanking my chairman and partner in this endeavor, Senator MURKOWSKI, for her working with me to produce a very fine bill that was crafted on a bipartisan basis. It is extraordinary that this bill is on the floor for the second consecutive year after many years when we were not able to move the bill by regular order. Much of the credit goes to her leadership and her commitment to working through tough issues in a fair and a pragmatic way.

One of the reasons I am particularly proud of moving a bipartisan bill is the importance this bill has for my home State of New Mexico.

This bill reflects the long tradition we have in my State of working across the aisle to support conservation priorities. It includes a number of important accomplishments for the State, including language to protect the sacred lands of Chaco Canyon, along with funding to support the Valles Caldera National Preserve and the new resources to clean up the PFAS contamination in New Mexico and across the country.

This bill is also an important reflection of why the work that Chairman SHELBY and Vice Chairman LEAHY did earlier this year to secure a 2-year budget agreement is so important.

The Interior bill roughly 2.5 percent more funding than last year once you factor in the increase we received under the budget agreement and the savings we picked up from using the first year of the wildfire cap adjustment.

The funds in this bill allow this body to make solid increases to support the Land and Water Conservation Fund and to protect and manage national parks, wildlife refuges, and other public lands. I know many hope we can do better on the Land and Water Conservation Fund, and so do I. While I am pleased about the increase in this bill above the enacted level, I will be working to improve the LWCF’s funding when we conference with the House. But our efforts in the short term should not take away from the goal we have set on a bipartisan basis to provide permanent, mandatory, full funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund. That remains a top priority for me, and I think we can and should accomplish that in this Congress.

The bill also makes critical investments in Indian Country. Many of those were mentioned by Chairman MURKOWSKI, and we believe there are really solid things that have been done there—investments in Indian Country, providing a 4-percent increase for the Interior Department, a 2-percent increase for programs funded through the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Bureau of Indian Education.

We provide $2.25 billion in new firefighting funds using the wildfire cap adjustment, which means that these funds are finally, for the first time, provided without requiring reductions to other important programs. It also means that the Forest Service will not be forced to raid nonfire programs to pay for firefighting needs without knowing whether those funds will be repaid.

The bill increases funding for the Environmental Protection Agency by 2 percent, in order to support new bipartisan infrastructure priorities and to make important investments in regional cleanup programs. The EPA is still struggling after years of budget cuts, but I am proud that our bill includes the best EPA budget in a decade and completely rejects the billions in cuts proposed by the Trump administration.

It also provides vital resources to our counties by fully funding the payment in lieu of taxes program—a program that supports over $40 million per year in local government services in New Mexico.

The bill boosts funding for cultural agencies, including the National Endowment for the Arts and Humanities, as well as the Kennedy Center, the National Gallery of Art, and the Smithsonian Institution. Specifically, I am proud that we are able to increase the budgets of NEA and NEH by $2 million each. These funds provide a critical boost to local arts and humanities programs in small towns across the United States—programs that create countless jobs and ensure economic vitality in communities like those in New Mexico.

I am also pleased that the bill contains no new funding requested by the administration for the Interior Department reorganization. It is important that we now have both Chambers on record on this important issue, and I hope the administration hears us loud and clear.

I appreciate that the bill contains no new poison pill riders for the second year in a row, which is all the more notable given the number of difficult issues that we confront through the EPA and the Federal land management agencies.

I want to thank Chairman SHELBY and Senator MURKOWSKI for their commitment to moving a clean Interior bill.

That said, I do want to note that the bill does continue several provisions that I oppose, including provisions dealing with the lead content of ammunition, biomass energy policy, Clean Water Act exemptions, and Clean Air Act exemptions.

I am opposed to the troubling provision in the bill that weakens protections for the sage grouse. Given the bad-faith efforts by this administration to weaken efforts to protect the sage grouse, it is extremely shortsighted for Congress to continue to block protections under the Endangered Species Act for the species when the administration has failed to hold up its end of the bargain.

These provisions are contrary to the spirit of the no poison pill riders agreement. Thankfully, they are not in the underlying House bill, H.R. 3055, and I expect to have some frank conversations as part of the conference process about the need to remove them and the need to include a number of other important curbs on this administration included in that legislation. So I want to be on record that in the conference, I will be fighting to keep the House’s positions on several of these very important items.

I look forward to debating this bill, considering amendments, and ultimately passing it with a bipartisan
vote so that we can proceed to a conference with the House.

I also want to express my personal thanks to the majority subcommittee staff—Emy Lesofski, Nona McCoy, and Lucas Agnew—for working with me and my staff. This is Emy’s first bill serving in the office of the subcommittee, and I congratulate her on this milestone as the Senate takes up the bill. Their work is a great credit to Chairman MURKOWSKI and Chairman SHEPARD.

I would also like to thank my staff—Rachael Taylor, Ryan Hunt, Melissa Zimmerman, and Faisal Amin—for all of their hard work to accommodate the priorities of Senators on both sides of the aisle.

I think one thing that Chairman MURKOWSKI and I worked on was trying to balance the priorities of Senators on both sides of the aisle. That was the purpose of which is to overturn a very, very important part of the tax reform that we passed in December of 2017 that made the Tax Code much more fair than it was before. Specifically, I am referring to the limitations that we put on the ability of people to deduct State and local taxes.

Let’s remember what our Tax Code looked like before our tax reform. Wealthy individuals could deduct the full amount of any State and local tax deductions, however high they got. And we use the acronym “SALT” to refer to these State and local tax deductions. So why do I say that is unfair? Well, it is unfair because it subsidizes people who choose to live in high-tax jurisdictions. It does that because it lowers the tax bill of somebody who lives in a high-tax jurisdiction, like Manhattan or San Francisco, because they get to deduct the full amount of the outrageously high State and local taxes that they pay. The way that they get to deduct that big number means the rest of us have to pay higher rates on our income than we otherwise would have to pay. Why should my constituents in Blair County or Cambria County suffer in order to subsidize the folks who choose to live in high-tax jurisdictions like the Upper West Side of Manhattan?

It is totally unfair. They certainly should not have to do that. And have no doubt about it—the huge benefits of this unlimited State and local tax deduction that we used to have always flowed to a handful of States that have chosen to have very, very high taxes. California and New York are two good examples. Under the old regime, about two-thirds of the State and local tax deductions went to just those two States—just California and New York. They had one-third of all the benefits.

Take New Jersey, right next door to my State of Pennsylvania. New Jersey has 4 million fewer people than we have in Pennsylvania, almost one-third fewer people, but they got more of the benefit of the SALT deductions than my entire State. That is because New Jersey is a very high-tax State. Guess what? It is a high-tax State because the people who live there voted for politicians who raise their taxes. That is apparently what they want. They want to have all of the services that go with that. They are happy with very high State income tax and local property taxes. That is their decision. Look, if you want to vote for someone who is going to impose exorbitantly high taxes on you, you should be free to cast that vote. But don’t expect my constituents to subsidize them.

So that was the regime we had in place. Tax reform came along, and we said: Do you know what we are going to do? We are going to put a limit on the amount of the State and local taxes that a tax filer can deduct. The limit is $10,000. It is not trivial. It is a lot of money. But that is the limit. If you pay more than that in State and local taxes, you do not get to deduct it.

In response to that, very interestingly, several of these high-tax States have designed a scam to get around the limitation we imposed. The scam is that they create this vehicle, and then they have their taxpayers pay their taxes into that vehicle and call it a charity, call it a charitable contribution. The money then goes out of that vehicle and goes to the government. It is not a charitable contribution at all. It is a transparent, obvious attempt to circumvent the law that we passed in 2017. The IRS came along and said: Well, this is an obvious scam. They developed a rule that shuts down the scam. It says: If you create this scam, this make-believe charity, as a way to circumvent the cap on State and local deductions, we are going to disallow the deduction. So the IRS ruling shuts down the scam and maintains the deduction cap, and what my Democratic colleagues want to do right now is have a vote to invalidate the IRS ruling—in other words, have a vote to keep the scam. That is what the vote is today, to make sure we destroy the IRS ruling and keep this scam in place.

One of the ironies of this whole debate is that many of my Democratic colleagues voted against our tax reform because they said that it was too much of a tax cut for the rich, despite the fact that, in fact, our tax reform shifted the tax burden from lower income taxpayers to higher income taxpayers while saving money for everybody.

The relative proportion of taxes paid increased for wealthy people, decreased for low-income people, while everyone had taxes. That is saving money, and it is not justificable to my Democratic colleagues.

Now they come along, and they want to repeal the rule that shuts down the scam. They want to perpetuate the scam. This IRS ruling is a massive giveaway to the wealthiest Americans. It is amazing.

According to the Joint Committee on Taxation, 94 percent of the benefit—if they had their way and prevailed on this vote, 94 percent of the benefit would go to people whose income is over $200,000; 52 percent of the benefit would go to taxpayers with income over $1 million.

Not only is it fundamentally unfair to ask people in some low-tax jurisdictions to pay the taxes chosen by people in high-tax jurisdictions, the subsidy all flows from low- and middle-income people to very, very wealthy people. That is the deal. Millionaires would receive an average tax cut of $60,000; taxpayers with income between $50,000 and $100,000 would receive an average tax cut of less than $10—not $10,000—$10.

What we did when we put a limit on the ability to deduct State and local taxes was a big step in making our Tax Code more fair. It lowered the tax bill of somebody who has their taxpayers pay their taxes into that vehicle and call it a charity, call it a charitable contribution. The money then goes out of that vehicle and goes to the government. It is not a charitable contribution at all. It is a transparent, obvious attempt to circumvent the law that we passed in 2017. The IRS came along and said: Well, this is an obvious scam. They developed a rule that shuts down the scam. It says: If you create this scam, this make-believe charity, as a way to circumvent the cap on State and local deductions, we are going to disallow the deduction. So the IRS ruling shuts down the scam and maintains the deduction cap, and what my Democratic colleagues want to do right now is have a vote to invalidate the IRS ruling—in other words, have a vote to keep the scam. That is what the vote is today, to make sure we destroy the IRS ruling and keep this scam in place.

This echos all of the evidence we have seen from the intelligence community and many others, like Facebook, whose CEO, Mr. Zuckerberg, is testifying on the other side of the Capitol today on some of the ongoing efforts. We have seen this evidence, as well, from Special Counsel Mueller and many others.

The alarm bells are going off, and what are we doing? We are running out of time to do something about it.
Twice in recent weeks I have come to the floor to make a unanimous consent request on bipartisan legislation, which I have introduced, called the FIRE Act, and twice this bipartisan legislation has been blocked by my Republican colleagues. Actually, their actions, or inaction, from the President on Twitter.

Again, let me once again go forward with what this bill does. It is pretty simple and very straightforward. It would say to all Presidential campaign committees: If a foreign power reaches out to your campaign, offering assistance or offering dirt on a political opponent, the appropriate response is not to say thank you; the appropriate response is to call the FBI.

When I first introduced this legislation, we were concerned about the Mueller report’s finding that the Trump campaign welcomed the assistance of the Russian Government during the 2016 election. At the time, I was also deeply alarmed by the President’s comments in the Oval Office during the summer that he would entertain offers of foreign assistance in future elections.

A lot has happened since then, which makes matters even more urgent than ever. In the time since I last spoke on the FIRE Act, the President has used his office to seek dirt on a political opponent, Mr. Biden. It appears he pressured the Ukrainians. In the middle of ongoing trade negotiations, he went on national television to call on China to investigate Mr. Biden.

He also, during this period of time, has used the bully pulpit to intimidate and threaten an intelligence community whistleblower. I am glad to see that many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have stood up for the integrity of the whistleblower program and the notions that whistleblowers are a critical part of keeping our system on the up and up and that whistleblowers should not be threatened.

We have also heard in these past few weeks—I am not going to get into all of the details—a lot of contradictory and, frankly, almost Orwellian claims about whether the President’s asking a favor of the Ukrainian President is evidence of a quid pro quo. Then, just in recent days, we have seen a series of career diplomats coming forward, basically trying to validate the whistleblower’s complaint.

I know the House is working on some of this, and our Senate Intelligence Committee is also looking at some of the counterintelligence concerns about the President’s dealings with the President of Ukraine, particularly with Mr. Giuliani and his associates.

I have particular interest, as well, in terms of what the Attorney General is doing when he is going out, asking our closest allies—our FVEY partners, in the case of Australia and the United Kingdom—to use their intelligence services to bring us dirt on the President’s political opponents. That puts in jeopardy the trust basis the Five Eyes plan operates under.

We need, more than ever, this basic FIRE Act bill to make it absolutely clear that if we see foreign governments interfering, the obligation ought to be on any Presidential campaign to tell the FBI.

I see my colleague on the other side of the aisle, and I know she will probably object again. I just hope my colleagues will think about and look back on how history is going to judge anybody. Did we do what was necessary to protect the integrity of our democratic process? And how in the heck did we allow the protection of our democratic process to become a partisan issue? We would never make protection of the power grid a partisan issue. Yet, unfortunately, I think we are going to see folks on the other side of the aisle object to this commonsense basic reform.

If there are ways to improve on this legislation, I am wide open. I know my colleagues care about the breadth. Let me be clear. Some of the claims that were made last time are not true, do not affect diplomatic efforts, do not affect folks who are visiting here in this country. We have been more necessary clear. This is about a foreign government’s offer or their spy service’s offer of assistance during a Presidential campaign directly to that campaign.

But if there are ways to improve on the legislation, let’s have it at it. Let’s offer an amendment. Let’s at least vote. The truth is, we know what we need to do to protect our elections.

Before I make my unanimous consent request, I want to recognize my friends and colleagues, Senator KLOBUCHAR and Senator Wyden, who, after I make my request, will be speaking on a broader election security bill of which I am proud to be an original co-sponsor as well. Let me simply say that I support the measure, but I think we have paper ballot backups, to make sure we have postelection audits, to make sure if the Kremlin is paying for advertising on Facebook, they have the same kind of disclosure requirements as if they advertise on FOX—commonsense bipartisan proposals that, if they actually got to the floor of the Senate, I bet we would get 80 votes. My hope is that we will have that opportunity.

The truth is, the only person winning from our failure to act—and, unfortunately, today, in terms of the split between America and Ukraine—is Vladimir Putin.

Again, I appeal to my colleagues: Let’s move forward on the first step, protecting the integrity of our elections. Let’s bring forward the FIRE Act. Let’s make absolutely clear that if a foreign government tries to intervene in a Presidential election, the obligation is to report to the FBI and not say thank you.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Rules Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 2242, the FIRE Act: that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; that the bill be 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. Is there objection?

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I would allow my colleague to speak on this item. I say to my colleague from Tennessee, and others, that if there are ways to improve this legislation, let’s have it at it. But the notion that we are going into a Presidential election in which our intelligence community has said that Russia and others will be back, and we have taken no action to prevent that when there are commonsense items from social media constraints to making clear the foreign government shouldn’t intervene, to having paper ballot backups, to making sure we have appropriate campaign disinformation, to empowering our responsibility, and I hope in the future my colleagues will reconsider.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 2669

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I am proud to be here with Senator Warner and Senator Wyden, both leaders on this election security issue. It has been 1,006 days since Russia attacked us in 2016, something that has been confirmed by all of President Trump’s top intelligence agents. In fact, former Director Coats actually said they are getting bolder.

The next major elections are just 377 days away. We must take action now to secure our elections.

I know Senator Wyden will be addressing the actual hacking of our election equipment, which is so important, as well as other issues, but I am focused on this propaganda issue, this disinformation campaign that we have seen from the Russians.

The Honest Ads Act, which is part of the bill that I will be asking for unanimous consent on, the SHIELD Act, which is going to be passed by the House today, includes a number of measures that would close loopholes to stop foreign spending on issue ads in our elections. It would boost disclosure and transparency requirements, and it would help to stop bad actors from using deceptive practices to mislead voters.

All that may sound like a list of policy issues that seem very removed, but let me make it very specific. Here is one example of literally, millions.
about it until long after the election. It was the face of an African-American woman, an innocent woman, in Chicago. She later called our office and said: I don't know where they got my face. They put her face on a Facebook ad that went up on thousands of African-American Facebook pages in swing states. This is what the Russians did. Her picture was there, and it said: Don’t wait in line to vote for Hillary Clinton. You can text your vote at—and it gave a five-digit number, like 86153.

That is a crime. That is a crime. They are suppressing the vote. They are telling a voter to vote illegally in a way that will not register their vote. That is what we are talking about here—propaganda. Yes, it hurt one side in this 2016 election, but the next time it could be someone else on the other side of the aisle.

Fundamental to our democracy and our Founding Fathers was the simple idea that we would determine our faith in America. I don’t believe that we would not let foreign powers influence our elections. That is what this is about. It is about protecting our election hardware and infrastructure, and it is also about protecting us from this disinformation campaign and all of this really bad stuff.

I don’t think my colleagues are interested in protecting—I hope this isn’t their goal—the big social media companies. I hope their goal is to protect Americans so they can determine their own faith in an election.

With that, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 2238, the STOPPING Harmful Interference in Elections for a Lasting Democracy Act, otherwise known as the SHIELD Act, which was introduced earlier today; further, 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: Is there objection?

Ms. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The HONORABLE MR. PRESIDENT. Objection. The Senator from Oregon.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 238

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I will be making a unanimous consent request to move that SAFE Act in just a couple of moments. This is legislation that Senator KLOBUCHAR and I have teamed up on for quite some time.

It basically incorporates the three priorities that all of the nonpartisan election cybersecurity experts recommend: paper ballots, routine post-election, risk-limiting audits, and Federal cyber security standards for election systems.

I am going to make some brief remarks and then pose a unanimous consent request.

I just find it stunning that the Republican Party has its wall-to-wall campaign of obstruction against election security. Because of this legislative blockade, the Senate has been AWOL when it comes to stopping foreign cyber attacks on our elections.

For example, I think most Americans would be stunned to learn that there is not a single mandatory, nationwide election cyber security standard on the books. For example, there are no rules barring connecting voting machines to the internet. I say to the Presiding Officer and colleagues that doing so is equivalent to putting American ballot boxes in the Kremlin. That is what happens when you don’t have cyber security standards.

Let’s remember what happened in the election cyber security debacle of 2016. Russian hackers probed all 50 State election systems. Russians successfully hacked at least one election technology vendor, according to the Mueller report. Russians penetrated two Florida county election systems, according to Florida’s Governor. That is just what we know about.

People are always saying: Well, no votes were ever changed. No one should be surprised. I think the most any of us know is that you wouldn’t know it unless you had a real forensic analysis conducted by cybersecurity experts who broke the systems down, and that hasn’t been done.

Despite all the ways foreign hackers have already made it into our election infrastructure, Congress has refused to arm State and county election officials with the knowledge and funding they need to secure their systems.

I will just make one additional point, and I thank my colleague for her courtesy because I know everyone is on a tight schedule. This summer, I saw for myself how vulnerable election systems are. I went to DEF CON, which is really the major “white hat” hacker convention in Las Vegas. I went because I wanted to see how easy it was to hack e-pollbooks, voting machines, and other key parts of election infrastructure and that we would not let our colleagues on the other side, including the distinguished majority leader, could have seen all of these young people in the Voting Village going through a who’s who of hackable voting machines and see just how easy it was to compromise voting machines to alter votes, disrupt ballot printers, and meddle with registration systems.

Teenagers in the DEF CON Voting Village showed me an e-pollbook hack so completely that young people were playing video games like “Doom” on it. I sure wish my colleagues could have been there.

I sit on the Intelligence Committee. I am not going to get into anything classified, but I am going to close simply by saying that, as of today, the threats that we face in 2020 from hostile foreign powers, in my view, are going to make 2016 look like peanuts.

For that reason, I now ask unanimous consent that the Rules Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 2238, the Securing America’s Federal Elections Act, otherwise known as the SAFE Act; that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; 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. Is there objection?

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, my mom would always say: You know, it is not a good sign if you are doing the same thing over and over and expecting a different result.

My colleagues have sought several times, under the guise of election security, to circumvent going to the Rules Committee and trying to bring these bills to the floor. It is important to note that the legislation they are bringing would do something that most people, especially people in Tennessee, tell me they do not want to see happen. What it would do is take away authority from your local election commission, your State election commission, and then vest that authority with the Federal Government.

Federalizing our elections, in my opinion, would actually make them less secure. Is there anybody who thinks the Federal Government is going to do a better job of administering an election in Williamson County, Tennessee, where I have served on the election commission? The answer would be “of course, not.” They know that their friends and neighbors who served on those entities would do a better job.

I must also remind my colleagues that every single Member—Democrat, Republican, and Independent; every Member of the Senate—agrees that foreign meddling in our Nation’s business is a problem. For decades, foreign nations have sought to meddle in our affairs in the physical space. Ought we to have expected them to try this in the virtual space? It ought not have come as a surprise to us.

We also know that Members are working on this issue, and that there has been progress that has been made by the Intel community, by State-level authorities, and by those who are making certain these election systems are secure. And guess what. They are doing this without a Federal power grab taking place.

I fear that my friends on the other side of the aisle still have not gotten
over that they lost in 2016. Further, they have yet to accept that their colleagues in the House of Representatives have turned their best hopes for correcting this electoral disappointment into a farce.

We know that in 2016 the Russians seized upon partisan hysteria and used it to pit the American people against one another. They did not affect voting in election systems.

It is therefore incumbent upon us to ask that my friends in the minority cease using the business of the Senate to continue these requests.

I do object to the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I am going to be brief because I just think it is so critical to respond to the comments of my colleague. I have said, and the distinction he has made.

The fact is that here we are, with just a few months until people start voting. They are going to vote in primaries early next year. They are going to go to the polls from sea to shining sea in the fall of 2020. I will just say to my colleagues that we have something like 25 States in America that are nakedly vulnerable. These are the States that are still using hackable, paperless voting machines and States that do not have routine, post-election audits.

As Senator WARNER, Senator KLOBUCAR, and I have said, and the distinguished minority leader, Senator SCHUMER, all we are interested in is working to deal with this issue in an objective way, based on the facts outlined by the experts who aren’t at all political.

I think it is very unfortunate that there has been an objection to the proposal from the distinguished Senator from Virginia, Mr. WARNER, and the proposal from the ranking member on the Rules Committee, who has worked with me on the SAFE Act, and the SAFE Act itself because, as a result of this action, the Senate is missing yet another opportunity to provide an additional measure of security for the 2020 election.

I will close with one last response in light of a comment my colleague, our new Senator from Tennessee, has made. She and I have talked about these issues, and I have appreciated it. She said that no votes were changed—no votes were changed in the election. Nobody knows that. Unless you do a forensic analysis and break down the machines, you won’t know that.

I sure hope that soon we will be back on this floor moving the proposal advanced by the Senator from Virginia and the proposal by the Senator from Minnesota and me because these are measures proposed by independent experts who don’t care about Ds and Rs; they care about what is right for America.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

HONG KONG

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, as we gather today here in peace and safety for the people of Hong Kong, I want to present a crucial fact to the American people right now.

The fact is that here we are, with just a few months until people start voting. They are going to vote in primaries early next year. They are going to go to the polls from sea to shining sea in the fall of 2020. I will just say to my colleagues that we have something like 25 States in America that are nakedly vulnerable. These are the States that are still using hackable, paperless voting machines and States that do not have routine, post-election audits.

As Senator WARNER, Senator KLOBUCAR, and I have said, and the distinguished minority leader, Senator SCHUMER, all we are interested in is working to deal with this issue in an objective way, based on the facts outlined by the experts who aren’t at all political.

I think it is very unfortunate that there has been an objection to the proposal from the distinguished Senator from Virginia, Mr. WARNER, and the proposal from the ranking member on the Rules Committee, who has worked with me on the SAFE Act, and the SAFE Act itself because, as a result of this action, the Senate is missing yet another opportunity to provide an additional measure of security for the 2020 election.

I will close with one last response in light of a comment my colleague, our new Senator from Tennessee, has made. She and I have talked about these issues, and I have appreciated it. She said that no votes were changed—no votes were changed in the election. Nobody knows that. Unless you do a forensic analysis and break down the machines, you won’t know that.

I sure hope that soon we will be back on this floor moving the proposal advanced by the Senator from Virginia and the proposal by the Senator from Minnesota and me because these are measures proposed by independent experts who don’t care about Ds and Rs; they care about what is right for America.

I yield the floor.
Hong Kong seek to vindicate today, and those are the rights Beijing is attempting to strip from this city as we stand here today in this Chamber. The people of Hong Kong—they have an expression. The protesters say they are going to be like water. They say “Be fluid.” Some have actually referred to this as a water movement. They mean “Be fluid. Be reactive. Adapt to the situation.”

I just have to say, having been there myself, having been to the streets, having spoken with ordinary people, with them and talked with them, their courage and their bravery under pressure is really something to behold. It is an inspiration to me, and I think it should be an inspiration to all of us. Their love of liberty—you never love something more than when it is threatened—their love of liberty is really extraordinary.

I want to say something the Reverend Chu Yiu-ming said about liberty and democracy. He said it so beautifully.

“We strive for democracy, because democracy strives for freedom, equality and universal love. Political freedom is more than loyalty to a state. [Political freedom] professes human dignity. Every single person living in a community possesses unique potential and unique powers, capable of making a unique contribution to society.

That is extraordinary, and he is exactly right. Hongkongers know it, and that is what they are standing for, and that is what they are fighting for.

The people of Hong Kong need our support, they deserve our support, and they are depending on our support. That is why it is so important for us to act. It is time to take up and pass the Hong Kong Human Rights and Democracy Act. The time for debate is over. The time for delay has passed. It is now time to stand with the people of Hong Kong.

The signal to the world that the United States will stand with freedom-loving people, that the United States will stand up to Beijing, and that the United States will not permit China to dominate its neighbors and its region and the world.

It is time for this body to act and to act now, and it is time to do more. That is why I will soon be introducing further measures to help support the people of Hong Kong. I will be calling for the imposition of Global Magnitsky sanctions on individuals and business entities that abet Beijing in its suppression of the freedoms of speech and assembly that rightfully belong to the people of Hong Kong.

I would just say to those corporations doing business in China and to those multinational corporate entities and organizations like the NBA that it is time for you to take a stand as well. It is time for you to show a little backbone. It is time for you to show some independence. You may be multinational corporations that do business everywhere in the world, but remember that you are based here in this country. Remember—the NBA should—that you are an American organization. These companies need to remember that they are American entities, and it is time to show a little American independence.

When Beijing tries to use threats of coercion and threats of market access to get the NBA to censure and to get corporations like Apple to censure, it is time for these corporations to stand up and say: We are not going to participate, and we are not going to become part of the Chinese Communist Party’s propaganda machine. It is time for these companies to remember where their loyalties actually lie.

I have to say, for too long now and for too many years now, we have seen too many of these companies and these same corporate executives—who make money hand over fist in China—we have seen them happily send our jobs to China. We have seen them happily outsource our work to China. Now they want to import censorship into this country from China. Well, no thank you. It is time that they are open about what it is they are doing, and it is time they stand up to Beijing and say: No further.

I want to say again that the situation in Hong Kong is urgent, and the people of Hong Kong are looking to the United States and to other freedom-loving peoples around the world for support and for strength. It is time that we send them the message—and call on our friends in Beijing—that we must stand with Hong Kong because our own security and our own prosperity and our own ideals are at stake there.

I think, finally, of the words of John Quincy Adams, whom I will paraphrase. He said: Wherever the standard of freedom is unfurled, there will be America’s prayers, there will be America’s benedictions, there will be America’s heart, and today, there needs to be America’s help.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business, please.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REMEMBERING TED STEVENS

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, the Senate is honoring our former colleague, Senator Ted Stevens, with the unveiling of his official portrait. I come to the floor to say some words about a friend and former chairman.

Ted Stevens’ life in public service started early when he joined the Army Corps in 1943. So great was his desire to serve our country that he joined after attending just one semester of college.

During the war, he flew dangerous, unescorted missions in China and India, earning two Distinguished Flying Crosses for flights behind enemy lines. After the war, he returned to his studies and graduated from UCLA and Harvard Law School. Not long after that, he moved to Alaska to practice law, and there he began a life of service to the State he called home for the rest of his life.

Ted served as a district attorney and became known for accompanying U.S. Marshals on raids, and that was really an early hint of his temperament and intensity on the job. Of course, all Senators devote their careers to their States, but few have the distinction of achieving a historical level of public service. Senator Stevens was one of them. Working in the Department of Interior in the 1950s, he became known as “Mr. Alaska” for his focus on achieving statehood. He worked tirelessly to assure the concerns of then-President Eisenhower to get statehood passed through both the House and the Senate.

When the Alaska Statehood Act finally passed, Ted returned to Alaska and served as a representative in the State House, becoming Speaker of the House after just one term. Then, in 1968, he came to the Senate, where he would go on to serve for 40 years.

Once here, he distinguished himself as a fierce advocate for Alaska. He fought relentlessly for funding to build rural hospitals, highways, courts, and military bases across the State he helped create. His efforts only increased when he ascended to the powerful chairmanship of the Appropriations Committee. He often quipped that being such a young State, Alaska needed extra help to catch up to its elder siblings; and help is exactly what he provided. One estimate says he steered more than $3.4 billion in Federal funding to Alaskan projects in just the last 14 years of his tenure.

Those of us who served with him on the Appropriations Committee got to know Ted’s Incredible Hulk tie, which he would wear on days with especially difficult debates. He was a fighter and a fierce advocate for his State and his party. When a reporter once asked about his reputation for losing his temper, Senator Stevens replied: I didn’t lose my temper. I know right where it is.

But he would also cross party lines and work side by side with his appropriations colleagues, especially Bob Byrd and Daniel Inouye. They would trade the gavel between them, serving as chair and ranking member of subcommittees and the full committee.

Beyond Federal funding, Stevens settled many longstanding issues that faced his young State, beach, and among them was the settling of Tribal land claims. The Alaskan Native Claims Settlement Act would become the largest land settlement claim in U.S. history. It was hailed as groundbreaking for its involvement of more than 200,000 Native communities from the outset.

Always with an eye to the future, Ted Stevens not only supported Native leaders in asserting land claims, but he also supported economic development measures in the final bill.

Personally, I remain thankful for Ted’s support with the Ten-in-Ten Fuel
Economy Act, a bill I authored in 2007 with Senators Olympia Snowe, Maria Cantwell, Tom Carper, and others. The bill was drafted to increase fuel economy by 10 miles per gallon within 10 years, but it was responsible for much more. The Obama administration went on to use the Ten-in-Ten Act to set rules that will increase fuel efficiency to more than 50 miles per gallon by 2025 and save consumers more than $400 billion at the pump.

Here is how it got done. I couldn’t get it in done. It was controversial at the time and, believe it or not, Ted Stevens played a big role in getting this bill passed. As ranking member of the Commerce Committee, he and Senator Inouye included the language as part of a broader energy bill that President Bush signed into law in 2007.

So this was a big deal, and it was controversial. Senator Stevens knew that, but he understood the importance of the issue, and he included the language in his bills, and it could not have passed any other way. It was a very big event for me, and it really sealed my respect for this Senator from a different party, a different State; but he cared, you could go to him, and he helped.

I remember back then. Now our mileage is going up, and I think of Ted, when I talked to him, saying: OK. We will get it done—and he and Dan Inouye did do that. He said: ‘My motto has always been ‘To hell with politics, just do what’s right for Alaska.’ ”

I don’t think anyone who had the pleasure of knowing Ted Stevens would know him as anything other than a great legislator for the State of Alaska and a great legislator for the United States of America.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I rise to speak on the appropriations bill that is now before the Senate. I would like, however, to defer to the ranking minority member on the Senate Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee for his comments, and then I would reserve the rest of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERRICK. Mr. President, thank you and a huge thanks to my colleague for making time to join me to make comments, which I am going to make very brief, but also for the leadership of the subcommittee and the bipartisan work. It is the way the Senate should work. Let’s just expand that spirit to the entire Chamber, and we will make a lot of progress.

This bill maintains funding for important rural development programs, including housing and rural broadband, which is essential all across America. It provides assistance with farm ownership and farm operating loans because access to credit to farmers is critical to stay in business, and it helps new farmers come into the farming and ranching community, including minorities, women, and veterans.

It provides critical funding for SNAP. In our country, no one should go hungry. It assists with school meal equipment grants, the Farmer’s Market Nutrition Program, and the Commodity Supplemental Food Program, all relevant to making sure our children and our families have basic nutrition. It assists on the international front with Food for Peace, the McGovern-Dole Program funds millions of children around the world.

I was down in Central America and found that the average child in Guatemala at 9 years old is 6 inches shorter than the average Guatemalan child raised in the United States—stunning. It is a huge factor and affects the entire course of the mind. America is doing incredible work around the world in poverty-stricken countries. This food program also increases school attendance, the nutritional component.

Critical funding for the Food and Drug Administration is part of this bill for a whole host of reasons.

There is only one thing in this bill that I have disagreement with, and that is funding for the relocation of the National Institute of Food and Agriculture and the Economic Research Service. I think those organizations do a far better job when they are here networking with the other key critical policy groups and when folks coming from Oregon and places remotely around the country visit NIFA and ERS at the same time as visiting other programs.

Tribute to Bob Ross

Mr. President, for 11 years, Bob Ross has been a fixture from the Department of Agriculture to our subcommittee. That is because he is fabulous, and we just couldn’t let him go. Most people in rural America haven’t heard of Bob Ross, but millions and millions have benefited from his work, particularly his superb work on rural housing. He has been invaluable to us. Few people get a chance to work to make the world a better place as much as he has.

He is on to the next chapter of his life, retirement, and perhaps many adventures in retirement. Bob is sitting behind me. We thank him for his years of service and wish him all the best of luck in the chapters to come.

I thank the chair of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture. It is a pleasure to work with him.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon for his work and also express appreciation for the bipartisan approach to the appropriations bill. This is how we are supposed to do things.

It is not just the Ag appropriations bill, it is the other bills we have included in this package that includes Commerce-Justice-Science, T-HUD, as well as our Ag appropriations bill and Interior.

This is the work of the Senate. This is regular order. This is how it should be done. So I am appreciative of the bipartisan approach taken not only on our bill but on these other bills and the fact that we now have them on the floor. I hope it continues in terms of regular order and bipartisan that enables us to advance these bills in regular order.

Then we have the other appropriations bills as well. We moved all 12 of these bills through our full Appropriations Committee in a bipartisan way. Now we need to do the same thing on the floor and then go to conference with the House to get this done. We have a continuing resolution in place until November 21, so it is imperative that we continue this work and that we do it in this way.

I am pleased to introduce the 2020 appropriations bill for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies. This legislation passed out of our Appropriations Committee, and it is the case of this appropriations bill, with unanimous support out of the full Appropriations Committee.

I am pleased to bring it to the floor. The other bills we have included now in this package had broad-based bipartisan support as well, as the Presiding Officer knows being a member of the full committee.

I am pleased to join my colleagues on the Subcommittees on Interior; Transportation, Housing and Urban Development; Commerce, Justice and Science. For now, my comments will be focused on our bill specifically, the Ag appropriations bill.

Right now, farmers across this country are really up against it, no question about it. Whether you are from North Dakota, Oklahoma, points in between—east or west or north or south—you or our farmers are really up against it. In North Dakota, we have had unbelievable flooding. From snowstorms to rainstorms—but pretty much nonstop rain and other challenges that have left our fields swamped.

We have a great diversity of crops, most of which have not been harvested because we can’t get farm equipment out in the field in order to conduct that harvest.

Earlier this year in May, we worked to advance supplemental to address the hurricanes—the other wildfires we had out in California, the hurricanes that hit the Southeast, and other weather disasters. So in that supplemental package we passed back in May, we included assistance that we call WHIP+ for the Midwest farm country, anticipating not only that we needed to address the flooding and problems that occurred this spring but that there were additional flooding coming. Of course, that is exactly what happened. So we worked to ensure that there is disaster assistance legislation passed that will help.

Now we need to advance this appropriating bill to make sure we continue to support our folks not only due to the challenges they face because of weather issues but also low commodity
prices and the real challenges we face due to trade right now. We need to keep advancing on all these fronts. Of course, this legislation is an important part of that.

It includes support for our producers, funding for those very important programs that provide vital direct health and safety benefits and safeguards for all Americans not only through the USDA but, as I said, the Food and Drug Administration. Agriculture supports more than 16 million American families and forms the backbone of our rural communities. Our farmers are the best in the world, and what they do benefits every single American every single day. We have the highest quality, lowest cost food supply in the history of the world, produced by our farmers and ranchers. It benefits every single American every single day. So we are talking about good farm policy and good ag policy. We are talking about something that benefits every single American every single day.

Again, I thank Senator MERKLEY for the bipartisan working relationship we have had on our committee. I think this bill reflects a well-balanced compromise on a lot of the issues we had, not only among the members but on both sides of the aisle, and I hope my colleagues will join me in passing this important legislation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

(The remarks of Mr. CORNYN pertaining to the introduction of S. 2690 are printed in today's Record under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

TAX CUTS AND JOBS ACT

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, briefly on another matter, we are just a couple of months away from the 2-year anniversary of the passage of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. Because of this legislation, families across the country are benefiting from lower income tax rates and are able to keep more of what they earn. We have also helped families by doubling the standard deduction for children, expanding the child tax credit, and other important components of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act.

I want to speak briefly about filing their taxes, it was a welcomed relief. The journey to pass the legislation wasn’t easy, of course, and there was no shortage—there never are—of naysayers. Many of our Senate Democratic colleagues asked us to consider this legislation, and I think we only benefited the rich, the evidence to the contrary notwithstanding. We know that is false because of what the facts tell us.

Let me go back for a second and explain why this congressional resolution of disapproval we will be voting on at about 3 o’clock is so ironic and so mistaken.

Prior to tax reform, without limit, taxpayers could itemize their deductions for State and local taxes. They got to deduct that from their Federal income taxes, which meant, in essence, in those high-tax jurisdictions—the cities and the States that had high local and State taxes—taxpayers from around the country were subsidizing those taxpayers in those high-tax jurisdictions.

The Tax Cuts and Jobs Act attempted to deal with this unfairness by capping this deduction, better known now as the SALT deduction—the State and local tax deduction—at $10,000 for everybody across the country. Everybody was treated the same. Everybody was put on a level playing field. In other words, tax reform stopped the endless subsidy that taxpayers who were living in States with fiscal decisions that were made by other States and local governments. There is no reason we should ask a taxpayer who is living in Austin to subsidize the financial decisions, the fiscal decisions, made in Albany, in Sacramento, or in any other State capitol.

Before the cap, the wealthiest Americans were disproportionately reaping the benefit of no-limit deduction. That is why the cap was included in tax reform to support the middle class, not the top 1 percent. In the process, we prevented the richest people in the country from gaming the Tax Code.

This chart, which was produced by the Senate Committee on Finance, courtesy of Chairman GRASSLEY, talks about who benefits from the SALT cap repeal. This is what we will be voting on indirectly this afternoon.

Here, 52 percent of the benefit goes to taxpayers who filed their income taxes at a marginal rate of 35 percent and income inequality once, I have heard it a thousand times. Yet here they seek to undo a cap that treats every taxpayer the same and essentially require taxpayers who are in high-tax States to subsidize those who are in low-tax States and localities. And 52 percent of them make over $1 million—$1 million a year. A millionaire would receive a tax cut of nearly $60,000—higher than the household incomes of many people who live in middle-class States around the country.

That is what we will be voting on. That is what the Democratic leader from New York—a high-tax State and city—seeks to do for his constituents, and it is to the detriment of hard-working families in my State and in many States around the country.

After continually hammering the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, it is actually duplicitous to argue that it somehow benefits the wealthy when there was just last month the highest marginal rate. Our Democratic friends like to say they are the party of the working man and woman, but clearly they are working on behalf of the 52 percent of taxpayers who have incomes of over $1 million who will be affected and 6 percent of taxpayers who will be affected who earn under $200,000. You can bet that if the Senate follows the lead of our Democratic colleagues to kill the SALT cap, the people who have made a lot of money. They pay their taxes, contribute their philanthropy, and help in innumerable ways. This is simply a way to try to make sure our taxpayers in Oklahoma, Delaware, and Wyoming subsidize the high tax rates in New York, Los Angeles, or other places that have high State and local taxes. In good conscience, we cannot let that happen.

The Joint Committee on Taxation estimated that if tax reform passed, a number of States have created a workaround—call it a tax dodge—to circumvent this $10,000 limit. In June, the Treasury issued a regulation to stop them—this is the tax dodge—and required States to adhere to the limit that Congress passed into law and that the President signed.

The financial consequences of what the Democratic Members of the Senate are trying to do here are enormous. The Joint Committee on Taxation estimated that if one-third of the uncapped SALT deduction went to the top 1 percent, that is what the Democratic leader from New York—a high-tax State and city—seeks to do for his constituents, but it is to the detriment of hard-working families in my State and in many States around the country.

I don’t have any ax to grind with people who have made a lot of money. They pay their taxes, contribute their philanthropy, and help in innumerable ways.
the folks who live in these high-tax cities and States can get a $60,000 tax cut is something I am simply unwilling to participate in. I urge all of my colleagues to vote against this resolution of disapproval.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I echo what my colleague said about S.J. Res. 50, a congressional resolution of disapproval we are being asked to vote on this afternoon. I agree with the Senator from Texas. It is a mistake. It is wrong. I think he used the words “ironic,” “mistaken,” and “duplicitous.” I would call this the most transparent proposal the height of hypocrisy. That is what we are looking at right here, and I am planning to oppose it.

Two years ago, the Republicans passed major tax reform for this country. We wanted to double the Tax Code simpler, make it fairer, and have people pay less, and that is what we have seen. To do it, we have also eliminated some tax deductions for the wealthy. One was the State and local tax deduction that was specifically aimed at the wealthy. We eliminated it. That is what our goal was—to eliminate those sorts of deductions so that people all across the country would be the true benefactors of tax reform.

Let’s be clear about who will be benefitting by the Congressional Review Act that is being proposed to be voted on today. There will be 94 percent of the benefits going to those with incomes over $200,000. Those are not the people who need tax relief in this country.

We made choices when passing tax reform. We wanted to provide tax relief for the middle class, and we wanted to double the child tax credit. It worked. We wanted to lower the tax rates as well. The results are that a great majority of American households are actually paying less in taxes today than they were before.

We have also had this great boost to the economy. We have more people working and one of the lowest unemployment rates we have seen. We have seen wages and incomes grow. We have seen the unemployment rate drop to a 50-year low. We have seen economic growth beat all previous predictions. That is what we have gotten with the tax reform—the tax relief—that the Republicans have passed and that President Trump has signed into law. The Republicans are going to continue to focus on keeping taxes low for all Americans.

The best description I have heard of this proposal is that it seems to be an effort to give tax breaks to rich people in blue States.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I guess if you live long enough and are around here long enough, you get to hear it all.

Hypocrisy is when the party of the rich—now the party that gave $1 trillion in the Trump tax bill to the largest corporations, with most of it going to the wealthiest one-tenth of 1 percent—now says it is for the working guy. Amazing. Hypocrisy is when donor States, like my State of New Jersey, that gave moocher States—those that actually receive far more than they give to the Federal Treasury—say that somehow we should continue to pay more. Yet that is overwhelmingly the reality that is evident. In fact, I find the comments of some of my colleagues here to be pretty ironic.

I urge the Senate to reject these new IRS rules that are designed to block efforts by homeowners across America to avoid the Trump tax law’s harmful caps on their State and local tax deductions.

I thank Leader SCHUMER and Ranking Member WYDEN for the opportunity to exercise our authority under the Congressional Review Act to stop these IRS rules from taking effect.

It was 2 years ago when President Trump and his allies rammed their corporate tax bill through Congress. They promised middle-class families throughout the country and $4,000 of relief in their salaries. Instead, all they got was $1.5 trillion more in debt and an economy that was even more rigged in favor of big corporations and wealthy CEOs.

Of course, as bad as the tax bill is for the whole country, it is even worse for States like New Jersey. That is because, even after borrowing over $1.5 trillion from China, the President still can’t pay for his deficit-exploiting corporate tax cuts. Where are all of my colleagues—all of those deficit hawks—who talked about exploding deficits and debt? They are silent.

Even though he couldn’t have enough of this $1.5 trillion of borrowing, what did President Trump do? He divided into the wallets of New Jersey’s and other States’ middle classes by gutting the State and local tax deductions they used to write off. Their property taxes. In 2016, $1.8 million, or around 40 percent of New Jersey’s taxpayers, deducted property and State income taxes from their Federal returns. That average was about $18,000 per deduction. More than 90 percent of those who deducted earned less than $200,000. So to say that the Trump tax law was a giant middle-class tax cut is no exaggeration, for already New Jersey families are paying the price.

Earlier this month, new data from ProPublica reveals that because of the new $10,000 cap on property tax deductions, home values in New Jersey have taken a huge hit. In fact, home values in Essex County, NJ, declined more than those of any other county in America.

And according to nj.com, of over 30 counties across the Nation suffering the largest dip in home values, 16 of them are in the Garden State. That is why Governor Murphy and New Jersey’s legislative leaders took action to protect homeowners from getting hammered. They adopted a program, as did over 30 other States. And, by the way, these States, or all these red States, are not the “blue States” or wealthy States. These other States that adopted similar provisions before the Trump tax bill that were getting the benefit of a local tax credit for charitable contributions to nonprofits set up by local governments. They adopted a program that New Jersey and other States have in the books in some form.

In return, taxpayers could receive a property credit worth up to 90 percent of their contribution. Other States have long used similar charitable contribution programs. For example, in Alabama, there is a 100-percent tax credit available for contributions to private school scholarship funds. In Missouri, one program incentivizes donations to shelters for survivors of domestic abuse. Congress could pass programs that actually go to an education fund and to a conservation fund. I could go through the list of these 32 States that had charity tax-credit programs across the country, which now the IRS rules are nullifying, and which all of those States—and many of my Republican colleagues who represent them—are now facing. What was completely acceptable and the IRS had no problem with now is not acceptable whatever.

The IRS long respected these programs. So I was hopeful that New Jersey’s charitable contribution credits would provide relief to homeowners suffering under the Trump tax scam and would be treated the same as all of those 32 other States.

Unfortunately, as soon as New Jersey and other States took action, the IRS reversed course and issued new regulations, hamstringing this long-accepted type of charitable contribution program.

These are harmful regulations for all of the 32 States that are represented through some of these programs, and the Senate has an opportunity to protect all of those 32 States’ charitable contribution programs.

Look, in an ideal world, New Jersey’s charitable contribution credit wouldn’t be necessary because Congress would uphold the full state and local tax deduction as a bedrock principle of our Tax Code. As a matter of fact, the state and local tax deduction is the oldest deduction in the history of the code, and it is a principle that I would especially expect my Republican colleagues to stand up for.

Because the Federal income tax creation in 1913, the State and local tax deduction has encouraged States to stand on their own feet. It encourages States to make smart investments that, at the end of the day, make them less reliant on Federal handouts.

In New Jersey, we know that when we invest in public schools, we prepare our students to succeed in high-paying fields. In New Jersey, we know that...
when we invest in mass transit, we connect workers to new jobs and opportunities. In New Jersey, we know that when we invest in public health and law enforcement, we all do better because our streets are safer and our families are healthier.

It is no coincidence that New Jersey is one of the most economically productive States in the Nation, to the betterment of all Americans, especially those in less productive States—donor State versus moocher States.

Isn't that a good thing? Isn't a State's right to set its own tax policies a right worth defending?

For as long I can remember, I have heard my Republican colleagues talk about self-reliance, about personal responsibility, about protecting not punishing success, and about States' rights. Well, the Trump tax law was nothing short of a massive tax on the success of States like New Jersey and the State rights of States like New Jersey.

Likewise, I have heard Republicans talk about States' rights and the virtues of federalism. Well, guess what. The State and local tax deduction is a bedrock of federalism.

Today's CRA vote is an opportunity for my colleagues across the aisle to actually stand up for those principles of self-reliance, of States' rights, and federalism; to walk the walk, instead of just talking the talk, and to preserve the programs of these 32 States with charity tax credit programs that are now all threatened of being extinguished by the IRS's determination.

I want to close by sharing a constituent letter I received earlier this year about what the property tax deduction meant to one New Jersey family.

This past April, Leigh, from Budd Lake, wrote:

My husband and I just did our taxes today. At first time ever—we own money. And not just a little, hundreds.

We own a home and for the first time we were not able to itemize our deductions; our deductions cut in half.

There is no incentive to us owning our home anymore. We are an average middle class family paying a mortgage and trying to raise three kids. I'm tired of our family being collateral damage in yet another political fight.

Leigh is absolutely right. New Jersey families shouldn't have to foot the bill for massive handouts for big corporations.

To add insult to injury, while the new IRS rules crack down on New Jersey's efforts to save families like Leigh's money, last fall the Treasury Department made clear that corporations the programs of these 32 States—could continue to benefit from the same exact kind of workaround. Corporations can continue to benefit from the same kind of workaround.

How is that for protecting the little guy? How is that for hypocrisy?

It is not fair. It is not right. Our constituents deserve better. So we will continue to push for a long-term solution to this problem. I have introduced the Stop Attacking Local Taxpayers Act, or SALT Act, to restore the full deductibility of State and local taxes.

Under my bill, the more you pay in property and State taxes, the more relief you would receive, opposite of what the Trump tax bill says, which is that the higher the cost of living is in your State and the more you pay in State and local taxes, the more you owe the Federal Government come tax time. It is double taxation. It makes no sense.

The SALT Act deserves the full consideration of the Senate, but in the meantime, we should use the opportunity before us today to help hardworking homeowners suffering from the Trump tax law. We should help these 32 States—overwhelmingly, most of them, Republican—that have a tax credit program be able to sustain that program for the benefits of the decisions they made in their States and for the success these States made in their States and for the success they would prefer to deprive the administration of a victory, even if it comes at the expense of the American people. That should not stand.

Earlier this month, I wrote a column with Congressman KEVIN BRADY, the ranking Republican on the House Ways and Means Committee. We wrote that time would tell if Democrats cared more about undermining President Trump than helping the American economy and job creation as a result of the USMCA. It is looking more like the former than the latter.

The USMCA is not brought up for a vote in the House very soon, Democrats will have a price to pay next year when the American people have a chance to weigh in. There is little Americans dislike more in politics than zero-sum, oppose-the-other-party politics, no matter the cost.

The USMCA would create hundreds of thousands of jobs, protect American industries, and provide confidence to U.S. businesses and innovators to invest right here in America.

That is what Democrats seem willing to sacrifice by inaction on the USMCA. But Democrats are making the wrong political calculus. This underestimates the intelligence of the American voter and their ability to sniff out a phony.

President Trump has done his job. He has renegotiated a trade deal that nearly everyone besides a few congressmen dislikes more than its predecessor we know as NAFTA.

It is now up to the House of Representatives to do their job and bring this deal to a vote. If they don't act soon, the American people will hold them accountable a year from now.

S.J. RES. 50

Now to the issue before the U.S. Senate—the State and local tax deduction. This week, Democrats are using the Congressional Review Act to force a vote on a resolution that would effectively repeal an IRS regulation aimed at preventing millionaires and billionaires from exploiting a tax loophole.
This loophole would allow top income earners to save billions of dollars in Federal taxes annually.

New York City hedge fund and private equity managers would most assuredly be some of the biggest beneficiaries. While the same time, the taxpayers with incomes under $50,000 would see virtually no benefit.

In this case one might think my Democratic colleagues would be cheering on Treasury Department and the Internal Revenue Service for taking decisive actions and shutting down this loophole for the wealthy. But this doesn’t seem to be the case. Democrats—and only Democrats—including the Democratic minority leader, are arguing in favor of allowing wealthy taxpayers to exploit this loophole. Moreover, predominantly Democratic States have been promoting and bemoaning the loss of this loophole.

The loophole I am talking about is a concerted effort by predominantly only Democrat States to help their wealthiest residents get around the $10,000 cap on the deduction of State and local taxes, which has come to be known by the acronym SALT.

These efforts to get around the cap have been called blue State SALT workarounds. These workarounds are essentially State-sanctioned tax shelters where wealthy residents make payments to a State or local government-controlled fund in exchange for tax credits they can use to wipe out most or all of their State taxes.

These States then want the Federal Government to ignore this sleight of hand and recognize these payments as fully deductible charitable contributions when they are nothing more than State tax payments. Well, that is really too cute by half. It is cheating, and these States are encouraging it, forcing the rest of the country to subsidize these taxpayers with incomes between $200,000 and $1 million. When combined with those earning over $1 million, you can see that fully 94 percent of the tax benefit would go to high-income Americans. Repeal would be extremely costly, and for that same cost, we could advance much more worthy efforts to help working and middle-class families all over the country.

To illustrate this point, I have here a chart based on a nonpartisan Joint Committee on Taxation distribution analysis. They have made very clear through their chart showing who would benefit from repealing the cap on deductions for State and local taxes.

While eliminating these Treasury regulations wouldn’t repeal the SALT cap entirely, it would effectively make the cap toothless, as more and more States would create workarounds. And let’s not forget—the repeal of the cap is their ultimate goal.

As we can see here on the chart, the majority of the benefits from repealing the SALT cap would flow to taxpayers with incomes exceeding $1 million. Let’s think about that just for a minute. Less than half of 1 percent of all tax returns report income exceeding $1 million. Yet, according to the Joint Committee on Taxation, these taxpayers would receive 52 percent of the tax benefit if this resolution of disapproval went through. Another 42 percent of the tax benefit would go to taxpayers with incomes between $200,000 and $1 million. When combined with those earning over $1 million, you can see that fully 94 percent of the tax benefit would go to taxpayers with incomes over $200,000. To put this into perspective, only 7 percent of tax returns report income exceeding this level.

Now compare this to taxpayers with incomes under $200,000, which is about 93 percent of all taxpayers. According to the Joint Committee on Taxation, this group would receive a measly 6 percent of the benefit from repealing the cap, as opposed to the 52 percent Democrats are proposing. Only a handful of taxpayers with incomes under $200,000—or about 3 percent—would actually see any benefit. Ninety-seven percent of these taxpayers wouldn’t see even one penny of benefit from taking away the SALT cap.

So, very simply, there you have it. The same Democrats who have criticized the 2017 tax bill for allegedly benefiting only the wealthy—can you believe it?—are now actively pushing an agenda that would overwhelmingly benefit the wealthy. This goes to show how off-base Democratic criticism of tax reform really is, as we have heard it over the last 2 years.

Far from being a giveaway to the wealthy, the tax reform passed in 2017 was a concerted effort to provide tax relief for everybody. Republicans accomplished this tax cut for everybody primarily by lowering tax rates across the board, but we also did it by repealing or limiting certain regressive tax benefits, such as the deduction for State and local taxes. We likely couldn’t have made those changes if we hadn’t limited the deduction for State taxes that mostly benefited the wealthy.

Democrats who wrongly associate this SALT cap with a tax increase on middle-income folks simply aren’t looking at the facts or at tax reform as a whole. Two years ago, Republicans created a tax cut for an overwhelming majority of Americans. This is true even for taxpayers affected by the deduction for State taxes.

Before an income tax reform, many upper-middle-income taxpayers—particularly those in the high-tax blue States—had to pay the alternative minimum tax. We refer to that as the AMT. For anyone who used to pay the AMT, after you struggled through the at-the- margins complexity of the AMT rules, you realized an unfortunate fact: The AMT clawed back the deduction for your State tax payments. Therefore, many of these taxpayers saw little or no benefit from this deduction before tax reform.

Democrats don’t like to admit this inconvenient truth, but it is true. They don’t seem to let facts interfere with their political rhetoric. So, yes, these same taxpayers are likely now affected by the SALT cap, but because Republicans largely did away with the AMT—at the same time, lowering everybody’s tax rates—they still received a tax cut. Let’s not forget the taxpayers no longer have to deal with the mind-numbing complexity of the AMT. Now a question: Do Democrats really want middle-income families to have to go back to the nonsense of figuring out the alternative minimum tax every year?

I have heard Democrats try to justify their efforts to undermine the SALT...
cap by claiming it was part of some nefarious plot against blue States. That is simply not true. Yes, more taxpayers in blue States are affected by the cap given the high State taxes those States impose on their residents, but the fact is, on average, every income group in every State is affected by the 2017 tax cut and the 2017 tax cut bill. This isn’t just coming from this Senator, CHUCK GRASSLEY, the 2017 tax cut bill. This isn’t just coming from one Senator, CHUCK GRASSLEY, 2017 tax cut bill. This isn’t just coming from one Senator, CHUCK GRASSLEY, is, on average, every income group in this taxable income class is overblown,” said Kim Rueben, the director of the State and Local Finance Initiative at the Tax Policy Center. “If there’s going to be any effect of the SALT cap on the ability of some States to have progressive taxes it’s too early to know that yet.”

**TAXABLE INCOME**

In some ways, the $10,000 limit on state and local tax deductions—SALT—is saving states money by lowering costs;That’s because investors seeking to reduce their tax bill are plowing a record-setting amount of cash into municipal bonds, driving interest rates lower. The extra yield that investors demand to compensate for the risk of holding Illinois general-obligation bonds, for instance, has fallen to the lowest since May 2015, according to data compiled by Bloomberg.

States are also benefiting from a broader tax base because the law eliminated some exemptions and limited deductions, like mortgage interest. Since states that levy income taxes use federal adjusted gross income or taxable income as the base, they have more income to tax. Still, the nervous of Democratic governors and their budget officers frayed in December when income tax collections plunged by more than $7 billion from the previous year. Cuomo was quick to call the tax law “politically diabolical” and an act of “economic civil war” against the middle class.

Then April came. New York collected $3.4 billion more in personal income tax revenue last month than a year earlier, a 57% increase, according to data compiled by Miller Samuel Inc. California took in $19.2 billion in April, exceeding Governor Gavin Newsom’s estimate by $4 billion. New Jersey had a record April with tax collections up 57%, allowing it to boost forecasts for the year by $377 million and triggering a political battle over how to spend the windfall. Illinois individual and corporate tax revenue was $1.5 billion more than projected, allowing Governor J.B. Pritzker to scrap a plan to put off pension payments.

**TIMING CHANGE**

April personal income tax collections in 28 states and Washington increased by $15.3 billion, or 36.2% year-over-year to $61.4 billion, Bank of America Corp. said. “SALT cap in particular is a system risk to state credit quality at this point,” said Bill Sichel, global head of public finance at Bank of America. Moody’s, which manages $9 billion of municipal bonds, said the $10,000 cap on state and local tax deductions “is a vote to provide a massive tax cut for the wealthy.”

Moody’s Investors Service said this in April.

*Mr. Grassley. As this article highlights, revenue for blue States this tax season were up, not down.*

The ratings agency Moody’s released a report in April saying there were no discernible signs that individuals were fleeing high-tax States as a result of the SALT cap. However, even if taxpayer migration were to occur as a result of the cap, the answer to the problem isn’t repealing the cap; it is for States to look in their own backyard at their own tax-and-spend policy. The truth is, these State politicians aren’t concerned about their own taxpayers. What they are really worried about is their continued ability to gouge those taxpayers with ever-increasing State and local taxes, which used to be subsidized by taxpayers from other States through the Federal Tax Code because there was no SALT cap.

In closing, I want to turn back to this very chart, the same one I discussed earlier. For Democrats still on the fence as to whether to vote to repeal the IRS regulations on the SALT work-arounds, you ought to study this chart very closely.

I ask a question to the other side: Could you, with a straight face, argue that a vote to protect these work-arounds is not a vote to provide a massive tax cut for the wealthy? This chart shows it is helping the wealthy.

For Democrats who intend to vote for this tax scam anyway, I don’t want to hear any more long-winded speeches about how the tax bill of 2017 benefited the wealthy. That’s not the tax bill of 2017, Mr. President. It’s the tax cut last year, 2018.

The ratings agency Moody’s released a report in April saying there were no discernible signs that individuals were fleeing high-tax States as a result of the SALT cap. However, even if taxpayer migration were to occur as a result of the cap, the answer to the problem isn’t repealing the cap; it is for States to look in their own backyard at their own tax-and-spend policy. The truth is, these State politicians aren’t concerned about their own taxpayers. What they are really worried about is their continued ability to gouge those taxpayers with ever-increasing State and local taxes, which used to be subsidized by taxpayers from other States through the Federal Tax Code because there was no SALT cap.

In closing, I want to turn back to this very chart, the same one I discussed earlier. For Democrats still on the fence as to whether to vote to repeal the IRS regulations on the SALT work-arounds, you ought to study this chart very closely.

I ask a question to the other side: Could you, with a straight face, argue that a vote to protect these work-arounds is not a vote to provide a massive tax cut for the wealthy? This chart shows it is helping the wealthy.

For Democrats who intend to vote for this tax scam anyway, I don’t want to hear any more long-winded speeches about how the tax bill of 2017 benefited the wealthy. That’s not the tax bill of 2017, Mr. President. It’s the tax cut last year, 2018.
State work-arounds through the SALT cap are nothing more than State-sanctioned tax shelters. By voting to undermine that cap, Democrats are voting to enrich the wealthy taxpayers whom they persistently have vilified as not paying enough. Moreover, they allow tax relief provided to the middle class in jeopardy. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I want to make sure the Senate and the country understand what this debate is all about.

Senate Republicans have been writing letters to the Department of Treasury, saying that the Treasury's SALT regulations are flawed. In effect, businesses using workarounds to fund private school voucher programs would be exempt from the regulation. Middle-class school voucher programs would be allowed to continue as before, without a full deduction for charitable contributions to State tax credit programs. The regulations produced by the Treasury Department are overly broad, and hurt the majority of States by effectively eliminating the benefit of those State charitable tax credit programs. These include credits that support priorities like conservation, child care, charitable giving, and access to higher education.

This is particularly striking, given that the SALT cap was already estimated to slash overall charitable giving by as much as $20 billion a year.

Now on top of that, the regulations that I oppose and feel so strongly about coming from the Treasury Department that they would cut charitable giving to State tax credit programs in 33 States. My Republican colleagues' constituents will be hurt by these regulations, just like my constituents at home. We are talking about childcare centers in my State charities, or they can join the private school voucher programs. These unintended consequences of losing their charitable tax credits and supporting this resolution offered by the leader, Senator SCHUMER, and a host of other colleagues in voting to get rid of the Treasury Department's rule and stand with us on the CRA.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

UNITED STATES-MEXICO-CANADA AGREEMENT

Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, I come to the floor frustrated—frustrated by the fact that it has been 327 days since President Trump signed the USMCA, and the House has done nothing to take it up for a vote.

It is not because the House hadn't had time. They have found time to do a lot of things, like continue on their partisan expedition toward impeaching the President. They passed a bill with nothing to it. They spent a lot of “energy” on the Green New Deal, and one Member of the House took the time to show the world she was frightened by her garbage disposal.

The question is, What is preventing Congress from getting the USMCA done?

From Humboldt County all the way to Hamburg, IA, at my townhall meetings or during a visit to a small business or manufacturing plants and even just in between, I have been hearing one thing consistently and across the board: Iowans want the USMCA now.

These hard-working folks know the impact the USMCA will have on Iowa's economy and the U.S. economy as a whole. There is no reason Iowans should be waiting in limbo for this agreement to be ratified.

This trade agreement is a win for the American people, plain and simple. By passing USMCA, we can spend a lot of money on our troops, spend a lot of time on our troops, spend a lot of money on our troops, and join me, Senator SCHUMER, and a host of other colleagues in voting to get rid of the Treasury Department's rule and stand with us on the CRA.

By passing USMCA, we can spend a lot of money on our troops, spend a lot of money on our troops, and join me, Senator SCHUMER, and a host of other colleagues in voting to get rid of the Treasury Department's rule and stand with us on the CRA.
President Trump understands the need to modernize trade with two of our closest allies, and that is why he negotiated a great trade deal with Mexico and Canada—the USMCA. Passing the USMCA will allow us to compete in today’s 21st century economy and will provide folks back home in Iowa with some certainty—certainty in a time where prices have been low and markets have been eroded from other trade wars.

Iowans want and need USMCA. Canada and Mexico are our States’ top two trading partners. In 2018 alone, we exported $6.6 billion worth of products to our neighbors to the north and to the south. Trade with Canada and Mexico directly increases the value of Iowa exports like beef, adding $70 in value to each head that comes from the State.

In case you didn’t know it, Mexico is the No. 1 consumer of Iowa corn. I was up in Northwestern Iowa a couple of weeks ago visiting with one Iowa corn farmer, and I told him that if we were able to get the USMCA deal done, it would have a direct impact—positive—on his farm.

It is not just our farmers who will benefit from the USMCA; it is also our businesses and our manufacturers. I was with some business leaders at a roundtable in Des Moines, and time and again they told me how important it is that we get this trade deal done and in place.

All of this leaves me scratching my head. Why is the USMCA going to do what Americans are demanding. When will they stop obstructing the good work done by our President to get a deal in place?

House Democrats need to do their job so Iowa farmers, manufacturers, and business owners can do theirs. Now is the time to pass the USMCA. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. President, I come to the floor to speak in support of the USMCA, and I appreciate all of my other colleagues who are speaking out as well.

Almost a year has passed since President Trump signed the U.S.-Mexico-Canada Agreement and notified Congress of the administration’s intention to enter into the deal. Legislation to implement the agreement must originate and be approved first in the U.S. House, and then the U.S. Senate, where it will pass with a strong bipartisan vote, including mine.

This modernization of NAFTA matters for Arizona businesses, hard-working citizens, and families. Mexico has already ratified USMCA, and Canada is in the process of doing so. Congress needs to pass USMCA without any further delay.

Simply put, USMCA is a win for Arizona. Trade with Mexico and Canada is key to Arizona jobs and opportunities. Almost 50 percent of all Arizona exports go to Mexico and Canada, and more than 228,000 Arizona jobs rely on this trade. In 2018, Arizona and Mexico engaged in $16.6 billion worth of cross-border commerce.

Exports to Canada and Mexico support Arizona jobs across a broad variety of industries. In 2018, Arizona companies exported $2.3 billion worth of computers and electrical products, $1.4 billion in appliances, $928 million in transportation equipment, and $796 million in machinery to Canada and Mexico. Arizona miners exported $1 billion in minerals and ores, and Arizona farmers exported $1.3 billion in agricultural goods. One out of five Arizona manufacturers export to Canada and Mexico, and most of those are small and medium-sized businesses. It is not too hard to see how much Arizona manufacturers, such as Caterpillar, benefit Arizona's emerging automotive sector by requiring at least 75 percent of auto parts in order for it to be sold duty-free. Arizona's farmers and ranchers have new opportunities to export dairy, eggs, wheat, chicken, and turkey products to Canada.

Earlier this month, Speaker PELOSI said about USMCA that her Democratic caucus was on a path to yes.” Well, with less than two dozen legislative days remaining in 2019, I sure hope that is true, and I would encourage them to get to yes now.

The USMCA is good for our country, and too much time has passed without any House action. During these divided times, this is a proposal that should bring both sides of the aisle together.

The USMCA is good for America, and it is good for Arizona.

USMCA is a clear win for our constituents in Arizona. Arizonaans in every corner of our great State need to contact their Representative in the House and tell them to encourage Speaker PELOSI to bring this bill to the floor immediately. Let’s pass USMCA now.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDENT. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, as our colleagues can hear, we are on the floor talking about the USMCA and the need to get this agreement passed. It is really frustrating. I feel as if we have come to the floor, time and again, to encourage our friends in the House, and I guess we are all but begging them to take a pause from their political agenda and take one vote—just one vote that is going to make a tremendous amount of difference in the lives of businesses, of our auto manufacturers, our farmers, our chemical producers, and workers.

Our friends across the aisle like to say they are all for the workers. Well, if you are all for the workers, let me tell you something, there are 12 million—get that—12 million workers who are directly impacted by the benefits that would come from the USMCA, and this is across every single industrial sector.

As I have been about Tennessee, what I have heard from so many is a simple question: When are you going to pass this? How long is it going to take? We heard from so many talented young Americans, what are they doing? They are thinking locally or regionally. Some of these talented young Americans, what are they doing? They are thinking globally. They are planning ahead for decades of productivity. This is going to ease regulations for our dairy and beef and pork farmers who are in Tennessee.
Indeed, I was out in the past couple of weeks and talked with a farmer who is a cattle farmer. He came to one of our meetings, and I got around to questions and answers. The very first question was, When is this going to be done? When is it going to be done? Why is it taking so long? What happened? There was an agreement between Mexico, Canada, and the United States months ago. Why can’t this get a vote?

These are real problems for real people who are working real jobs and are very serious. It is very important. These are working diligently. The intellectual property provisions that are in this bill are so significant for our singers, our songwriters, and our musicians who call Nashville home, and they want to see this take place.

I have to tell you, I know that all of these issues I have discussed might not matter to those who are always interested in the 24-hour news cycle and winning the shiny object debate of the day, but I assure you this: This matters to Tennesseans because Tennesseans exported $13.7 billion worth of transportation equipment, electronics, machinery, chemicals, fabricated metal, appliances, paper, plastics, rubber, and other goods to Canada in 2017—a $13.7 billion export community to our neighbors to the north and south.

Tennessee businesses and workers have waited long enough, and they want to make sure the vote be completed and the USMCA become a reality.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Romney). The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I appreciate the comments from my colleague from Tennessee about the importance of this agreement in her State, and I can tell you it is also important to a State a little further north called Ohio. Our No. 1 trading partner, by far, is Canada and No. 2 is Mexico, and we want this agreement.

I hear about it all the time I am out talking to our farmers. They are concerned about the weather. They are concerned about what is going on with the China market. They are concerned about low prices. They see this as an opportunity. They see this as kind of the light at the end of the tunnel.

If we can get the USMCA done, that expands opportunities for us and, therefore, increases our prices and gives us a chance. It is the same situation with a lot of manufacturers. It is amazing how many of them depend on Mexico and Canada to be able to sell their products. This is a big deal in Ohio and a big deal for our country. So I am here today to try to urge the House of Representatives to go ahead and move on this and then to urge the Senate to take it up right away. The Trump administration negotiated a good agreement. It deserves a vote.

I am a former trade lawyer—a recovering one—and I am also a former member of the Ways and Means Committee and a former U.S. Trade Representative, and now I am on the Finance Committee, where we deal with trade. The bottom line is that, in all of those years working with trade, it is a complicated area. It is a politically difficult area. But the bottom line is that Mexico and Canada are our biggest trading partner, by far, and the two countries together are responsible for 25 percent of our exports going to Canada alone. That is twice the national average, by the way. So we are particularly focused on Canada and Mexico, which represent $28 billion in trade total.

What I am hearing from farmers, manufacturers, and service providers is that this is really important for us. So we have to be sure that, because this relationship is so important, it is built on solid foundations. U.S. companies are effectively voting yes for the status quo. I don’t think that will happen. I think it will pass if we can get it to the floor for a vote.

Taken together, our neighbors, Canada and Mexico, make up the most important foreign market, U.S. products, and not just for Ohio. In fact, according to the recent data we have, one-third of all American exports in 2019 have already gone to Mexico or Canada, well ahead of any other foreign markets. So trade with Mexico and Canada is now responsible for 12 million jobs nationally. Every single State represented here has jobs related to this.

In Ohio, again, our No. 1 and No. 2 trading partners are Canada and Mexico, with 39 percent of our exports going to Canada alone. That is twice the national average, by the way. So we are particularly focused on Canada and Mexico, which represent $28 billion in trade total.

What I am hearing from farmers, manufacturers, and service providers is that this is really important for us. So we have to be sure that, because this relationship is so important, it is built on solid foundations. U.S. companies are effectively voting yes for the status quo. I don’t think that will happen. I think it will pass if we can get it to the floor for a vote.

NAFTA doesn’t have things in it that would expect in a 21st century agreement.

Start with the digital economy. So much of our economy now operates over the internet. Yet there is nothing in the current agreement, NAFTA, that supports this trade like our modern agreements do.

Another aspect is labor and environmental standards, which are weak and not enforceable in the NAFTA agreement but are in the USMCA. That is a big change in and of itself.

This is not just a name change. This is a fundamental change in the way in which we relate to our neighbors to the south and north.

This handy-dandy chart I put together shows us some of the differences between the two agreements. The first one is to do with the digital economy. The independent International Trade Commission has done a study on this. They are required by law to do it. They say that the new USMCA is going to create 176,000 new jobs. That is the green check under USMCA. That is a big difference right there. If we want to create more jobs, by the way, here are 176,000 new jobs, and 20,000 of those jobs are in the auto industry. That is very important to our country and particularly important to States like mine. How many businesses and around the country rely on internet sales that we talked about earlier. Internet sales and rules for the internet are unchanged in NAFTA. Frankly, there is no chapter in NAFTA that deals with commerce on the internet. It is unbelievable. It turns out that the USMCA does, and that is important because small businesses that rely on access to Canada and Mexico through internet sales are going to have an easier time to compete.

Second, businesses in Ohio and around the country rely on internet sales that we talked about earlier. Internet sales and rules for the internet are changed in the USMCA. Frankly, there is no chapter in NAFTA that deals with commerce on the internet. It is unbelievable. It turns out that the USMCA does, and that is important because small businesses that rely on access to Canada and Mexico through internet sales are going to have an easier time to compete.

Third, businesses in Ohio and around the country rely on internet sales that we talked about earlier. Internet sales and rules for the internet are changed in the USMCA. Frankly, there is no chapter in NAFTA that deals with commerce on the internet. It is unbelievable. It turns out that the USMCA does, and that is important because small businesses that rely on access to Canada and Mexico through internet sales are going to have an easier time to compete.

Fourth, businesses in Ohio and around the country rely on internet sales that we talked about earlier. Internet sales and rules for the internet are changed in the USMCA. Frankly, there is no chapter in NAFTA that deals with commerce on the internet. It is unbelievable. It turns out that the USMCA does, and that is important because small businesses that rely on access to Canada and Mexico through internet sales are going to have an easier time to compete.

Fifth, businesses in Ohio and around the country rely on internet sales that we talked about earlier. Internet sales and rules for the internet are changed in the USMCA. Frankly, there is no chapter in NAFTA that deals with commerce on the internet. It is unbelievable. It turns out that the USMCA does, and that is important because small businesses that rely on access to Canada and Mexico through internet sales are going to have an easier time to compete.
good for the economy. The International Trade Commission, or the ITC, also says that this agreement will increase the GDP of our country, which is the economic growth of our country, and, significantly, in fact, more than the Trans-Pacific Partnership did. Remember that the TPP is small because that a lot of Democrats have spoken very favorably of because of its impact on the economy. The USMCA actually increases our economy more than the Trans-Pacific Partnership would have.

Another issue that is unusual but is in this agreement and is helpful to our manufacturing in Ohio and around the country is that 70 percent of the steel used in manufacturing vehicles has to be made in the United States, Canada, or Mexico. So this is a new standard that does not exist in NAFTA at all. This means more steel jobs in America and more heavy manufacturing jobs in this country. So we have a check on USMCA, yes, with 70 percent of the steel that we use in our manufacturing in Ohio and around the country have supported this agreement.

It is important that we have a chance to send our dairy products—wheat, soybeans, and corn—and our proteins; beef, poultry, and pork. This is really going to help our farmers. That is why 1,000 farm groups around the country have supported this agreement.

Again, with what is going on with China, with the smaller markets, with the difficult weather we have had, and the fact of low prices for commodity crops—all are real problems—this is a godsend. It is really needed for our farmers.

A lot of Democrats are telling me: Ron, this is just like the NAFTA agreement in so many respects.

It is really not. It is a different agreement. The truth of the matter is that the agreement that we are going to see in the 21st century with regard to our important trade relationship with our two neighbors to the north and south. It is about improved market access for manufacturing and a level playing field. This is about being sure that we have the ability in the modern digital economy to get a fair shake. Put these two agreements side-by-side, and this is a much-needed upgrade. It has to get a vote, and, if it does, I think it will pass.

With all the improvements we talked about today, this is not just an exercise in rebranding NAFTA. This is about a new agreement that is really a big difference, and it is a binary choice. Are you for this new agreement, which is better in every respect, or are you for the status quo, which is NAFTA?

My hope is that the House will take this to the Senate, and if they do, I think it will pass. It will then come to the Senate, and I am confident that in the Senate we will have the support to pass this on a bipartisan basis.

What I am most confident in is the fact that American workers, farmers, and service providers are going to have the chance to improve their economic opportunities because this agreement is going to be good for all of them.

The USMCA has been going on right now, and I get that. But, folks, this is not even an election year. Let's finish it up this year before we get into the 2020 election year. Let's be sure that before Thanksgiving, we have the agreement passed in the House and sent to the Senate to take a look at it. It is too important. We need to keep the American people first and put politics second and get this done.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, we have been talking about the USMCA and the Senator from Ohio crammed into just a few moments quite a bit of facts. We are late in time, so I am going to try to abbreviate.

The Senator from Ohio taught me something a few years ago that is an undisputed fact: We sell twice as many goods to countries where we have trade agreements than we do with countries where we don't. This is a big opportunity to expand on an already great success story in terms of our trade with Canada.

What do we see now in trade with Canada and Mexico? We see 12 million American jobs, more than $500 billion worth of exports, and the USMCA would enhance and improve that. It is good for large manufacturing. It is good for small manufacturing. It is good for the creative industry—those people in Nashville and in Hollywood—will benefit also, in terms of our ability to protect our intellectual property. Farmers, ranchers, and agribusiness will all benefit.

We strengthen our position with regard to China. This is not an agreement with China, but we will be in a stronger position to compete with China because of this.

I urge the Speaker of the House of Representatives to bring this to a vote in the other body. There is one person on the face of the Earth who can bring this bill, and that is the Speaker of the House of Representatives. She needs to do it, and if she does, we will see a rare opportunity for bipartisanship in the U.S. Congress. The House, controlled by Democrats, will pass the USMCA because they know it is good for jobs and they know it is good for families and working people. The Senate will pass it on an overwhelmingly bipartisan basis, and that ought to be refreshing.

I want to do something that I seldom do. I am going to quote the Washington Post. I don't get a chance to do that very often. The Washington Post has strongly endorsed USMCA. The editorial board wrote recently: "USMCA would be a real improvement over the status quo," and it went on to urge Democrats, including many who have already said they support the agreement, to bring the USMCA up without delay.

This is an opportunity for us to move our economy forward. This is an opportunity for us to join with Canada and Mexico, which have already indicated their support for this treaty, and an opportunity for bipartisanship, which needs to break out more in this building.

So I join my colleagues. I am glad to rise with them in support of urging the Speaker to bring this bill to the floor, and I urge quick adoption in the House and Senate.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mrs. HYDE-SMITH. Mr. President, the American people elected President Trump based in part on his promise to negotiate better trade deals with foreign nations—first among them, our largest trading partners, Canada and Mexico.

The President and his administration wasted no time in working with these two neighbors to rewrite the North American Free Trade Agreement to reflect today's economic reality. Those talks produced the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement, or USMCA,
which the President unveiled more than 1 year ago.

When NAFTA was written more than a quarter of a century ago, the Internet was in its infancy and few could have foreseen the increasingly globalized and digital economy we have today. USMCA takes us into the 21st century, updating antiquated rules to prohibit the theft of trade secrets, reward American innovators, and improve cross-border e-commerce, while also providing market access for American businesses and benefits for American workers in more traditional sectors like agriculture and manufacturing.

Market access is very important to agriculture and to our Nation’s economy in general. Ninety-five percent of the world’s population lives outside of these United States. Without good trade agreements that give us free access to other markets, we cannot prosper in agriculture or any other business that depends on exports. The USMCA will result in a fairer deal for U.S. businesses and consumers.

Today the American people should ask themselves more than ever what it means for the House and Senate to take up, debate, and pass an agreement that will boost the American economy and job creation.

Manufacturers, farmers, and other businesses in my State of Mississippi certainly want to know why we have not done that. The truth is, House Democrats have delayed taking action because they want first to deny President Trump a win as long as possible and, secondly, to secure last-minute favors for Big Labor.

It is ironic that these same Democrats and big labor groups now oppose USMCA because of environmental protections for our workers. The truth is, they are largely responsible for the original NAFTA, which they now claim incentivized a mass exodus of U.S. companies to Mexico and decimated our manufacturing sector.

Unfortunately, Democrats’ inexcusable foot-dragging is just hurting American consumers and businesses. For years, Mississippi has worked aggressively to increase the market penetration of its manufactured goods and agricultural products in foreign markets. My State exported $11.8 billion in goods in 2018—a 61-percent increase over the past decade. Foreign trade accounts for almost 10 percent of Mississippi GDP, a more than 50,000 workers and large manufacturers, medium and small businesses, and farms played a role in producing these goods for use around the world but primarily to Canada and Mexico, my State’s largest trading partners.

The bottom line is, the USMCA represents an important new tool for Mississippi to expand its ability to sell more of what we produce to consumers abroad. There is no good reason for the House to have held up this 21st-century trade agreement, and it is time to finally take a vote, send it to the Senate, and get it done.

We all are benefitting from the strongest U.S. economy and lowest jobless rate in decades. Congress needs to do its job to help maintain and strengthen this economic growth. USMCA will create more certainty for businesses and increase business confidence, thus making the state of the world’s economy.

Let’s pass the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement and spend more time on accomplishing as much as we can on issues that will actually make a difference in the lives of the American people.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I rise to support the USMCA—the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement—along with my colleagues. You heard a number of them already. You will hear more. It is compelling.

It is time to act. We are ready to go. This legislation has to start in the House under fast track. We need the House to move forward. There is no question that the bipartisan support is there. Bipartisan support is here in the Senate, and bipartisan support is there in the House. The House just builds on the momentum of bringing the legislation to the floor and getting it passed.

The benefits of this agreement are very clear. It will increase exports, expand consumer choice, raise wages, and boost growth for much of North America and especially here in the United States. An analysis by the U.S. National Trade Commission found that USMCA will raise GDP by nearly $63 billion and create 176,000 jobs in the United States. It is clear that we need to move forward.

The agreement will secure and expand market access for our ag products for an ag State like mine. It will grow our manufacturing base for manufacturing States like Ohio, whose good Senator is here to my right. It will provide important modernizations for our technology sector for States like the Presiding Officer’s State. It is certainly a high-tech State.

It will solidify the United States as the global energy leader. We are now, as you know, exporting energy in a bigger way than we ever have before. This just builds on that momentum. These are all significant wins for our States individually and for this country as a whole.

As I said, ag is certainly a big issue for us in North Dakota. The USMCA really makes an important difference and a helpful difference for us in agriculture. For the last 50 years, our country has had a trade surplus. Our farmers and ranchers can export anyone in the world. They produce the highest quality, lowest cost food supply in the world, and we have a positive balance of trade in agriculture. We have made commitments in Canada and Mexico to place to continue that positive balance in our agriculture trade. In my State, for example, we shipped $4.5 billion of agriculture products around the globe in 2017, making us the ninth largest exporter of agriculture goods among the 50 States. Our farmers and ranchers depend on being able to do that. What we are seeing right now are low commodity prices in our country, which is very difficult for our farmers and ranchers. The best way to work out of that is with trade agreements that allow us to sell more globally.

According to the ITC, when fully implemented, USMCA will increase food and agriculture exports to Canada and Mexico by $2.2 billion. This agreement secures existing market access, makes ag trade fair, increases access to the Canadian market, supports innovation in agriculture and more, which is why it is so critical that we pass this legislation as soon as we can.

By maintaining all zero-tariff provisions on ag products, USMCA will secure crucial market access in Canada and Mexico for our farmers and ranchers. Canada and Mexico are critical markets for U.S. ag products. To give you some examples, Mexico is the No. 1 buyer of U.S. corn and DDGS, distillers dried grains with solubles; and Canada is the No. 2 buyer of U.S. ethanol. Additionally, Mexico is the No. 1 buyer of U.S. soybean meal, oil, and whole beans. Canada is the No. 4 buyer of soybean meal and the No. 7 buyer of soybean oil.

Again, you are talking about two very large markets for ag products, for manufacturing products, and for technology—two incredibly important partners. I can go on.

Again, I want to be respectful of my colleagues on the floor. This is one of those cases where it is clear. This is absolutely beneficial to our country. The point is, it is a bipartisan issue. I think, whether you talk to Members of the Senate or to Members of the House, they will tell you this is a bipartisan issue. This is a trade agreement that is good for our country and good for two very strong allies and neighbors. Obviously, Canada and Mexico are two very large trading partners.

We have been on the floor before asking for the House to advance this legislation. If we could start the legislation here, we would. We would pass it right now, and we would pass it with a bipartisan vote, but it requires the House to get started. I hope that all of our colleagues will visit with their counterparts from their respective States in the House and urge that this bill be brought to the floor, passed in the House, and delivered to the Senate so we can pass it for the President to sign and put it into effect for Americans across this great country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, this is a classic example of everything having been said but nobody has said it yet. One of the great traditions of the Senate is to be sure everybody says it. We are going to say it now, and we will
continue to say it until the House finally has that vote.

It has been pointed out that this agreement was signed well over a year ago. It has been pointed out that our two biggest trading partners are Mexico and Canada, who fly those tough planes in the Commerce Committee, chairman of the Commerce, Science, and Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee on Appropriations. From 1987 to 1995, his colleagues chose him to be the Assistant Republican Leader. He led the Senate's Arms Control Observer Group for 15 years, and he served as the President pro tempore of the Senate majority party, from 2003 to 2007—so leadership across all levels.

Alaska. When it came to both of those toughest areas in World War II. Nobody in the world does that part of the economy more efficiently or more effectively. So that is important. It is important to realize that lots of other things are in trade, as well, but agriculture has to be mentioned a lot until we get this done.

Whether I was at the Missouri State Fair in August or the roundtable meetings I was at in our State in October, cost comes up—$88 billion is the agricultural economy in Missouri. We are about the same amount. I think Senator Hoyer said his State is in the top 10 in the country. We export about $4 billion worth of ag products. We also export pickup trucks and airplanes and lots of technology from our State. We export our fair share of beer cans and other things that go all over the world. We are going to continue to make that happen.

Opening markets make a big difference. It also makes a big difference in how you look at the world. If you have strong trading relationships, you are pretty careful with how you deal with all those other relationships. We need to do that. We need to have this vote. The votes are in the House. The votes are in the Senate. It is up to the Speaker to bring this up.

I think the U.S. Trade Representative is working as hard with Democrats in the House as he could possibly be expected to do to maybe look at those last few things that might make this a better deal.

Senator PORTMAN did a great job talking about why the choice here is if you want to continue to have NAFTA—which has been great for all three partners, Canada, Mexico, and us—or do you want to have USMCA, which in area after area has the 20-year update it needs.

We need to get on with this. We need to get on with the activities of the day.

REMEMBERING TED STEVENS

Mr. President, I am going to start off by saying one of the things that were going to do today is accept the official portrait of Ted Stevens, President pro tempore of the Senate—the highest office that the Senate can possibly give to anybody. It is the highest office in the Senate.

He was a chairman one time of the Commerce Committee, chairman of the appropriating committee, and a guy who flew those tough planes in the toughest areas in World War II. He flew as a pilot in the Army Air Corps. He flew missions behind enemy lines in China in support of the Flying Tigers. The stories we have heard over the years are truly legendary of his efforts in the war.

After the military, Ted helped Alaska to achieve its dream of statehood. He was a key point man at the Department of the Interior during the Eisenhower administration. Think about what that means to have the opportunity to shape statehood for your State and then to go on and serve your State at this level as he did for so many years.

He went on to become one of the longest serving Republican Senators of all time. In this Chamber, he represented Alaska with great dignity, with great distinction over the course of 30 exceptional years. He was truly a public servant.

Really, from the very beginning, Ted was one of those special kinds of guys. After being appointed to the Senate in 1968, he established himself as a leader among leaders. Over the course of his time in the Senate, he chaired the Select Committee on Ethics; Rules and Administration; Governmental Affairs; Commerce, Science, and Transportation; and the Appropriations Committee on Appropriations. From 1977 to 1985, his colleagues chose him to be the Assistant Republican Leader. He led the Senate’s Arms Control Observer Group for 15 years, and he served as the President pro tempore of the Senate majority party, from 2003 to 2007—so leadership across all levels.

As one might expect, Ted was a force to be reckoned with. He made sure Alaska’s voice was heard and was heard in every debate. As such, he secured an incredible number of legislative victories that shaped both the State of Alaska and our Nation.

He helped to settle most of Alaska’s Native land claims, returning 44 million acres to the State and establishing a new model that empowered our Native peoples to create new economic opportunities. Ted was instrumental in securing the passage of a bill that enabled the construction of the nation’s longest pipeline, which, to this day, remains the backbone of our State’s economy and is a critical part of our Nation’s energy security supply.

Ted was a guy who worked very, very hard, but who also loved to fish. He loved to be outside. His focusing on fishing led him to be very concerned about what he saw as being the overfishing by foreign fleets, which was taking place just miles off of Alaska’s shores. So he worked across the aisle with Senator Warren Magnuson to protect and sustain our fisheries into the future. The Magnuson-Stevens law has been repeatedly reauthorized and, to this day, still bears his names.

Ted was a guy who really is impossible to overstate the beneficial impact that Ted had on Alaska. Now, keep in mind he came to the Senate in 1968—less than a decade after Alaska had become a State. So he knew as well as anyone how tough those early years of statehood were. He knew probably as well as anyone how difficult life was for so many Alaskans, particularly in the rural parts of our State and, more than anyone else, he helped to change that.

Ted was an appropriator for a long time. He was legendary in that role. He once convinced the entire Committee on Appropriations to go to Alaska for 2 weeks to see Alaska’s needs firsthand. The Federal funding he secured year after year allowed many Alaskans to gain access to very basic infrastructure. We are talking water and sewer—things that most Americans would take for granted. He also worked to help develop Alaska so we would have a telemedicine network that would work.

He worked to secure facilities for the U.S. Forest Service and Essential Air Service for our rural communities—programs and benefits that continue to this day.

He was a public servant. He was the ultimate public servant. He dedicated his life to service. He spent more than six decades fighting for our State and the country he loved. His service began during World War II, when he flew as a pilot in the Army Air Corps. He flew missions behind enemy lines in China in support of the Flying Tigers. The stories we have heard over the years are truly legendary of his efforts in the war.

Ted was a public servant. He was the ultimate public servant. He dedicated his life to service. He spent more than six decades fighting for our State and the country he loved. His service began during World War II, when he flew as a pilot in the Army Air Corps. He flew missions behind enemy lines in China in support of the Flying Tigers. The stories we have heard over the years are truly legendary of his efforts in the war. 

After the military, Ted helped Alaska to achieve its dream of statehood. He was a key point man at the Department of the Interior during the Eisenhower administration. Think about what that means to have the opportunity to shape statehood for your State and then to go on and serve your State at this level as he did for so many years.

He went on to become one of the longest serving Republican Senators of all time. In this Chamber, he represented Alaska with great dignity, with great distinction over the course of 30 exceptional years. He was truly a public servant.

Really, from the very beginning, Ted was one of those special kinds of guys.
There is absolutely no doubt that the people of Alaska are better off because of Ted Stevens. Many around the State still lovingly refer to Ted as “Uncle Ted.” We are happier, and we are clearly healthier. We are a safer and more prosperous State because of his contributions. Yet, the same is true for every American because Ted’s accomplishments did not end with the State of Alaska. He was a patriot. He was firmly committed to our national defense and the security of our country. He had great admiration for those who answered the call to serve in uniform, as he had. He traveled the world to visit with our troops and hear directly from them.

He was a longtime leader on the Appropriations Subcommittee on Department of Defense. He and Dan Inouye would kind of share the chairmanship, one between the other practically. Throughout his Senate tenure, he fought tirelessly to make sure our military had the best equipment, better pay, and the needed care it sought. He was a defender of those who defended us.

Ted was an avid surfer when he was young, and he recognized the importance of sports in our daily lives. I can remember a story that has gone around for so many years; that of having to put his eldest daughter, Sue, on a boy’s softball team because we didn’t have a girls’ league in Alaska at the time. So he championed title IX of the Education Amendments Act, which provides equal opportunity for women to participate in sports. He also authored the Amateur Sports Act, which created the U.S. Olympic Committee, and worked to ensure funding for physical education programs—programs, again, that had that fingerprint of Ted Stevens from so many years prior.

I can go on and on about Ted’s accomplishments. His legislative accomplishments are considerable and far too many to speak to here today, things like his work to ban damaging high seas drift nets to the funding he secured to advance AIDS and breast cancer research. He was involved in so much.

In recognizing that other colleagues wish to speak of Senator Stevens as well, I, instead, will speak very briefly about what I feel made him so effective and really so beloved—because he was beloved, maybe feared a little bit but beloved.

The first thing to understand is that Ted had a pretty simple motto. It was about what I feel made him so effective. Obviously, they were both veterans, and they were both from young, offshore States. Yet, they looked out for one another. They had one another’s back. When they were elected, they would be chairman and vice chairman and would trade off but would work with one another. In later years, it was not uncommon to find them both smoking cigars out on the propping and having evening discussions, talking about what had happened that day or what was going to happen the next day.

Another thing that folks should know about Ted is that he was definitely a fighter. I am told that Newsweek described him as a “scrapper” when he first arrived in the Senate, and it certainly proved to be an apt description throughout his tenure. Yet Ted was, again, pretty clear: If Alaskans were in trouble, he was out there to defend them.

There were times he would put on his Incredible Hulk tie and channel the big guy’s persona. When that happened, everyone knew to look out because Ted was going to the mat for Alaska on that day. Look out. Some suggested that Ted had a bit of a temper. A Senator is chuckling back there. I hear that.

I think Ted knew that a little bit of a temper could actually serve him pretty well, and he would usually have a cute, little gleam in his eye when he would say, “I never lose my temper. I know exactly where I left it.”

Ted was one of those guys who was great to his people, but when something needed to be said—when it needed to be direct and to the point—he was not going to shy away from it. That was another part of what really made him a legend around here. I think Ted loved listening and those who know me know I have an immense, great affection for Ted and that this day and the recognition he is receiving has great personal meaning. I had the extraordinary fortune to know Ted Stevens for almost my entire life. At one point, he was my boss. I was a high school intern. My first opportunity to really be out of Alaska on my own was when I was an intern here for Senator Ted. Later, of course, he was my colleague in the Senate, where he mentored me and partnered with me to help serve Alaska. Above all that, he was a true friend—truly a friend—and I miss him dearly.

I am reminded of him all the time. I have his old office in the Hart Building. I have pictures and mementos that remind me of Ted. Every time I go back home to the State, I think of him. It is not just because, when I land, it reads “Ted Stevens Anchorage International Airport.” It is also when I go out to the community, a bridge or a community that is no longer utilizing a honey bucket system because of the work that Ted did. When you go home, when you visit in Alaska, you see firsthand the impact he had. You see it everywhere. I often say that Ted built Alaska and that Ted was Alaska.

So you can see why we named him the “Alaskan of the 20th Century” and why we remain so grateful for all that he has done for us.

I am happy there is now going to be a place in the Capitol where I can visit Ted, talk to him, and think about what he might have said and about the counsel he might have provided for our State and our Nation. I do hope the portrait will be a reminder to those of us who serve here that we can work together even on the hardest of days and that, if we do, we can achieve great things for the American people, which sometimes might just require us to say: To hell with politics. Just do what is right.

I am honored and privileged to be here with so many Alaskans, including Catherine, Ted’s wife, as well as many of our children and grandchildren. I know they are overwhelmed by the number of friends and colleagues and staff who are here to celebrate Ted’s life and legacy.

In channeling here, I think Ted is looking down on all of this and is thinking: Enough already. This is too much. You all have to get back to work because, after all, we have appropriation bills on the floor.

With that, I yield to the fine Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I will speak for only a few moments, and then the distinguished junior Senator from Alaska will close this part of the debate.

The senior Senator from Alaska mentioned that only 38 of us have actually served with Senator Ted Stevens. Of that group, I am the junior-most in the Senate, and I know that was the junior-most Member of this body more than a decade ago when I rose on this floor to pay tribute to this great Senator from Alaska, Ted Stevens, on his last day in office.

I did not speak from my desk, as you can imagine. I didn’t have a very prominent desk at the time. I chose instead to stand as close as I could directly behind Senator Stevens. I suppose I wanted to have his back, at least from his side of the Chamber, for one last time. And I wanted to make sure I could see his wife Catherine in the gallery, as I may have done just a few moments ago, because she meant so much and still means so much to all of us and to my wife Gayle and to our families.

What we learned from Ted Stevens guides our work today. I was honored to serve alongside him for just a few years. I was anguished when he had to leave us in 2008, and together with all of us, I mourned his death in 2010.

The legacy is earned when the people of our States see fit to return us time and again to Washington to do their business. Respect is earned when we
engage in the long fight to fulfill our oaths and to support and defend the Constitution.

Ted Stevens earned both seniority and respect for 40 years. When he was elected as the third Senator ever from the Land of the Midnight Sun, he had already, by his own account, embarked on a career that was对他 already, as has been mentioned, a brave pilot in World War II for the Flying Tigers and as a key leader in putting that 49th star on the American flag.

The portrait being unveiled in the Old Senate Chamber today, where so many great debates took place, is a fitting homage to Ted Stevens. As the senior Senator has mentioned, the seemingly gruff exterior depicted was a facade over one of the most genuine and patriotic people ever to walk these halls.

He went to work every day to defend Americans and to make good on the promise of the country so deeply loved. He belonged in the place of honor where he will be displayed.

Members who served with Ted Stevens will look on that portrait and remember that.

I hope our more recent colleagues who have joined since Ted Stevens left will come to this chamber and learn from him, as we did.

As chairman of the Commerce Committee, a committee Ted Stevens once led, I went to Alaska with the junior Senator from Alaska this summer to learn, among other things, from coastguarders who are keeping our Nation safe in the Far North. But I saw a lot of that State, and there is a lot to see.

Despite its geographic size, Alaska is in many respects a small town. Like my home State of Mississippi, everyone knows just about everyone else, and virtually every Alaskan knew Ted Stevens. They knew what he did for them. They knew what he did for this country.

I could see his legacy this summer. The essence of his leadership is everywhere in so many ways. He helped turn America’s last frontier into a thriving community for Alaskans and Americans and a place of wonder and adventure for any of us who will visit there.

While he was at it, he performed small acts of kindness that I will never forget and heroic acts of statesmanship almost every day in his chosen homes—this closed Chamber and that wide open State.

I can’t wait to see the portrait. I can’t wait to tell him hello and, once again, to look him right in the eye.

I yield the floor.

SULLIVAN, Mr. President, I want to add my voice in recognizing what an important role he played here.

I want to thank the Senators from Alabama and Mississippi and, of course, my good friend Senator MURKOWSKI. Many other Senators—the Senators from California, Iowa—all came to the floor today to talk about this great American, this great Alaskan.

I try to come to the floor about once a week, and I do a speech that I call the “Alaskan of the Week” to talk about what has been done great stuff for our State, their community, the country.

But as Senator MURKOWSKI just mentioned in her remarks, I am literally able now to talk about the Alaskan of the Century. That is right. The State of Alaska’s legislature voted that Ted Stevens was the Alaskan of the Century for reasons we are all talking about today. So I just want to add a few more words about this legendary U.S. Senator, whose portrait we are unveiling today.

Let me say it is more than fitting that we have a portrait of Senator Stevens in the Halls of Congress. It is a small tribute compared to the magnitude of his contributions to our country and to our State. Yet, in so many ways, it is proper and fitting because his spirit certainly remains in this body. It is an example of leadership and public service that other Senators have heard me talk about and I know Senator MURKOWSKI hears all the time—how so many of my colleagues still talk about Senator Stevens and what he meant, just like my good friend the Senator from Alabama and so many others.

So I will just give a little more color to this great man’s life. He was born in Indiana in 1923. When he was a young boy, the Great Depression hit. Senator Stevens supported his family by selling newspapers on the street until the untimely death of his father, he moved to California to live with an aunt and uncle, where he learned to kind of relax and to surf. The surf board that he learned to surf on stayed with him in his office until the day he died.

As was already mentioned, he was, of course, a part of America’s “greatest generation”—a pilot, 14th Army Air Corps, flying supplies to General Chenault’s Fighting Tigers over “the Hump”—India, China, Burma—very dangerous missions. In 1953, armed with a law degree from Harvard, he made his way to then the Territory of Alaska, where he found, in his words, “the passion of my career, the Alaskan dream.”

So what was this dream of Ted Stevens? A dream of an Alaska with promises of the 21st century “springing up from the Arctic,” he said—an Alaska whose Federal Government works with us, not against us, to achieve our destiny to develop our resources and our economy for the benefit of all Alaskans but also for the benefit of all Americans; an Alaska that lives up to the potential the United States saw when it voted to allow Alaska to become the 49th State.

Senator Stevens worked tirelessly for these dreams, and in the last speech he gave on this floor—before he became incapacitated, he recounted some of his successes.

He said: “Where there was nothing but tundra and forest, today there are now airports, roads, ports, water and sewer systems, hospitals, clinics, communications networks, research labs, and much, much more.”

He went on to say: “Alaska was not Seward’s folly and is no longer an impoverished territory. Alaska is a great State and an essential contributor to our Nation’s energy security and national defense.”

In that speech, he said that he was proud to have had a role—a role—in that transformation of Alaska.

Now, I think we are all realizing that in that speech Senator Stevens was being very humble. He didn’t have just a role; he played the lead role. Indeed, everywhere any Alaskan goes across the State—as Senator MURKOWSKI has already stated—you see signs of his hard work, his dedication to the Alaskan dream and the critical role he played in transforming our great State.
But I think many of us—and we have already heard it being talked about today—also see his hard work in the friendships and example he set here in the U.S. Senate, friendships not based on party labels but on a commitment to serving and fighting for the betterment of Alaska and America, maintaining a strong military and national defense, and deep reverence for our veterans and fellow Alaskans—are a key part of the Stevens legacy.

As I mentioned, Members of this body, like Senator Shelby and Senator Leahy, who, as Vice President, traveled to Anchorage to speak at Ted Stevens' funeral; and, of course, as Senator Murkowski mentioned, his famous, enduring friendship with Hawaii's Daniel Inouye.

Senator Murkowski also mentioned his famous motto: "To hell with politics, just do what's right for Alaska." As a matter of fact, I happen to be wearing a very special pair of cufflinks that once belonged to Ted Stevens. That very motto is on these cufflinks. When we are doing important stuff, I will wear these on the floor to remind me—and I think all of us—of what is important not just for our States but for our country.

As was already noted, it wasn't just Alaska that he focused on and achieved so many great results for; it was our Nation. Whether national security, strengthening our military, taking care of our veterans through improved pay and benefits, as Senator Murkowski mentioned, modernizing our fishing industry, our telecommunications industry, being known as the title IX—"the Father" of that important legislation, making sure young girls have the opportunity to play sports—if you are an American and you have daughters—I have three—and they are playing sports right now, guess I had a little farther to go than most—well, actually, a lot farther than most. Our State recently dedicated a wonderful statue of Ted Stevens in the Ted Stevens International Airport. I think it's a little too big for the airport, but I'm always honored to serve in the Senate seat Senator Stevens held for over 40 years and to literally sit at the same desk—right here, this desk—he used in the Senate. More important, I try to live by and serve my constituents according to these principles and the example he set for Alaska and America. But here is something else that is really so remarkable about Ted Stevens. I said I try to serve in that example, but, as you are hearing on the Senate floor, so many other Senators have said that they believe that too. That is really remarkable and shows how much influence he still has in this body to this day.

Like most Senators, I try to get home every weekend. Senator Murkowski and I are very fortunate to have our home every weekend. Senator Murkowski is with us in spirit, as are so many other Alaskans and others who had such deep respect for Senator Stevens; and his wonderful grandchildren, many of whom Julie and I have known and watched grow up with pride since they were born.

So congratulations, especially to the family of Ted Stevens: Catherine, his wonderful wife; his children: Ben, Walter, Ted Junior, Susan, Lily, and Beth, who is with us in spirit, as so many other Alaskans and others who had such deep respect for Senator Stevens; and to his wonderful grandchildren, many of whom Julie and I have known and watched grow up with pride since they were born.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I support the resolution that the Senate is voting on today to disapprove of new rules from the Trump administration to diminish the value of tax credits offered by State and local governments.

From the very beginning, I have been against the 2017 tax bill that became law. At a time of skyrocketing economic inequality, this tax law has given the largest tax cuts to the wealthiest people and biggest corporations. But in Maryland, 376,000 families are paying higher taxes according to our Bureau of Revenue Estimates, due in large part to the tax law's $10,000 limit on the state and local tax deduction. According to the IRS, 46 percent of households in Maryland claimed the State and local tax deduction prior to the new tax law, which is the largest share of any state in the country. The average State and local tax deduction in Maryland was roughly $13,000—well over the $10,000 limit. Everything in the Maryland State budget, such as education, transportation, and state Medicaid funding, is now more burdensome for Maryland taxpayers to finance.

To make matters worse for working Marylanders, on June 13, 2019, the Treasury Department issued a regulation against tax credits offered by State and local governments for charitable giving. This misguided regulation reduces a taxpayer's Federal deduction for charitable donations by the amount of any tax credit the taxpayer receives from the State or local governments. The effects of this regulation go well beyond programs recently established by some States attempting to mitigate the damage of the new tax law. These rules will be deeply detrimental to longstanding tax credit programs throughout the Nation. In Maryland, this will affect tax credit programs for affordable housing, conservation, and community endowment funds.

Ultimately, allowing this regulation to take effect will make it even more difficult for State and local communities to fund our schools, emergency responders, health care, roads, and other critical services. That is unacceptable, which is why I support the Congressional Review Act resolution to overturn the Treasury Department's June 2019 regulation.

Mr. SULLIVAN. I yield the floor.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the joint resolution to overturn the Treasury Department's June 2019 regulation.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Georgia, Mr. Isakson.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Ms. Harris), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. Sanders), the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. Warren), and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. Whitehouse) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Cortez). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?
The result was announced—yeas 43, nays 52, as follows:

[Roll Call Vote No. 331 Leg.]

YEAS—43

Baldwin
Blumenthal
Boosher
Brown
Kain
Cantwell
Cardin
Carpenter
Casey
Coons
Cortez Masto
Duckworth
Durbin
Duckworth
Feinstein
Gillibrand
Hassan
NAYS—52

Alexander
Barrasso
Bennet
Blacksburn
Blunt
Boozman
Braun
Burr
Capito
Cassidy
Collins
Cromyn
Cotton
Cramer
Crapo
Cruz
Daines
Emi
Harrs
Isakson

The joint resolution was rejected.

COMMERCIAL, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, VETERANS AFFAIRS, TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2020—Re- sumed

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 3055, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3055) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes.

Pending:
Shelby amendment No. 948, in the nature of a substitute.
McConnell (for Shelby) amendment No. 950, to make a technical correction.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

UNÁNIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1834

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I think everyone in this Chamber would agree that free and fair elections are the bedrock of our democracy. We know it has been under attack. We know, from the Mueller report, that Russia, in 2016, used a systematic and comprehensive attack on our electoral system to try to undermine our democracy.

That attack occurred in the State of Maryland. Let me just quote, if I might, from the Washington Post article that said:

Maryland was never in play in 2016. The Russians targeted it anyway.

The article states:

Russia’s Twitter campaign to influence the 2016 presidential election in Maryland began in June 2016, shortly after Election Day, when the St. Petersburg-based Internet Research Agency began running accounts that tweeted about local news events.

Yet, the IRA, the Russian troll factory that U.S. prosecutors blame for the massive disinformation efforts during the 2016 campaign, did not attempt and preparation to its Maryland operation, all in a likely effort, experts say, to widen racial divisions and demonize African American voters.

That is what happened in 2016. Our intelligence community tells us that Russia is active today trying to influence our 2020 elections, and they are using technology to try to undermine our free election system. We must do more to protect our system.

It was for that reason and many others that I introduced S. 1834, the Deceptive Practices and Voter Intimidation Prevention Act of 2019. It is cosponsored by Senator KLOBUCHAR, Senator LEAHY, Senator FISCHER, and others.

This bill is an effort to try to protect us from this type of international interference in our elections, as well as local efforts that are aimed at trying to intimidate voters targeted at minority voters. There should have no place in American politics.

This bill did pass the House of Representatives in March of this year in H.R. 1.

Very quickly, let me tell you what this bill does. It prohibits individuals from knowingly deceiving others about the time, place, eligibility, or procedures for participating in a Federal election; addresses new digital challenges that pose a threat to citizens exercising their right to vote, particularly the use of digital platforms to disseminate false information regarding Federal elections; and combating voter intimidation, especially efforts aimed at suppressing voter rights.

I would hope every Member of this Chamber would support these efforts. Unfortunately, the majority leader has failed to bring any of these issues to the floor or give us any time to take up legislation in order to protect our free electoral system. The election primaries will start early next year. We need to take action now.

That is why I am going to make this unanimous consent request. I hope we can agree to it.

I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 1834, the Deceptive Practices and Voter Intimidation Prevention Act of 2019; that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; that the bill be read a third time and passed; and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I don’t disagree with everything that is in the Senator’s bill—far from it. I agree with much of it, but it does have several critical flaws, and it is not ready for prime time.

In most, if not all, States, it is already illegal to prevent or try to prevent lawful voters from trying to register to vote. We all agree that every qualified voter should have an opportunity to register for an election. But this proposal is written so broadly that it would prevent election officials from rejecting the registration of an illegal immigrant. It could prevent poll workers from stopping a 16-year-old from voting in an election. In other words, this would seemingly make it illegal perhaps unregistrable for an official to actually do their job.

I assume it is not intentional, but it is obviously a big problem. Other sections of the bill create significant First Amendment concerns, it creates criminal penalties for political speech that misstates endorsements, it provides everyone of lying, but there are enormous problems when the Federal Government starts sending people to jail for what they say. Even the ACLU opposes my colleague’s bill because this bill is so anti-First Amendment.

Just a few days ago, Secretary Hillary Clinton claimed that a former third-party candidate was a Russian asset and that a Democratic Presidential candidate she doesn’t like is Russia’s preferred candidate in the upcoming election. Should Mrs. Clinton have violated Federal law because she perhaps misstated a political endorsement as a way of making a political point? We don’t want to start down the road where the Federal Government refrees free speech.

This bill did pass the House of Representatives in March of this year in H.R. 1.

Very quickly, let me tell you what this bill does. It prohibits individuals from knowingly deceiving others about the time, place, eligibility, or procedures for participating in a Federal election; addresses new digital challenges that pose a threat to citizens exercising their right to vote, particularly the use of digital platforms to disseminate false information regarding Federal elections; and combating voter intimidation, especially efforts aimed at suppressing voter rights.

I would hope every Member of this Chamber would support these efforts. Unfortunately, the majority leader has failed to bring any of these issues to the floor or give us any time to take up legislation in order to protect our free electoral system. The election primaries will start early next year. We need to take action now.

That is why I am going to make this unanimous consent request. I hope we can agree to it.

I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 1834, the Deceptive Practices and Voter Intimidation Prevention Act of 2019; that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; that the bill be read a third time and passed; and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I regret that my colleague has blocked the objection. Let me point out that this bill has been pending in previous Congresses. We have gone through all of the challenges my friend has already talked about. There are real problems that are occurring in our States.

We had billboard and minority communities highlighting voter fraud in an effort to intimidate African-American voters. We have seen information sent out with wrong dates of elections. We have seen robocalls pretending to be from a particular campaign when they are from the opposite campaign in an effort to intimidate voters from participating.
We can always find reasons why we shouldn’t consider legislation, but the truth of the matter is that we have given the OK in our system for some to say it is all right to try to intimidate voters from voting—something I would hope this Congress would want to go on record and say they would have no place in America, particularly when it is targeted at minority communities in an effort to reduce their numbers.

I regret my colleague has objected, and I hope that we will have a chance to take up election security legislation.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The P RESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The P RESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNITED STATES-MEXICO-CANADA TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. President, it has been a year since the United States, Mexico, and Canada agreed to the U.S.-Mexico-Canada Trade Agreement, the replacement for NAFTA and the modernization for the NAFTA agreement that has been so important to all three of our countries. In fact, we are coming up on 1 year since it was signed by leaders of all three countries. In fact, the country of Mexico has ratified the USMCA. Canada is waiting for the United States to take the next step so they, too, can ratify this very important trade agreement.

This agreement between the three countries on the North American continent is estimated to add $68.2 billion to the U.S. economy and create 176,000 new jobs. The USMCA would also increase exports to Canada by 5.9 percent, to a total of $19.1 billion, and shipments to Mexico by 6.7 percent, or $14.2 billion. Imports from Canada and Mexico would rise by 4.8 and 3.8 percent, respectively.

But the ratification process has to begin with the Democrats in the House under the trade promotion authority with which this deal was struck. The Democrats leading the House seem to be more focused on taking away one of the tools the House and Senate can use to combat cheating, and allaying the fears of the bilateral trade agreement. All of this adds to leverage in negotiating with China.

I want to speak for a couple of minutes about the specifics to my State of North Dakota. We are a border State with Manitoba and Saskatchewan in Canada. Our border is by far our biggest trading partner. In 2017, my State of North Dakota exported $5.8 billion worth of goods to the global marketplace. Those exports contributed to 29,000 jobs. Of that $5.8 billion, we exported $4.9 billion of goods to Canada. That is 84 percent of North Dakota’s exports that go to our northern neighbor, Canada. When adding Mexico into that equation, that is 88 percent of the value of North Dakota’s exported goods and services going to USMCA countries.

Farmers and manufacturers can be very pleased with the renegotiated terms that will now benefit them directly with a commitment from Canada to reduce trade distorting policies and improve transparency, something that we have a little issue with in the original NAFTA.

In addition, the new agreement assures nondiscriminatory treatment for agricultural products, including the other countries. This is a major win for our farmers. Specifically for North Dakota, I spoke directly with President Trump concerning the biased Canada grain grading issue and wrote a line he actually used in a speech.

I worked closely with U.S. Trade Representative Lighthizer and chief agriculture negotiator Doud to ensure that our grain growers were relieved of the unfair practice of grading North Dakota grain as sub-par feed. This is an estimated $300 million of valuable U.S. exports of grain to Canada.

North Dakota grain growers deserve better, and they will now be recognized properly if we can get the House of Representatives to bring the USMCA up for a vote.

Our manufacturing workforce will be pleased with the automotive and machinery provisions that are included in this deal. Going forward, vehicles are mandated to have 75 percent of North Dakota content to qualify for duties and, when working with China, the United States, there are no tariffs, compared to 62.5 percent. Also, at least 40 percent of a vehicle eligible for duty-free importing must have been built by workers earning at least $16 an hour. This is a big win for labor. This wage requirement will ensure that the USMCA is not being flooded by cheap labor, particularly from south of the border.

Renegotiating and reorganizing NAFTA into the USMCA was an essential move for our State, given the economic relationship and mutual reliance North Dakota and Canada share as neighbors. I applaud President Trump for securing his promise to approve a superior deal for our State and our country. It is my sincere hope that the House and Senate will act to ratify this agreement as soon as possible in order to cement this win for our country.

We must demand that Speaker PELOSI set partisan politics aside, even if just for a day, to bring this important ratification up to the House so it can be passed and sent to the Senate so we can be on our way to a new, improved, modern U.S.-Mexico-Canada Trade Agreement.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The P RESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. BLACKBURN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The P RESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. BLACKBURN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, I understand that several of our colleagues today have been on the Senate floor calling for an immediate vote on the President’s new North American Free Trade Agreement.

Setting aside the fact that there have not yet been the hearings or the mark-ups necessary to allow that to happen, it would be a major mistake for the Trump administration to seek a vote on a trade deal until it is a good deal. While the new North American Free Trade Agreement includes some improvements to the existing agreement, there is still work to be done to get the best deal for American workers and consumers.

Updating NAFTA, for example, means confronting the areas where older trade agreements continually have fallen short: fighting to protect labor rights in the interests of working families, preventing a race to the bottom when it comes to the environment, and making sure there are vigorous enforcements of our trade agreements so that other countries can’t treat a trade deal as an empty document that gives them yet more time and more opportunities to rip off American jobs.

I do have real concerns about the current trade enforcement because the new NAFTA carries over too much of the weak enforcement system of the original NAFTA. It is too easy on trade cheats, and it is not good enough for American workers, particularly on the issue of protecting our working families and labor rights.

Now, I and our colleague Senator BROWN have proposed several additional tools to address specific challenges in Mexico. It is my view, in having talked to trade officials and in having gathered information elsewhere, that by all accounts, there has been good progress on this front. Additional tools that must be confronted is that of identifying the hundreds of thousands of sham labor contracts in Mexico that
have exploited workers there and harmed workers here in our country. Mexico must remain on track to get those contracts renegotiated on behalf of the interests of our workers.

To my colleagues who say this deal must be named the name of certainty, I want to make a point that, I think, is very important. During this overhaul, the original North American Free Trade Agreement remains in place. Workers, farmers, ranchers, and businesses should not have to go to bed at night fearing that economic uncertainty is going to rob them of their livelihoods. The uncertainty arises only when the President acts out and makes impulsive threats regarding our trade relationships. When the President threatened new tariffs on Mexico this June over immigration policy, that created far more uncertainty than our taking the time that would be necessary to get this deal right. American workers and farmers have already been hurt by the President’s impulsive moves. We are going to get hurt if Trump threatens and produces chaos, causing the Congress to accept a bad deal on the North American Free Trade Agreement.

Passing a trade deal that would allow the President to unilaterally change trade rules and jerk around entire industries would be a substantial mistake and would be one that would produce still more uncertainty. That is not how you get trade done right. Because we have suspicions and concerns about how the administration wants NAFTA 2.0 to be implemented.

I am just going to close by mentioning a fact or two about my State.

In my State, trade and global commerce are priority business. One in five jobs in Oregon depends on international trade, and the trade jobs often pay better than do the nontrade jobs because they reflect a level of added value. What a principle turns on with this is that it is not the case for many of the 3 million Virginians with preexisting conditions.

I fear some Members of this body have forgotten what it was like before the Affordable Care Act, when an unexpected surgery or a diagnosis of a chronic illness could mean a one-way ticket out of the middle class. Unfortunately, this is not a hypothetical. Recently, one of my constituents, a man named Jesse, received a $230,000 medical bill for his back surgery. Unbeknownst to him, he had purchased a plan that he thought would cover this, but this plan, unfortunately, was a junk plan that considered his back injury as preexisting.

Jesse is one of the more than 3 million Virginians with a preexisting medical condition.

I have three daughters. Two of my three daughters have preexisting medical conditions that would not be covered under these junk plans.

Today I want to share some of those stories to remind my colleagues of what real people will face if we allow the administration to continue dismantling these protections that folks count on.

Recently I got an email from Linda in Warren County, VA. She is a cancer survivor with multiple preexisting conditions. She wrote:

Due to the housing fallout in 2008, we lost our healthcare coverage and I could no longer get health coverage because of my cancer diagnosis.

Mindy from Henrico, around Richmond, is also a cancer survivor. She wrote:

I am a functioning member of society, however that will not last long if I lose this access to medical help. I went off my medications in 2000 as I couldn’t afford a doctor and medication... and it was a very thin line between me and homelessness.

Justine from Loudon County is worried that she could lose coverage for her children.

It is a good question that Justine asks, and that we should all ask ourselves. As a father, as I mentioned, I have dealt with the scary reality of having a child with juvenile diabetes and a child with asthma, but I am also an extraordinarily lucky individual, and I knew that because of the insurance I had, the resources, they would be taken care of. That is not the case for many of the 3 million Virginians who have preexisting conditions or the countless tens of millions of Americans.

Katherine in Blacksburg, VA, told me about her daughter who was diagnosed at age 3 with juvenile diabetes. She wrote:

Until there is a cure for diabetes, I cannot imagine how costly it would be for her to secure and manage her health if there were limitations on coverage for people with preexisting conditions.

Katherine’s daughter deserves access to healthcare just as much as my daughter does.

I got a letter from a pharmacist in Abingdon, in far southwest Virginia, named Michael. He treats diabetics every day, and he also knows what it is like because he has lived with the disease for 38 years.

He writes:

Without insulin we will die... If coverage for pre-existing conditions goes away, you will see a large decline in the health of type 1 diabetics, and more dependence upon Medicaid.

This is not only somebody who has dealt with diabetes for 38 years, but he is also a knowledgeable consumer. He is a pharmacist.

I have too many of these stories to share them all today, and I see my friend, the Senator from Washington State. She and other of my colleagues will be coming to the floor today and over the next few days until we have a
chance to vote on this CRA, to share stories as well as what we will do to Virginians, Washingtonians, Tennesseans, and Americans all across this Nation if we go back to a time when we did not protect people with preexisting conditions.

One or two more quick stories. James from Danville, VA, told me about his 10 separate preexisting conditions. Lynn from Lynchburg is on three separate medications due to a brain tumor. She could die if her insurance coverage didn’t cover those medications, and the list goes on.

In closing, when we talk about preexisting conditions, we are talking about people’s lives. That is why we must pass the resolution I have introduced to reverse the administration’s harmful rule changes and defend protections for folks with preexisting conditions.

I think virtually every one of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle have said they absolutely want to protect folks with preexisting conditions. Even for folks who otherwise completely don’t agree with the ACA, that is the one part of the ACA that folks have agreed upon.

We have all week we are going to have a chance to move past talk, to move past statements, to actually go on the record with an up-or-down vote, to go on the record to say that we are going to protect provisions of the ACA that make sure that folks with preexisting conditions weren’t discriminated against, or we will go on the record saying: No, what the administration is doing is all right.

These short-term or junk plans sound good until you realize you are not getting the kind of coverage that you thought you were buying. We will have that decision point come next week.

I ask my colleagues across the aisle who believe and say they support protections with preexisting conditions, well, they will have a chance to go on the record next week. I hope they will. I hope we will pass overwhelmingly this CRA and make sure that protections for folks with preexisting conditions are maintained.

I can’t think of an issue that is more important to so many families all across Virginia, and, for that matter, all across the country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I want to thank the Senator from Virginia for bringing forward this CRA that we will be voting on that will allow us to affirmatively from the Senate say: We want to protect people with preexisting conditions and people from these junk plans that really take away the protections that are so important and that every family counts on. So I really appreciate that from the Senator.

When it comes to healthcare, families across our country have repeatedly seen President Trump and Republicans say one thing and do the exact opposite. Despite proclaiming themselves somewhere along the line as the “party of healthcare,” despite making empty promises to fight for families and people with preexisting conditions, the cornerstone of Republicans’ healthcare policy, these families really rely on with their massively harmful TrumpCare proposals—the junk plans that you just heard about—and waivers that chip away at patient protections, and, of course, that puts it on which the court could rule on any day.

Let’s make it clear. If Republicans get their way in court, they are going to throw the lives of patients across the country into chaos and uncertainty by striking down those protections for preexisting conditions by stripping away health insurance from tens of millions of people covered through Medicaid expansion or the exchanges.

It will get rid of the lifetime and annual limits that are on patients’ out-of-pocket costs, while bringing back caps on their benefits, even for those who are insured through their own employers—so this applies to everyone—and ending essential health benefits that require insurers to cover things like prescription drugs or maternity care, mental healthcare, emergency care, and a lot more.

While Republicans have been advancing their attacks on families’ healthcare, they have also been blocking commonsense solutions that Democrats are out here pushing for—like legislation to bring down drug prices through impactful steps like Medicare negotiation or making coverage more affordable for our working families and protecting patients with preexisting conditions from the Republicans’ reckless lawsuits.

Now, Democrats in the House have also passed legislation to restore funding to a program that helps people find the right care for themselves, to reverse President Trump’s harmful junk insurance rule, and to actually defend patients from that partisan lawsuit that Republicans are pushing to upend healthcare as we know it.

Now, what have Leader MCCONNELL and Senate Republicans done with those solutions that have come over here from the House? Well, they have buried one of them in a legislative graveyard, while brazenly and inaccurately claiming they care about fighting for patients or protecting preexisting conditions.

I am here to say today that Republicans’ transparent healthcare charade is coming to an end. Soon, as you heard, Democrats will force a vote on legislation that Senator MCCONNELL cannot bury in their legislative graveyard, meaning every Senator here is going to have to go on the record as to whether they stand up and support healthcare—whether they stand with families or with President Trump and his schemes that take power away from patients and give it back to the insurance companies.

Our legislation will reverse a step that President Trump took to warp a tool meant to encourage innovation into one that encourages States to eliminate protections for patients with preexisting conditions, increases costs, and promotes those harmful junk insurance plans that can charge vulnerable patients more and cover less.

President Trump’s junk plans can flout protections for preexisting conditions, meaning that they can discriminate against patients—patients like Lily. She is a high school student from Gig Harbor, WA, and has cystic fibrosis; or Julie, who is a four-time cancer survivor from Mercer Island; or Javi, who is a college student in Seattle with mental health needs; and millions of other patients across the country with preexisting conditions.

Letting President Trump expand the use of these junk plans will leave patients with higher out-of-pocket costs, and fewer affordable options to get the healthcare that they need, and President Trump’s rule could even be used to cut financial help for patients who need it the most and provide windfall profits away from patients, even if they don’t buy that junk insurance.

This is absolutely unacceptable and exactly why the vote Democrats are going to be forcing is so important. It will get rid of the lifetime and annual limits that are on patients’ out-of-pocket costs, and fewer affordable options to get the healthcare that they need, and President Trump’s rule could even be used to cut financial help for patients who need it the most and provide windfall profits away from patients, even if they don’t buy that junk insurance.

This is absolutely unacceptable and exactly why the vote Democrats are going to be forcing is so important. It will get rid of the lifetime and annual limits that are on patients’ out-of-pocket costs, and fewer affordable options to get the healthcare that they need, and President Trump’s rule could even be used to cut financial help for patients who need it the most and provide windfall profits away from patients, even if they don’t buy that junk insurance.
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The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, our colleagues, Senator WARNER and Senator MURRAY, have come to the floor over the course of the day to speak about the importance of protecting Americans who have preexisting health conditions, and I want to see if I can put this in a bit of context so that people understand why those of us on this side feel so strongly, why I think Senator WARNER and Senator MURRAY were spot-on, and I want to put it in the context of the way I came up.

When I got out of law school, I set up a legal aid program for senior citizens. I was codirector of the Oregon Gray Panthers, and I saw what it meant when you had a preexisting condition. You could just clobber those people with preexisting health conditions. They would just throw all kinds of extra costs on them, heap extra expenses, and pretty much beat the stuffing out of anybody who had a preexisting health condition. It's tried and true. We could stand idly by and watch as they went to bed at night knowing that they wouldn't be wiped out in the morning if they have a preexisting condition.

So in the course of the whole debate about the Affordable Care Act, I produced a piece of legislation called the Healthy Americans Act. Seven Democrats and seven Republicans were cosponsors. Some of the Republican cosponsors are still serving in the U.S. Senate today if they have a preexisting condition.

What we had in it was airtight, loophole-free protection for anybody with a preexisting condition. We were thrilled that, by and large, our provision from the Healthy Americans Act became the provision in the Affordable Care Act that ensured that there would be a new generation of consumer protection and security for the millions of Americans who had these preexisting conditions.

Now, as my colleagues have said, there is a threat to preexisting condition protection that is now in the Affordable Care Act that really does provide airtight, loophole-free protection for those with preexisting conditions. I just want to make sure that we get on the record, for those who are following the debate, what it means if you roll back these protections for those with preexisting conditions.

In a sentence, what it means is America goes back to the days—those days when I was codirector of the Gray Panthers—when healthcare for the healthy and the wealthy. That is what you have if you allow discrimination against those with a preexisting condi-


tion. If you are healthy, you don’t have an issue with preexisting conditions. If you are wealthy, you don’t have an issue with preexisting conditions. But if you are not healthy and you are not wealthy and you get rid of these protections, you are in a world of hurt. That is what we are looking at should the Republicans prevail.

The Republican’s official position is ironclad: Preexisting consumer protections ought to be pretty much thrown out in the dustbin. It is going to spend a few minutes outlining the examples of why that is the case.

First, we saw the TrumpCare disaster of 2017. The Republicans tried to repeal the Affordable Care Act with its protection for preexisting conditions. They failed, and preexisting conditions lived to fight another day. Enough said there.

Second, my colleagues have chosen to stand idly by while Republican-led State Insurance Commissioners maneuver through the courts to toss out the entire Affordable Care Act overall with the protection for people with preexisting conditions. The so-called Texas lawsuit relies on an argument that wouldn’t hold up in law school 101 on a tentative grade of A. In the context of a decade of ideological judges, it does seem that this case may make its way to the Supreme Court.

I do want to be clear for those who are following this. Republican Mem-

bers on the prowl outside of the official administration. They always seem to be advertising for plans that provide them with health care, with the President hasn’t done you or your family any favors on health care.

One last point on healthcare: While Americans are looking for affordable healthcare plans on healthcare.gov, there are going to be a lot of scam artists. There are going to be a lot of people who are looking for a quick buck. These hustlers are going to be trying to pawn what are called junk plans onto unsuspecting families. The junk plans might sound attractive. They always seem to be advertising promotional materials that say: “Low premiums! Affordable coverage!” But I just want to make clear that if you or a loved one gets sick, chances are the fine print says that the carrier of this junk plan will not cover what you need. So despite the low premium, the real premium comes due right when you need your coverage the most.

I am also struck by how similar these junk plans are that are being offered
now by these rip-off insurers—how similar they are to another part of what we dealt with when I was co-director of the Gray Panthers, legal aid for senior citizens. Back then, we saw that fast-talking insurance salespeople would lure people into buying plans that didn’t make it this year.

When people tell me their healthcare stories, I can assure you they don’t start with their political affiliation or with anything else. They start with what is happening with them and their family. That is because, when it comes to their health and the health of their families, none of those other things matter. People in Michigan simply want their loved ones to get hurt or sick, they are going to be able to go to the doctor and that they are going to be able to get the healthcare they need.

Unfortunately, Michigan families have reason to be concerned right now. Any day now, the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals will rule on the Texas v. United States case. Everything is at stake—everything—including coverage for 17 million people through the Medicaid expansion. People earning minimum wage will not have to pick between having healthcare and not working or working, not getting healthcare or not working, getting healthcare—now they can work and get healthcare—or children to remain on their parent’s health insurance plans until age 26, coverage for preventive services like cancer screenings and flu shots, and protections for people with preexisting conditions.

Misty, who runs a consulting company in Leslie, MI, knows all about preexisting conditions. She was diagnosed with breast cancer at age 32. Her diagnosis came entirely out of the blue, 3 days after her husband lost his job. She said:

We were the lucky ones. He found another job 3 months later before our COBRA ran out.

She added this:

Insurance loss and job loss at the same time as a cancer diagnosis are stresses that I wonder if any of those people who are looking to get rid of coverage for people with preexisting conditions have ever thought they would have to do.

It is estimated that about half of Michigan families includes someone with a preexisting condition—about half—everything from heart disease, asthma, to breast cancer. Nationwide, we are talking about 130 million people who could lose their ability to have health insurance if healthcare reform is overturned. Think about that—130 million people.

There is another side effect of over-turning healthcare reform. Prescription drug costs. Now, 43 million seniors enrolled in Medicare Part D prescription drug plans are saving money thanks to healthcare reform and thanks to the Affordable Care Act, which helped close the prescription drug doughnut hole. What we call the gap in coverage where you are able to get coverage. Then the coverage is not there for a certain amount of time, and then you can get it once your drug costs get at a higher level.

In fact, healthcare reform saved more than just the average Medicare beneficiary almost $27 billion on their prescription drugs—almost $27 billion on the cost of their medicine. Instead of attacking healthcare reform, we should be working hard to reduce the ridiculous cost of medicine, as I have talked about many times on the floor of the Senate.

In 2017 alone, the average price of brand-name drugs that seniors often take was the rate of inflation four times the rate of inflation according to the AARP. That is one of the reasons why 72 percent of seniors in a recent poll said they are concerned about the cost of prescription medicine. Whether they are going to be able to get the lifesaving medicine they need and that the doctor is prescribing for them.

It is absolutely shameful that people in America, one of the richest countries in the world, are going without medicine they need to survive. How is that happening? How are we allowing that to happen? I have always believed that healthcare is a basic human right, and, yes, that includes medications.

We need to do something about this. We know the No. 1 thing we can do to help reduce prices is to let Medicare negotiate. Let Medicare negotiate. The fact is, when Medicare Part D was passed, the language that the drug companies got into the bill—specific language—to ban negotiation slipped into the middle of that bill.

We originally were excited about it because we thought it was going to help get Medicare prescription drug coverage, and then, of course, the lobbying force—the largest lobbying force in DC—prescription drug companies snuck in some language to make sure we couldn’t have the bargaining power of Medicare insurance to lower prices.

So it is real simple. We want to do something that can lower prices. Let Medicare negotiate. Just let them negotiate like every other insurance company. We know it works because the VA does it for veterans. We know it works. The VA is allowed to negotiate the price of prescription drugs, and, surprise, surprise, it saves money. It saves 40 percent compared to Medicare. Medicare could have saved $4.2 billion on just 50 drugs if it paid the same price as the VA—$14.4 billion if they paid the same price for seniors and people with disabilities as our veterans are able to receive.

So what is stopping us? Well, we can’t get the bill passed to take off the prohibition. I offered it in the Senate Finance Committee. Unfortunately, not one Republican colleague voted for it. We are going to bring it up again on the floor. We are going to bring it up every opportunity we have to make it clear that we, as Democrats, know—we know the best way to bring down prescription drug prices. Let Medicare negotiate. Just let them negotiate.

We know the reason we can’t ever get a vote on this. In 2018, there were 1,451 lobbyists for the pharmaceutical and health product industry. That is almost 15 for every Member of the Senate. Think about that. There are 100
Members, and there are almost 15 pharmaceutical lobbyists for every 1 Senator, and they are doing everything they can. Their job is to stop competition, keep prices high, and they have done a very good job of it. It is wrong for people, but they have done a very good job of what they were assigned to do.

As I mentioned before, back in 2003, when Medicare Part D was signed into law, they blocked Medicare from harnessing the bargaining power of 43 million American seniors to bring down the cost of their prescription medicines. Now, 16 years later, pharmaceutical companies are still doing everything they can to put their company profits before people.

It is time—it is past time to help people afford their prescription medications and protect people with pre-existing conditions. People in America, right now, shouldn't be worried about a court case in the Fifth Circuit and what is going to happen and what that will mean for their family and their healthcare.

We could do something right now. We could do something right now if people wanted to. Let me remind you that it has now been 167 days since the House passed legislation protecting people with pre-existing conditions. It has been 167 days ago the U.S. House of Representatives passed a bill and sent it over to the Senate, and we have not been allowed to vote on that. It has not been brought up for a vote. It needs to come up for a vote. It needs to be taken out of the legislative graveyard and walked to the floor of the U.S. Senate so we can vote to really protect people with preexisting health conditions.

Misty and other cancer survivors across Michigan and across the country shouldn’t have to wait a day longer. This is an issue about politics. It is about saving lives.

Misty closed her letter to me with this: “If [these elected officials] are truly as concerned about life as many of them claim to be, they need to be truly as concerned about life as many of them claim to be.”

Here is my question for the majority leader: What are you waiting for? It is time for us to act. Healthcare is personal. It should not be political on the floor of the U.S. Senate. It is time to act in protecting people with pre-existing conditions and lowering the cost of prescription drugs.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

(iii) Prior Related Cases, if any: BA–P–GAL, BA–P–GAV.

ORDER OF BUSINESS
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.

MORNING BUSINESS
Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

(iii) Prior Related Cases, if any: BA–P–GAL, BA–P–GAV.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF JUSTIN WALKER
Mr. DURBH. Mr. President, we have seen too many Trump judicial nominees in recent years who do not know their way around a courtroom. I suspect some of these nominees never even made it through a “Law and Order” episode.

The majority leader is now rushing a floor vote on Judge Walker, nominated to be a district court judge in Kentucky. Mr. Walker was just reported out of committee last week. The Walker nomination is leapfrogging a dozen other judicial nominees who have been on the calendar longer.

The American Bar Association, which does peer review evaluations of nominees, concluded that—Mr. Walker is not qualified to be a Federal trial judge. This is the eighth Trump judicial nominee to be rated “not qualified” by the ABA.

Mr. Walker is 37 years old and has been out of law school for only 10 years. He has never tried a case as lead or cocounsel, whether civil or criminal. He has only conducted a single deposition.

The ABA said that with Walker, “it was challenging to determine how much of his ten years since graduation from law school has been spent in the practice of law.” I find it hard to believe that there is a shortage of experienced, qualified attorneys or State court judges in Kentucky who could hit the ground running as a Federal trial judge. In fact, there is an experienced Kentucky State court judge sitting on the Senate Executive Calendar right now—David Tapp, whose nomination to the Court of Federal Claims was supported by the Bar Association. Why can’t we get district court nominees who actually know what they are doing in the courtroom, like Judge Tapp?

Rather than gaining actual courtroom experience, Mr. Walker has spent much of his time in recent years making media appearances. In 2018 alone, he appeared on TV or radio 127 times. That is not what we need on the Federal bench.

I will oppose the Walker nomination. He simply lacks the litigation and trial experience to serve as a district court judge.

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION
Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act requires that Congress receive prior notification of certain proposed arms sales as defined by that statute. Upon such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In keeping with the committee’s intention to see that relevant information is available to the full Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notifications which have been received. If the cover letter references a classified annex, then such annex is available to all Senators in the office of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, room SD–423.

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

DEFENSE SECURITY
COOPERATION AGENCY, Arlington, VA.

Hon. James E. Risch, Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 19–61 concerning the Navy’s proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of Bahrain for defense articles and services estimated to cost $150 million. After this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

Charles W. Hooper, Lieutenant General, USA, Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency.
If you wanted to get things done, it was a good idea to listen to Uncle Ted. His advice: “Get to really know people. Don’t pay attention to partisan diatribes, socialize and gain their trust.”

By following his advice, it is amazing what you can get done. I still apply those lessons today; it works: 87 votes for a farm bill that the President just signed last year.

Example may be better than advice, but when they make it a team that is hard to beat and that would be Ted Stevens and his friend—if not brother—Danny Inouye. Either one could be chairman, and the result would be the same in behalf of our military and national security.

We all have the public trust knowing we are only as good as our staff, and Ted had the best, many of whom are in the audience.

As the Senator toted the bucket for our Marine Corps, I mention one: Sid Ashworth.

Back in the day, the Commandant would trust me to follow up after meeting with Ted. We all knew the Air Force got top dollar; then the Army, Navy, and said, “When are you going to tell the Commandant? At least give me this.”

And it worked. Then I would call the Commandant and casually say, “Sir, we’re okay, we got our top ask.”

Thanks, Sid.

My relationship with Ted was simple, I did what he asked. On a Codel, very late at night, we were watching “Band of Brothers”—again; it was Ted’s favorite. All lights were off, it was past midnight, everyone fast asleep. I was sitting next to Ted whose eyes were closed, so I got up quietly and attempted to turn the TV off. Ted said in a very loud voice, “Leave it on, this next part is the best part.” I sat down.

“Temper is a valuable possession, don’t lose it,” Ted Stevens. Our Tuesday policy bills included discussions of appropriations bills versus policy and ideology. One day, Ted had enough and shouted, “When are you people going to understand, without Democrat votes, we cannot pass appropriations bills!”

He left the room, slammed the door so hard that Mike Mansfield’s portrait almost fell to the floor.

I waited about a minute, followed him down to his Appropriations office. I strode in and said, “Why in the hell did you do that?”

He said, “You don’t understand, I’m not angry, I just use my anger as a tool.”

Nevertheless, when he donned his “Hulk Tie” colleagues steered clear.

Ted Stevens had a wonderful perspective on life. A successful person can lay a firm foundation with bricks that others have thrown at him. Even the longest day will have an end, and it did. The Alaskan of the Century was vindicated.

With this grand portrait, he returns to the Senate, and he will remain here for decades to come.

In just 7 months, Ted and Danny will be honored again at the dedication of the Dwight David Eisenhower Memorial, Ted’s favorite President.

They led the charge to create the memorial. The dedication will be on May 8, 2020, and the memorial will be another part of Ted Stevens’ legacy.

It was a privilege to know and work with him and to share his friendship. Alaska and our country are better and stronger thanks to his duty and devotion.

We will never see the likes of Ted Stevens again. worker safety regulations, and consumer protection rules. For those reasons, I do not believe Eugene Scalia is fit to serve as Secretary of Labor.

My grandfather was one of the first Black members of United Auto Workers at Ford Motor Company, and through him, I learned the importance of worker rights that collective bargaining provides. Through collective action, unions are able to provide workers with livable wages, safe working conditions, and access to benefits like healthcare coverage and retirement savings.

Not only has Eugene Scalia represented companies in arbitrations against collective bargaining agreements, but he identifies it as one of his most significant career moments. The Secretary of Labor should be doing everything in their power to make it easier—not harder—for working people to join unions.

Eugene Scalia also represented the Chamber of Commerce in working to overturn the fiduciary rule, a commonsense step towards protecting the retirement security of countless working families. Employers trying to design a quality plan for their workers, workers striving to save, are trying to avoid spending down their nest egg too quickly, deserve access to quality advice, without fear that financial bias is
clouding their broker’s judgment. Unfortunately, that access to quality, unbiased advice was ultimately overturned, in part thanks to the efforts of Eugene Scalia.

More Federal oversight and stricter safeguards are necessary to prevent the exploitation and discrimination of working people; yet Eugene Scalia has dedicated his career to fighting against the existing safeguards. He argued that more than 30 women alleging sexual harassment and retaliation should have their claims thrown out, defended a company that refused to hire a woman because she had dreadlocks, and fought against corporate whistleblowers. He has also worked to undermine the rights and protections provided by the Americans with Disabilities Act, stating that workers with disabilities should not be provided workplace accommodations.

When I go back to my home in Newark, I see many working families struggling to make ends meet, sometimes while working two to three jobs. They often face underemployment, wage stagnation, wage theft, and a variety of other tactics meant to keep wages down and suppress worker rights. They deserve a Secretary of Labor that will fight for them. Together with all administration and the previous Secretary of Labor have been relentless in their efforts to roll back workers’ rights, attack unions, and undermine civil liberties. Unfortunately, I do not have any reason to believe that Secretary Scalia will be any different. This is why I must express my deep concern and opposition to his nomination and confirmation as Secretary of Labor.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO DR. EDWARD C. MONANAH

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize Dr. Edward C. Monahan, a professor at the University of Connecticut and longtime director of Connecticut Sea Grant.

Throughout his two decade tenure as director, Dr. Monahan positively transformed Connecticut Sea Grant, which is an integral part of a national network of programs that strive to protect and enhance our coastal and marine ecosystems through education, research, and technology. His remarkable work and visionary leadership secured vital funding for initiatives that improved the water quality in the Long Island Sound and helped establish a full-fledged Sea Grant College Program in our State.

Dr. Monahan demonstrated his excellent qualities as a leader through his decisive problem solving and readiness to find and implement solutions to critically important issues. A notable example of his accomplishments was when the Long Island Sound faced lobster die-off, an unprecedented disaster for the sound’s resources. He responded immediately by awarding development funds for pathobiologists to investigate the cause. The issue turned out far more complicated than initially expected, but Dr. Monahan smartly worked to allocate $3 million in Federal disaster relief funds to investigate the source. Connecticut Sea Grant institutions too part in 21 lobster research projects. This research helped uncover essential information for lobster biologists and led to changes in State and local pesticide usage for mosquito control.

One of the other landmarks of Dr. Monahan’s directorship was his expansion of Sea Grant’s international collaboration. Recognizing the advantages of overseas partnerships, Dr. Monahan worked with universities and government agencies to forge new connections that would support the exchange of innovative marine education, research, and technology. Impressively, he launched the Irish-American Aquatic Initiative, a initiative that launched a formal collaboration between Northeast United States Sea Grant programs and universities in the Republic of Ireland and Northern Ireland. Dr. Monahan also helped to establish relationships with Sea Grant activities in Mexico, Chile, China, and Germany, which set a new standard for international cooperation.

Among his many accomplishments as director of Connecticut Sea Grant, Dr. Monahan also served on the Sea Grant Association’s board, which organizes events at the national level and advocates for better understanding, use, and conservation of natural resources. Thanks to his outstanding efforts, Sea Grant has developed into an even more successful program. In recognition of his immense and ongoing contributions, the Sea Grant Association awarded Dr. Monahan its prestigious President’s Award in 2000 and 2001, along with its Distinguished Service Award in 2000.

I applaud his lifetime of dogged commitment to Connecticut’s coastal and marine health and hope my colleagues will join me in thanking Dr. Monahan for his extraordinary contributions to the marine sciences.

100TH ANNIVERSARY OF KETTERING UNIVERSITY

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the 100th anniversary of Kettering University. Located in the heart of Flint, MI, Kettering University provides world-class education and has helped propel students into careers that sit on the forefront of innovation. In 1919, in the infancy of what would become the automotive stronghold within Southeast Michigan, Kettering University began as the School of Automotive Trades, eventually renamed the Flint Institute of Technology, under the direction of Mr. Albert Sobeys, who trained mechanics and engineers for Buick.

The General Motors Corporation would then take over administering the institute, establishing the General Motors Institute, GMI. The institute continued to train not only engineers and mechanics but also managers and administrative staff. This training was so successful that GMI added a fifth-year thesis requirement and became a degree-granting college.

Due to innovation through the 1950s and 1960s, GMI continued to evolve with the inclusion of majors such as electrical engineering and over 70 new courses. Presidents Guy R. Cowing and Harold P. Rodes—who updated labs, equipment, and began building the campus as we know it today—added buildings such as the Campus Center and Thompson Residence Hall.

In the early 1980s, GM divested itself, which led to GMI becoming a private, nonprofit university, but it was not until 1998 that the institution changed its name a final time to honor one of the founders of the institution, Charles Kettering, who was an early and strong proponent of professional education. Kettering University continued to evolve to meet the needs of a technology-infused and rapidly changing society, whether in the automotive industry or in science and business. This includes new projects such as the GM Mobility Research Center and ventures in autonomous vehicles as well as artificial intelligence.

In addition to their academic initiatives, Kettering University has consistently given back to the Flint community through service and community engagement. Kettering helped establish the University Avenue Corridor Coalition to beautify and draw investment to the area. Students continue to give back through community service, whether it is helping to clean up a yard or engineering a solution to aid the greater community. During the height of the Flint water crisis, when the community was in dire need of assistance, a group of Kettering’s engineering students took action and developed an adapter to allow water filters to be accommodated to all types of faucets.

Kettering University has become a hub of modernization and inventiveness, proven by their ranking as fourth in the country in producing alumni who hold patents. Kettering’s alumni have become leaders in a variety of fields and lead notable organizations ranging from the former chairman and CEO of Gibson Guitar, James McCaslin, former President and COO of Harley-Davidson, and the current president, Mr. Peter Kibbe.
Motor Company, and Mary Barra, current chairman and CEO of General Motors Corporation. Kettering’s graduates have reshaped industries and continue to do so today.

Throughout its 100-year history, Kettering University has fostered an environment of innovation, ingenuity, and community. The university is deeply rooted in the city of Flint and has been an indispensable partner in the city’s development and renewal. I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing this important part of the history of Kettering University as it celebrates its centennial.

RECOGNIZING THE AREA PROGRESS COUNCIL OF WARREN COUNTY

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the Area Progress Council of Warren, County, Ohio, in honor of their 50th anniversary.

The Area Progress Council, a non-profit, nonpartisan organization, was formally incorporated 50 years ago on September 30, 1969. The mission was and continues to be to plan and promote positive growth and development of Warren County, Ohio. It works with local, State, and Federal governments to promote representation of community interests, facilitates programs to promote current and future leaders, and supports initiatives to promote a positive and proactive climate for economic growth.

For example, Project Excellence Endowment, established in 1987, seeks to annually identify, recognize, and reward excellent public educators in Warren County. In addition, Leadership Warren County was developed in 2000 to create a dynamic network of informed decision-makers whose increased awareness and commitment to serve will energize its citizens to shape their county’s future.

APC has supported and collaborated with many organizations, including: Little Miami Conservancy (1967); Warren County Park District (1970); United Way of Warren County (1970); County Planner (1972); Warren County Career Center (1976); Ralph J. Stolle Countryside YMCA (1976); Warren County Big Brothers Big Sisters (1978); Wellhead and Aquifer Protection (1992-1994); Widening (1994-1999); Warren County College Task Force (2001-2003); establishment of Sinclair Mason Campus (2007); and Rachel A Hutzel Observatory project located at Camp Joy (2011).

Ongoing efforts include organizing the Annual Warren County Economic Outlook Breakfast, since 1983; hosting the State of the County, since 1990; and organizing the Columbus Excursion, since 2000, where a group of educators and business men and women travel to Columbus to meet with the directors of the Ohio Department of Education in the morning and State legislators in the afternoon.

I congratulate the Area Progress Council of Warren County on their 50th anniversary and thank them for the work they do for Ohioans.
in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 17, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2998. A communication from the Acting Director of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries Off the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Ocean perch in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area" (RIN0648–XG869) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 15, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2998. A communication from the Acting Director of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries Off the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Ocean perch in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area" (RIN0648–XG869) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 15, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2998. A communication from the Acting Director of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries Off the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Ocean perch in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area" (RIN0648–XG869) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 15, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2998. A communication from the Acting Director of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries Off the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Ocean perch in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area" (RIN0648–XG869) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 15, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2998. A communication from the Acting Director of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries Off the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Ocean perch in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area" (RIN0648–XG869) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 15, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.
the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 18, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3015. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; Various Transport Airplanes” (Docket No. FAA–2019–0444) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 17, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3016. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; Various Transport Airplanes” (Docket No. FAA–2019–0444) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 17, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3017. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone; Allegheny River, Mile 0 to Mile 3, Pittsburgh, PA” (Docket No. USCG–2019–0806) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 17, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3018. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone; San Jacinto River, Channelview, TX” (Docket No. USCG–2019–0571) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 17, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3020. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone for Fireworks Display; PasapSCO River, Inner Harbor, Baltimore, MD” (Docket No. USCG–2019–0571) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 17, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3021. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled Spec1ial Local Regulation; Gulf of Mexico, Fort Myers Beach, FL” (Docket No. USCG–2019–0979) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 17, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3022. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Iran that was declared in Executive Order 12170 on November 14, 1979; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3023. A communication from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Revisions to Prohibitions and Restrictions on Proprietary Trading and Certain Interests in, and Relationships with Hedged Funds and Private Equity Funds” (2019–010) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 22, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3024. A communication from the Board Members of the Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board’s 2019 Annual Report to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM–148. A resolution adopted by the City Council of Hialeah, Florida urging revaluation of an application for permanent resident status by the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS); to the Committee on Homeland Security.

POM–149. A petition from a citizen of the State of Texas relative to federal courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with amendments:


By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with amendments:

S. 1821. A bill to amend the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 to provide for research on, and the development and deployment of, marine energy, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 116–141).

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with amendments:

S. 1831. A bill to require the Administrator of the Western Area Power Administration to establish a pilot project to provide increased transparency for customers, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 116–142).

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with amendments:

S. 2317. A bill to promote energy savings in residential heating and industry, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 116–143).

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, without amendment:

S. 2333. A bill to provide for enhanced energy grid security (Rept. No. 116–144).

H.R. 1240. A bill to amend the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 to promote energy efficiency via information and computing technologies, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 116–145).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced:

Mr. BLOOMBERG: A bill to withdraw lands in the State of California, for the benefit of the United States.

Mr. BOOKER, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. REED, Ms. SMITH, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. KINZ: S. 266. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to clarify the obligation to report acts of foreign election interference and to require the heads of Federal departments and agencies to develop and report systems by Federal campaigns to detect and report such acts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Ms. SMITH (for herself, Ms. ROSEN, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 2670. A bill to award career pathways in manufacturing grants to local educational agencies and consortia of local educational agencies, to provide technical assistance within the Office of Career, Technical, and Adult Education to administer the grants and support the local educational agencies with the preparation of grant applications and management of grant funds, to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to support community college and industry partnerships, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. BLEMMENTHAL, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 2671. A bill to build safer, thriving communities, and save lives by investing in effective violence reduction initiatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAWELEY (for himself and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

S. 2672. A bill to require that the headquarters of certain Federal agencies and permanent duty stations of employees of certain Federal agencies be relocated in order to eliminate the opportunity for underground nuclear testing in community areas and to share the benefits of Federal employment with economically distressed areas; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Ms. MCALNEY, Ms. HIRONO, and Mrs. CAPRONI):

S. 2673. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for eating disorders treatment for members and certain former members of the uniformed services, and dependents of such members, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. CAPITO (for herself and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 2674. A bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to establish a grant program for water infrastructure development by small public water systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. BOOKER:

S. 2675. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to carry out activities relating to neglected diseases of poverty, to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MENENDEZ:

S. 2676. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for credit for employer-provided job training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 2677. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to address social isolation and loneliness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Mr. BRUN)

S. 2678. A bill to promote economic security and workplace accountability for the workers of air carriers, and their subcontractors; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.
RE: the determination of constitutional rights to an attorney and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 2680. A bill to impose sanctions with respect to foreign support for Palestinian terrorism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 2681. A bill to promote and ensure delivery of high-quality special education and related services to students with visual disabilities or who are deaf or hard of hearing, or who are deaf-blind through instructional methodologies meeting their unique learning needs, to enhance accountability for the provision of such services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 2682. A bill to amend the SOAR Act; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. BURR (for himself and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. 2683. A bill to require the Secretary of the Department of Veterans Affairs to carry out interprofessional geriatric education initiatives or who are deaf or hard of hearing or deaf-blind through instructional methodologies meeting their unique learning needs, to enhance accountability for the provision of such services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BOOKER:

S. 2684. A bill to require Community Development Block Grant recipients to develop a strategy to support inclusive zoning policies, to allow for a credit to support housing affordability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. 2685. A bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to require that a consumer authorize the release of certain information; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. GARDNER (for himself and Mr. COONS):

S. 2686. A bill to improve reporting of the distribution of controlled substances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. WICKER):

S. 2687. A bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to establish pilot programs to assist low-income households in maintaining access to sanitation services and drinking water, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 2688. A bill to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to establish an Office of Technology Transitions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BOOKER:

S. 2689. A bill to prohibit the use of biometric recognition technology and biometric analysis in certain federally assisted rental dwelling units, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. CORYN (for himself, Ms. MCSALLY, Ms. ERNST, Mr. TILLIS, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina):

S. 2690. A bill to reduce mass violence, strengthen mental health collaboration in communities, improve school safety, 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. COTTON (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. JONES, Mr. CRUZ, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. DUCKWORTH, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. COONS, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. CASEY):

S. Res. 374. A resolution expressing support for the designation of October 23, 2019, as a national day of remembrance of the tragic terrorist bombing of the United States Marine Corps barracks in Beirut, Lebanon, in 1983; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Mr. BROWN):

S. Res. 375. A resolution recognizing the 75th anniversary of the Warsaw Uprising; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. MENKHEY):

S. Con. Res. 28. A concurrent resolution congratulating the Portland Trail Blazers on their 50th anniversary of their inaugural season; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 299. At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 299, a bill to amend title VII of the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize programs that support interprofessional geriatric education and training to develop a geriatric-capable workforce, improving health outcomes for a growing and diverse aging American population and their families, and for other purposes.

S. 430. At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 430, a bill to extend the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000.

S. 509. At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 509, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the United States Coast Guard.

S. 518. At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 518, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for Medicare coverage of certain lymphedema compression treatment items as items of durable medical equipment.

S. 605. At the request of Ms. Klobuchar, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) and the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST) were added as cosponsors of S. 605, a bill to assist States in carrying out projects to expand the child care workforce and child care facilities in the States, and for other purposes.

S. 685. At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 685, a bill to amend the Inspector General Act of 1978 relative to the powers of the Director of Justice Inspector General.

S. 877. At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the names of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING), the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH), the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 877, a bill to prohibit the sale of shark fins, and for other purposes.

S. 1126. At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1126, a bill to provide better care for Americans living with Alzheimer’s disease and related dementias and their caregivers, while accelerating progress toward prevention strategies, disease modifying treatments, and, ultimately, a cure.

S. 1239. At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. Cramer) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1239, a bill to apply requirements relating to delivery sales of cigarettes to delivery sales of electronic nicotine delivery systems, and for other purposes.

S. 1273. At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1273, a bill to amend title 17, United States Code, to establish an alternative dispute resolution program for copyright small claims, and for other purposes.

S. 1282. At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1282, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal certain rules related to the determination of unrelated business taxable income.

S. 1390. At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ALBRIGHT), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURRI) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) were added as cosponsors.
of S. 1390, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint a coin in commemoration of the opening of the National Law Enforcement Museum in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

S. 1414
At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1414, a bill to provide bankruptcy relief for student borrowers.

S. 1421
At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1421, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the 23d Headquarters Special Troops and the 3133d Signal Service Company in recognition of their unique and distinguished service as a “Ghost Army” that conducted deception operations in Europe during World War II.

S. 1524
At the request of Ms. ERNST, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) and the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1524, a bill to provide for the overall health and well-being of young people, including the promotion of lifelong sexual health and healthy relationships, and for other purposes.

S. 1757
At the request of Ms. HARRIS, the name of the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1757, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the United States Army Rangers Veterans of World War II in recognition of their extraordinary service during World War II.

S. 1831
At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1831, a bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the distribution of 3D printer plans for the printing of firearms, and for other purposes.

S. 1835
At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1835, a bill to reauthorize the Assistive Technology Act of 1998, and for other purposes.

S. 1838
At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) were added as cosponsors of S. 1838, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 in order to increase the amount of financial support available for working students.

S. 2160
At the request of Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2160, a bill to require the Department of Health and Human Services with respect to heritable disorders.

S. 2216
At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2216, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to formally recognize caregivers of veterans, notify veterans and caregivers of clinical determinations relating to eligibility for caregiver programs, and temporarily extend benefits for veterans who are determined ineligible for the family caregiver program, and for other purposes.

S. 2400
At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2400, a bill to promote digital citizenship and media literacy.

S. 2407
At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2407, a bill to establish a program to award grants to entities that provide transportation to residents from critically underserved urban communities and rural communities to green spaces.

S. 2467
At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2467, a bill to prohibit Federal agencies from using Government funds to pay for expenses at lodging establishments that are owned by or employ certain public officials or their relatives.

S. 2491
At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2491, a bill to terminate certain rules issued by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Commerce relating to endangered and threatened species, and for other purposes.

S. 2593
At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2593, a joint resolution to amend title 31, United States Code, to provide for automatic continuing resolutions.

S. 2639
At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2639, a bill to restore integrity to America’s Election.

S. 2641
At the request of Mr. RISCH, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2641, a bill to promote United States national security and prevent the resurgence of ISIS, and for other purposes.

S. 2655
At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2655, a bill to amend title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 in order to increase the amount of financial support available for working students.

S.J. RES. 56
At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. Tester) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. RES. 56, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to “Borrower Defense Institutional Accountability”.

S.J. RES. 59
At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN), the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST), the Senator from New Jersey (Ms. ROSEN) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) were added as cosponsors of S.J. RES. 59, a joint resolution expressing the sense of Congress on the precipitous withdrawal of United States Armed Forces from Syria and Afghanistan, and Turkey’s unprompted incursion into Syria.

S. RES. 292
At the request of Mr. CARIDN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. RES. 292, a resolution calling on the Government of Cameroon and armed separatist groups to respect the human rights of all Cameroonians citizens, to end all violence, and to pursue an inclusive dialogue to resolve the conflict in the Northwest and Southwest regions.

S. RES. 303
At the request of Mr. HAWLEY, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) and the Senator from
Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 303, a resolution calling upon the leadership of the Government of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea to dismantle its kwan-li-so political prison labor camp system, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 949 intended to be proposed to H.R. 3055, a bill making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. 2690. A bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to require that a consumer authorize the release of certain information; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. REED. Today, I am joined by Senator VAN HOLLEN in reintroducing the Consumer Credit Control Act, which gives consumers greater control over when and how their consumer reports are shared by consumer reporting agencies.

Our current consumer reporting system is backwards. Consumer reporting agencies collect extensive amounts of personal information on consumers, often without their knowledge, in order to compile consumer reports. These reports are then shared with financial institutions and others, typically without consent.

Following Equifax’s failure in 2017 to secure troves of valuable personally identifiable information it collected on over 145 million Americans, it was evident that this system had to change. Indeed, the National Consumer Law Center’s Chi Chi Wu stated in her October 2017 testimony before the House Financial Services Committee that the Equifax breach “means half of the US population and nearly three-quarters of the consumers with active credit reports are now at risk of identity theft due to one of the worst—if not the worst—breaches of consumer data in American history. These Americans are at risk of having their Social Security numbers, dates of birth, spouses, and even financial information used to open accounts. Phony tax returns, and even spurious medical bills incurred in their good names.”

To make matters worse, the risks of identity fraud may not dissipate over time. As Ed Mierzwinski, U.S. PIRG’s federal Consumer Program Director, explains “unlike credit card numbers, your Social Security Number and Date of Birth don’t change and may even grow more valuable over time, like gold in a bank vault. Much worse, they are the keys to “new accounts” in your identity theft.”

The Consumer Credit Control Act attempts to address these concerns and fix the current upside down system. Our legislation, at no cost to the consumer, seeks to give Americans greater control over when and how their consumer reports are released when applying for new credit, a loan, or insurance. It also would require consumer reporting agencies to verify a consumer’s identity and secure their permission before releasing consumer reports in instances that are particularly vulnerable to identity theft and fraud. Additionally, our legislation compels every consumer reporting agency to take reasonable steps to prevent unauthorized access to the consumer reports and personal information they maintain. These changes are designed to make it tougher for criminals to fraudulently open new credit or insurance accounts in other peoples names.

I urge our colleagues to cosponsor this commonsense legislative effort, and I thank Senator VAN HOLLEN, the National Consumer Law Center (on behalf of its low-income clients), U.S. PIRG, Americans for Financial Reform, the Center for Digital Democracy, Consumer Action, the Consumer Federation of America, Consumer Reports, Demos, the NAACP, the National Association of Consumer Advocates, the National Fair Housing Alliance, Public Citizen, Tennessee Citizen Action, and the Woodstock Institute for their support.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Ms. MCSALLY, Ms. ERNST, Mr. TILLIS, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina):

S. 2690. A bill to reduce mass violence, strengthen mental health collaboration in communities, improve school safety, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, 2 months ago, Texans were mourning the loss of 22 of our people killed in a senseless attack in El Paso, TX. Little did we know that just days away from another violent attack, this time in Midland and Odessa, which took seven lives.

Visiting these communities in the wake of these tragedies is tough—something I have, unfortunately, had experience with following the 2017 shooting in Sutherland Springs and, again, in 2018 in Santa Fe High School. There are no words to bring comfort to the families and the friends and the community members who were shaken to their very core by these sudden and unwarranted acts of violence.

But as I visited with the families and offered my condolences following each of these attacks, there was one common refrain, one common request: Please do something. Now, if I knew of a way to introduce and pass legislation that could stop these types of criminal acts from occurring, I guarantee we could pass it with 100 percent of the Senate and 435 Members of the House, if there was a way that would sign it. But that, unfortunately, is not the human condition. Unfortunately, there is no quick fix, no simple answer. Instead, we are left to look at the factors that led to these attacks and to try to do something to prevent the sequence of events from playing out again in the future.

Following the shooting in Sutherland Springs, we quickly discussed the facts about the shooter and how he obtained his weapons. He had a history of violence and a criminal conviction that should have prevented him from ever purchasing a firearm. But this information was never uploaded into the background check system by the FBI. As a result, the shooter was able to purchase four firearms, three of which were used in the attack. He shouldn’t have been able to do that.

Every time something like this happens, it is only natural to say: What if? What if those convictions had been uploaded? What if he wasn’t able to purchase those firearms? Could we have stopped this terrible loss of life?

My goal then, as it is now, is to do everything I can to ensure those questions don’t have to be asked again.

Ten days after the Sutherland Springs shooting, I introduced a piece of legislation called Fix NICS—Fix the National Instant Criminal Background Check System. The Fix NICS Act compels government agencies to submit relevant evidence. We worked hard on it over a long period of time, and it passed with more than 70 Senate bipartisan cosponsors.

What is the result of the Fix NICS bill we passed in the wake of Sutherland Springs? We now know that the Federal Government has increased its record submissions to the background check system by 400 percent—a 400 percent increase in the background check system. That means if somebody is dishonestly discharged from the military, if somebody has been convicted of domestic violence, violated a protective order, or convicted of any felony, the background check system is much more likely to have that derogatory information in it, and the seller will not sell that firearm. Because of this legislation, our Federal background databases are becoming stronger and better by the day and preventing more criminals from getting their hands on deadly weapons that are already prohibited by existing law.

But it is time once again to revisit this way we might reduce the loss of life, the way we might be able to reduce these mass violence episodes from occurring in our country in the future.

Today, I am introducing the Restoring, Enhancing, Strengthening, and Promoting Our Nation’s Safety Efforts—or the RESPONSE Act, as we call it. Just as Fix NICS did, this bill addresses specific problems to try to prevent attacks and make our communities safer.

First, this legislation takes aim at unlicensed firearms dealers who are known as "soil dealers". In the months after the Midland-Odessa shooting, we learned that the shooter failed a background check when he attempted to
The RESPONSE Act includes provisions to help identify students whose behavior indicates a threat of violence and then provide the student with the appropriate services they may need not to be a danger to themselves or others. By promoting best practices within our schools, as well as internet safety policies, we can help protect both students and school faculty and provide parents with a little peace of mind.

Finally, because so often these shooters advertise on social media or cry out for attention to law enforcement or other people ahead of time, this legislation includes provisions to ensure law enforcement can receive timely information about potential threats made online. Online providers and platforms have the ability to share information with law enforcement today during emergencies. And in the fight against child abuse, the RESPONSE Act would expand the scope of information they can share to include information about potential acts of mass violence or self-harm or hate crimes or acts of domestic terrorism.

The RESPONSE Act has been endorsed already by a number of law enforcement and mental health organizations, including the National Council for Behavioral Health, National Alliance on Mental Illness, the National District Attorneys Association, Fraternal Order of Police, and a number of others.

I am glad to say it also has received support already—even though we are only introducing it today—from a number of our colleagues here: Senators McSally, Tillis, Ernst, Capito, and Senator Tim Scott. I hope we can work together to build a big bipartisan list of our friends and neighbors in countless ways and, I believe, make our communities safer.

Third, the RESPONSE Act seeks to increase the safety of our students. I have heard from countless parents—no doubt, the Presiding Officer has too—that parents literally are in fear of sending their children to school, not knowing whether they may be victimized by one of these senseless attacks, especially in the aftermath of Santa Fe and Parkland High School. Parents are rightfully concerned about sending their kids to school, and they should not have to live with that.

So, to prevent unlicensed dealers from continuing to break the law, the RESPONSE Act creates a nationwide task force to investigate and prosecute those individuals. The task force will focus on those who are illegally selling firearms, as well as those attempting to buy firearms who provide false statements as part of the background check.

While preventing unlicensed dealers from selling weapons without appropriate background checks is an important way to reduce violence, it is only one of many we have to adopt that isn’t one single solution. It is multifactorial. There are multiple things we can and should do.

The second major piece of this legislation improves the quality and availability of mental health care. I asked the Odessa police chief following the shooting in Midland-Odessa: What is it you think we might have been able to do? He said: Well, we need better access to mental health diagnoses and treatment.

We clearly need to do more to identify and support struggling individuals who could pose a danger to themselves and to others. We know for a fact that the majority of gun deaths are suicides, self-inflicted. While mental illness is not the prevailing cause of mass violence, enhanced mental health resources, I believe, are critical to saving lives. The RESPONSE Act includes a range of measures, such as expanding mental health crisis intervention teams, improving coordination between mental health providers and law enforcement, and bolstering the mental health workforce.

Importantly, this bill expands something called assisted outpatient treatment programs, or AOTs. This is something we passed as part of the 21st Century Cures Act, my Mental Health and Safe Communities Act to help focus on, as a priority, pilot projects of these assisted treatment programs. Here we seek to expand them further based on the proven success. AOTs, or assisted outpatient treatment, provide families of individuals with mental illness an opportunity to get treatment for their loved one in their community, rather than in an institution. Making mental health resources more accessible will serve our most vulnerable friends and neighbors in countless ways and, I believe, make our communities safer.

Submit an answer.
Warsaw Uprising, a landmark event during World War II, in which brave citizens of Poland revolted against the German Nazi occupation of the city of Warsaw in the face of daunting and seemingly insurmountable odds; 

Whereas the Warsaw Uprising, which was part of a nationwide resistance against the German Nazi occupation of Poland, which lasted for 63 days, was started by the Polish Home Army, the underground resistance effort that included many young and brave individuals; 

Whereas the Warsaw Uprising occurred just over a year after the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising, which was the single largest act of Jewish resistance against forces of Nazi Germany; 

Whereas, after the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising, the remaining Jewish Poles from Warsaw were sent to Treblinka, the killing center and labor camp, and murdered; 

Whereas, beginning August 1, 1944, the Polish Home Army fought against the German Nazi occupation of Warsaw, using mostly homemade weapons and far outnumbered by the overwhelming German Nazi force, at a cost of 200,000 Polish civilians and 20,000 citizens of Poland killed, wounded, or missing; 

Whereas Adolf Hitler ordered the annihilation of the city of Warsaw and the extermination of its population, no punishment; the uprising, decimating 80 percent of Warsaw with no regard for the lives of the citizens of Warsaw and the rich heritage of historic architecture in Warsaw; 

Whereas a Soviet-led army halted its march toward the city of Berlin at the banks of the Vistula River on the specific orders of Stalin to allow the German Nazis to decimate the Poles; 

Whereas, throughout the Warsaw Uprising, many of the city of Warsaw, remained in hiding, or were wounded or killed, and the surviving population of Warsaw, which once totaled more than 1,300,000 people, was then sent to prisoner of war camps and endured harsh conditions; 

Whereas, after World War II, thousands of Polish refugees fled from Poland due to persecution and came to the United States for safety, security, and new opportunities; 

Whereas the deep, rich history and traditions of immigrants from Poland who settled in the United States, particularly in the States of Ohio, New York, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Illinois, and Wisconsin, have undeniably shaped the social fabric and foundation of the United States; 

Whereas, in the 20th century, Cleveland, Ohio; Buffalo, New York; Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; Milwaukee, Wisconsin; Detroit, Michigan; and Chicago, Illinois; served as the major epicenters for immigrants and workers from Poland whose remarkable contributions to the American industry led to the incorporation of new towns and the subsequent growth of those towns; 

Whereas the heroic actions of the Polish underground during World War II and the brave citizenry of Poland provide a valuable lesson in perseverance and patriotism; 

Whereas the legacy of the Warsaw Uprising serves as one of the most poignant reminders of the human cost of the Allied war effort during World War II to defeat Adolf Hitler and the German Nazis; and 

Whereas the bravery demonstrated by the citizens of Poland during the Warsaw Uprising continues to inspire people throughout the world who are subjected to tyranny and oppression and who join the fight for freedom, democracy, and the pursuit of liberty; Now, therefore, be it 

Resolved by the Senate— 

(1) recognizes the 75th anniversary of the Warsaw Uprising; 

(2) commends the bravery, heroism, and patriotism of the individuals who fought as part of the Polish Home Army in order to liberate Poland from German Nazi occupation; and 

(3) honors the memory of the soldiers and civilians whose lives were lost during the fighting, and the individuals who suffered in concentration camps and death camps during World War II and the Holocaust; 

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 28—CONGRATULATING THE PORTLAND TRAIL BLAZERS ON THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THEIR INAUGURAL SEASON 

Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: 

S. CON. RES. 28 

Whereas the Portland Trail Blazers have proudly and energetically represented Oregon’s pioneering spirit on the national basketball stage since 1970; 

Whereas the team’s signature phrase “Rip City,” coined by long-time announcer Bill Schonely, has come to represent the city of Portland and Trail Blazers fans throughout Oregon; 

Whereas dedicated administrators Harry Glickman and Larry Weinberg worked behind the scenes to establish a sustainable and beloved franchise; 

Whereas the Blazers, as they are known, won their first National Basketball Association title in 1977; 

Whereas Bill Walton, colorful personality and backbone of the franchise, was named Most Valuable Player for the NBA Finals that year, and won the NBA League MVP Award in 1978; 

Whereas the Blazers and their fans own the longest ever streak of consecutive sell-out NBA games, at 1,070; 

Whereas history-making players including Geoff Petrie, Clyde Drexler, Terry Porter, and Arvydas Sabonis powered the Blazers through the first quarter century of their existence; 

Whereas 21 consecutive playoff appearances (1983 to 2003) by the Blazers ranks 2nd all-time in NBA history; 

Whereas Blazers Brandon Roy and Rasheed Wallace represented Oregon nationally as All-Stars in 2008 and 2001, respectively, demonstrating that the talent of the Blazers had not waned; 

Whereas Damian Lillard and Brandon Roy blazed into their NBA careers with Rookie of the Year honors in 2012 and 2006, respectively, representing Portland as a hub for dedicated basketball stars; 

Whereas Damian Lillard and his outstanding teammates have led this franchise back into the realm of deep playoff runs, including last year’s strong showing in the Western Conference Finals; 

Whereas the owner and benefactor of the Blazers for 30 years, Paul Allen, is deeply missed after his death on October 18, 2018; and 

Whereas the Portland Trail Blazers have brought Oregonians together for 50 years, each year generating as much excitement, hope, and promise as the first year: Now, therefore, be it 

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress— 

(1) recognizes the Portland Trail Blazers for embodying the spirit and tradition of Oregon; 

(2) congratulates all players, administrators, and fans of the Portland Trail Blazers for half a century of dedication to the sport and franchise; 

(3) joins Oregonians and Blazers fans everywhere to celebrate Rip City’s 50th anniversary; and 

(4) directs the Clerk of the Senate to produce copies of this resolution for the Portland Trail Blazers team members, staff, and management. 

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED 

SA 967. Ms. ROSEN (for herself and Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELYI to the bill H.R. 3055, making appropriations for Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table. 

SA 968. Ms. ROSEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELYI to the bill H.R. 3055, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table. 

SA 969. Ms. ROSEN (for herself and Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELYI to the bill H.R. 3055, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table. 

SA 970. Ms. ROSEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELYI to the bill H.R. 3055, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table. 

SA 971. Ms. ERNST submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELYI to the bill H.R. 3055, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table. 

SA 972. Ms. ERNST (for herself and Mr. GRAHAM) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELYI to the bill H.R. 3055, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table. 

SA 973. Ms. ERNST submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELYI to the bill H.R. 3055, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table. 

SA 974. Ms. ERNST submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELYI to the bill H.R. 3055, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table. 

SA 975. Ms. ERNST submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELYI to the bill H.R. 3055, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table. 

SA 976. Ms. ERNST submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELYI to the bill H.R. 3055, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table. 

SA 977. Ms. ERNST submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELYI to the bill H.R. 3055, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table. 

SA 978. Ms. ERNST submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELYI to the bill H.R. 3055, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table. 

SA 979. Mr. MURPHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELYI to the bill H.R. 3055, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table. 

SA 980. Mr. MURPHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELYI to the bill H.R. 3055, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table.
SA 998. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELEY to the bill H.R. 3055, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 999. Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. RISCH, Mr. CRAPO, and Mr. MERKLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELEY to the bill H.R. 3055, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1000. Mr. REED submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELEY to the bill H.R. 3055, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1001. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELEY to the bill H.R. 3055, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1002. Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. REID) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELEY to the bill H.R. 3055, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1003. Ms. CANTWELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELEY to the bill H.R. 3055, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1004. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELEY to the bill H.R. 3055, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1005. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELEY to the bill H.R. 3055, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1006. Ms. ROSEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELEY to the bill H.R. 3055, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1007. Ms. ROSEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELEY to the bill H.R. 3055, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1008. Ms. ROSEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELEY to the bill H.R. 3055, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1009. Ms. ROSEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELEY to the bill H.R. 3055, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1010. Mr. KAIN (for himself, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. RISCH, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELEY to the bill H.R. 3055, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1011. Mr. JONES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELEY to the bill H.R. 3055, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1012. Mr. KAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELEY to the bill H.R. 3055, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1013. Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, and Mr. DURBIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELEY to the bill H.R. 3055, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1014. Mr. CASSIDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELEY to the bill H.R. 3055, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1015. Mrs. FEINSTEIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELEY to the bill H.R. 3055, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1016. Mrs. FEINSTEIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELEY to the bill H.R. 3055, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1017. Mrs. FEINSTEIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELEY to the bill H.R. 3055, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1018. Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. CHAMBER, and Ms. SMITH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELEY to the bill H.R. 3055, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1019. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELEY to the bill H.R. 3055, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1020. Ms. MUKROWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELEY to the bill H.R. 3055, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1021. Mr. SCOTT, of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. SMITH, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. VAN HOLLLEN, Mr. PKEUR, and Mr. JONES) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELEY to the bill H.R. 3055, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1022. Mrs. FEINSTEIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELEY to the bill H.R. 3055, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1023. Ms. SMITH (for herself, Mrs. ROUNDS, Mrs. MURRAY, and Mrs. SHAHEEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELEY to the bill H.R. 3055, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1024. Ms. SMITH (for herself and Mrs. SHAHEEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELEY to the bill H.R. 3055, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1025. Ms. SMITH (for herself, Mrs. ROUNDS, Mrs. MURRAY, and Mrs. SHAHEEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELEY to the bill H.R. 3055, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1026. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELEY to the bill H.R. 3055, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.
H.R. 3055, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1032. Ms. BALDWIN (for herself and Mr. MORAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1033. Mr. BURKHARDT (for himself and Mr. BURKHARDT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. BURKHARDT to the bill H.R. 3055, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1034. Mr. BARRASSO (for himself and Mr. CARPER, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. CARDIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1035. Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1036. Ms. SMITH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1037. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1038. Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1039. Mr. Kaine submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1040. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1041. Ms. SMITH (for herself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. Van HOLLLEN, Mr. Kaine, Mr. Warner, and Mr. Cardin) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1042. Ms. DUCKWORTH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1043. Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1044. Ms. SMITH (for herself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. Van HOLLLEN, Mr. Kaine, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. CARDIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1045. Mr. HEINRICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1046. Mr. HEINRICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1047. Mr. TOOMEEY (for himself and Mr. COONS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1048. Mrs. GILLIBRAND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1049. Ms. KLOBUCHAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1050. Ms. KLOBUCHAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1051. Mrs. FEINSTEIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1052. Ms. FEINSTEIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1053. Mrs. FEINSTEIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1054. Mrs. FEINSTEIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1055. Mrs. FEINSTEIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1056. Mrs. FEINSTEIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1057. Mrs. FEINSTEIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1058. Mrs. FEINSTEIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1059. Mrs. FEINSTEIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1060. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1061. Ms. CORTEZ MASTO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1062. Ms. CORTEZ MASTO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1063. Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself and Mr. PORTMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1064. Ms. CORTEZ MASTO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1065. Mr. INHOFE (for himself and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1066. Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3055, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 968. Ms. ROSEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title IV of division C, insert the following:

PROHIBITION OF USE OF FUNDS TO DIVERT FUNDS FROM THE SOUTHERN NEVADA PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT ACT

SEC. 4. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to rescind or divert funds from the special account established under section 4(e)(1)(C) of the Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act of 1998 (Public Law 105-263; 111 Stat. 2345) for any purpose not authorized under that Act.

SA 969. Ms. ROSEN (for herself and Mr. CORTEZ MASTO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title II of division D, insert the following:

SEC. 2. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the amount made available for the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation under the heading ‘‘PAYMENT TO THE NEIGHBORHOOD REINVESTMENT CORPORATION’’ under the heading ‘‘ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT OFFICES’’ under title III of this division shall be increased by $2,000,000.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the amount made available for the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation under title III of this division shall be decreased by $2,000,000.

SA 970. Ms. ROSEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 230, line 17, strike ‘‘$1,357,182,000’’ and insert ‘‘$1,357,182,000’’.

On page 233, line 9, strike ‘‘$136,244,000’’ and insert ‘‘$135,244,000’’.
SA 971. Ms. ERNST submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 101, lines 12 and 13, strike "$31,114,000" and insert "$30,114,000".

SA 972. Ms. ERNST (for herself and Mr. GRASSLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title II of division D, insert the following:


(a) by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

"(1) an item presented as an honorary or informal recognition award; or"

(b) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

"(2) shall be required absorb and receive the portable family by the end of the calendar year in which the portable family seeks to use the voucher;"

(c) by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

"(3) shall make assistance payments to the portable family under an annual contribution contract entered into between the covered public housing agency and the Secretary;"

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 3. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), none of the funds appropriated under this Act or any other Act may be used to—

(1) purchase, acquire, or distribute extraneous promotional items, including blankets, buttons, coloring books, cups, decals, fidget spinners, hats, holiday ornaments, jar grip openers, keychains, koozies, magnets, neckties, novelties, snuggies, stickers, stress balls, stuffed animals, tchotchkes, thermoses, tote bags, trading cards, or writing utensils; or

(2) manufacture or use a mascot or co-branded character to promote an agency, program, or agenda.

(b) The prohibition in subsection (a) shall not apply to the use of funds for—

(1) an item presented as an honorary or informal recognition award; or

(2) an item—

(A) used for recruitment for enlistment or employment with the Armed Forces; or

(B) used for recruitment for employment with the Federal Government; or

(C) distributed for diplomatic purposes, including gifts for foreign leaders.

SA 974. Ms. ERNST submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 4. (a) Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall submit to Congress and post on the website of the Office of Management and Budget a report on each project funded by an agency that is appropriated funds under this Act—

(1) that is more than 5 years behind schedule; or

(2) for which the amount spent on the project is not less than $1,000,000,000 more than the original cost estimate for the project.

(b) Each report submitted and posted under subsection (a) shall include, for each project included in the report—

(1) a brief description of the project, including—

(A) the purpose of the project;

(B) each location in which the project is carried out;

(C) the year in which the project was initiated;

(D) the Federal share of the total cost of the project; and

(E) each primary contractor, subcontractor, grant recipient, and subrecipient recipient of the project;

(2) an explanation of any change to the original scope of the project, including by the addition or narrowing of the initial requirements of the project;

(3) the original expected date for completion of the project;

(4) the current expected date for completion of the project; and

(5) the original cost estimate for the project, as adjusted to reflect increases in the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers, as published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics;

(6) the current cost estimate for the project, as adjusted to reflect increases in the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers, as published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics;

(7) an explanation for a delay in completion or increase in the original cost estimate for the project; and

(8) the amount of and rationale for any award, incentive fee, or other type of bonus, if any, awarded for the project.

SA 975. Ms. ERNST submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title IV of division D, insert the following:

SEC. 4. When issuing statements, press releases, requests for proposals, bid solicitations and other documents describing projects or programs funded in whole or in part with Federal money, all grantees receiving Federal funds included in this Act, including State and local governmental and recipients of Federal research grants, shall clearly state—

(1) the percentage of the total costs of the program or project which will be financed with Federal money;

(2) the dollar amount of Federal funds for the program or project; and

(3) percentage and dollar amount of the total costs of the project or program that will be financed by non-governmental sources.

SA 976. Ms. ERNST submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 4. Notwithstanding section 2, none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available under any provision of this Act may be used by a Federal agency to purchase information technology items produced by a Chinese-owned company for which a Federal agency has issued a warning about known cybersecurity risks.

SA 977. Ms. ERNST submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 345, strike lines 13 through 15.

SA 978. Ms. ERNST submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for
other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 419 of division D, strike “this Act” and insert “this division or divisions B, C, or D of this Act”.

SA 979. Mr. MURPHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHEELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 231, line 15, strike “$56,770,000” and insert “$56,270,000”.

On page 231, line 20, strike the period at the end and insert “: Provided further, That $10,000,000 of the amount made available under this heading shall be available for grants under the Highlands Conservation Act (Public Law 106–421; 118 Stat. 2375).”.

On page 263, line 9, strike “$136,244,000” and insert “$127,744,000”.

SA 980. Mr. MURPHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHEELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 231, line 15, strike “$56,770,000” and insert “$56,270,000”.

On page 231, line 20, strike the period at the end and insert “: Provided further, That $10,000,000 of the amount made available under this heading shall be available for grants under the Highlands Conservation Act (Public Law 106–421; 118 Stat. 2375).”.

On page 263, line 9, strike “$136,244,000” and insert “$127,744,000”.

SA 981. Mr. BENNET (for himself, Mr. KING, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. WAR-NER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHEELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

Subtitle B—Colorado Outdoor Recreation and Economy

SEC. 131. SHORT TITLE. This subtitle may be cited as the “Colorado Outdoor Recreation and Economy Act”.

SEC. 132. DEFINITION OF STATE. In this subtitle, the term “State” means the State of Colorado.

PART II—CONCEPTUAL DIVIDE

SEC. 141. DEFINITIONS. In this part:

(1) COVERED AREA.—The term “covered area” means any area designated as wilderness by the amendments to section 1 of the Wilderness Act of 1964 (16 U.S.C. 1132) made by Public Law 103–77 and Public Law 103–103, as applicable.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law (other than section 908 of the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7207), as amended by subsection (c)), a person subject to the jurisdiction of the United States may provide payment or financing terms for sales of agricultural commodities to Cuba or an individual or entity in Cuba.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY.—The term “agricultural commodity” has the meaning given that term in section 102 of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 (7 U.S.C. 5602).

(2) FINANCING.—The term “financing” includes the provision of credit.

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 908 of the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7207) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by striking “AND FINANCING” and inserting “AND FINANCING”;

(2) by striking subsection (b); and

(3) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “PROHIBITION” and all that follows through “1) in the section heading,” and inserting “IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding”;

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as subsections (b) and (c), respectively, and moving those subsections, as so redesignated, 2 ems to the left; and

(C) by striking “paragraph (1)” each place it appears and inserting “subsection (a)”.

SEC. 142. COLORADO WILDERNESS ADDITIONS. (a) DESIGNATION.—Section 2(a) of the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1964 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; Public Law 103–77) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “1993,” and inserting “1993, and certain Federal land within the White River National Forest that comprises approximately 6,896 acres, as generally depicted as ‘Proposed Ptarmigan Peak Wilderness Additions’ on the map entitled ‘Proposed Ptarmigan Peak Wilderness Additions’ and dated June 24, 2019,”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(23) HOOLY CROSS WILDERNESS ADDITION.—Certain Federal land within the White River National Forest that comprises approximately 8,036 acres and generally depicted as ‘Proposed Williams Fork Mountains Wilderness’ on the map entitled ‘Williams Fork Mountains Wilderness Proposal’ and dated June 24, 2019, is designated as a potential wilderness area.

(b) MANAGEMENT.—Subject to valid existing rights and except as provided in subsection (a), the potential wilderness area designated by subsection (a) shall be managed as part of the Holy Cross Wilderness designated by section 102(a)(5) of Public Law 96–560 (94 Stat. 3266).

(24) HOUSE RIDE WILDERNESS.—Certain Federal land within the White River National Forest that comprises approximately 5,235 acres, as generally depicted as ‘Proposed Hoosier Ridge Wilderness’ on the map entitled ‘Proposed Hoosier Ridge Wilderness Proposal’ and dated June 24, 2019, which shall be known as the ‘Hoosier Ridge Wilderness’.

(25) TENMILE WILDERNESS.—Certain Federal land within the White River National Forest that comprises approximately 7,624 acres, as generally depicted as ‘Proposed Tenmile Wilderness’ on the map entitled ‘Tenmile Proposal’ and dated June 24, 2019, which shall be known as the ‘Tenmile Wilderness’.

(26) EAGLES NEST WILDERNESS ADDITIONS.—Certain Federal land within the White River National Forest that comprises approximately 9,670 acres, as generally depicted as ‘Proposed Freeman Creek Wilderness Additions’ and dated June 24, 2019, which shall be incorporated into, and managed as part of, the Eagles Nest Wilderness designated by Public Law 94–352 (90 Stat. 870).

(b) APPLICABLE LAW.—Any reference in the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.) to the effective date of that Act shall be considered to be a reference to the date of enactment of this Act for purposes of administering a covered area.

(c) FIRE, INSECTS, AND DISEASES.—In accordance with section 4(d)(1) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(1)), the Secretary may carry out any activity in a covered area that the Secretary determines to be necessary for the control of fire, insects, and diseases, subject to the conditions as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

(d) GRAZING.—The grazing of livestock on a covered area, if established before the date of enactment of this Act, shall be permitted to continue subject to such reasonable regulations as the Secretary, in accordance with—

(1) section 4(d)(4) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(4)); and

(2) the guidelines set forth in Appendix A of the report of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives accompanying H.R. 2570 of the 106th Congress (H. Rept. 106–116).

(e) COORDINATION.—For purposes of administering the Federal land designated as wilderness by paragraph (26) of section 2(a) of the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1964 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; Public Law 103–77) (as added by subsection (a)(2)), the Secretary shall, as determined to be appropriate for the protection of watersheds, coordinate the activities of the Secretary in response to fires and flooding events with interested State and local agencies, including operations using aircraft or mechanized equipment.
SEC. 144. TENMILE RECREATION MANAGEMENT AREA.

(a) DESIGNATION.—Subject to valid existing rights, the approximately 8,297 acres of Federal land located in the White River National Forest, as generally depicted as the "Porcupine Gulch Wildlife Conservation Area" on the map entitled "Porcupine Gulch Wildlife Conservation Area Proposal" and dated June 24, 2019, are designated as the "Porcupine Gulch Wildlife Conservation Area" (referred to in this section as the "Wildlife Conservation Area").

(b) USES.—The purposes of the Wildlife Conservation Area shall be—

(1) to provide for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations the recreational, scenic, watershed, habitat, and ecological resources of the Recreation Management Area;

(2) to conserve and protect a wildlife migration corridor over Interstate 70; and

(3) to conserve, protect, and enhance the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations the wildlife, scenic, roadless, watershed, and ecological resources of the Wildlife Conservation Area.

(c) MANAGEMENT.—Except as provided in subsection (a), the Secretary shall manage the Wildlife Conservation Area in a manner that conserves, protects, and enhances the purposes described in subsection (b); and

(d) WATER.—Nothing in this section affects the designation of the Federal land within the Recreation Management Area for purposes of—

(1) federal transportation projects; and

(2) any other applicable laws (including regulations), the purposes described in subsection (c) of title 49, United States Code.

SEC. 145. TENMILE RECREATION MANAGEMENT AREA.

(a) DESIGNATION.—Subject to valid existing rights, the approximately 17,122 acres of Federal land in the White River National Forest in the State, as generally depicted as "Proposed Recreation Management Area" on the map entitled "Tennmile Propos" and dated June 24, 2019, are designated as the "Tennmile Recreation Management Area".

(b) USES.—The purposes of the Recreation Management Area are to conserve, protect, and enhance for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations the recreational, scenic, watershed, habitat, and ecological resources of the Recreation Management Area.

(c) MANAGEMENT.—Except as provided in clause (i), the Secretary shall manage the Recreation Management Area in a manner that conserves, protects, and enhances—

(i) the purposes of the Recreation Management Area described in subsection (b); and

(ii) recreation opportunities, including mountain biking, hiking, fishing, horseback riding, snowshoeing, climbing, skiing, camping, and hunting.

(d) FIRE, INSECTS, AND DISEASES.—The Secretary shall regulate the use of fire, insects, and disease within the Recreation Management Area in a manner that conserves, protects, and enhances the purposes described in subsection (b).

(e) WATER.—Nothing in this section affects the designation of the Federal land within the Recreation Management Area for purposes of—

(1) federal transportation projects; and

(2) any other applicable laws (including regulations), the purposes described in subsection (c) of title 49, United States Code.

SEC. 146. TENMILE RECREATION MANAGEMENT AREA.

(a) DESIGNATION.—Subject to valid existing rights, the approximately 180 days after the date of enactment this section the Secretary shall designate an area described by subsection (a) shall be designated as the "Tenmile Recreation Management Area." The term "Tenmile Recreation Management Area" includes the vacant allotments referred to in paragraph.

(b) USES.—The purposes of the Secretary to authorize livestock grazing or other use by livestock is published under paragraph (1), if applicable, the Secretary shall grant a permit or other authorization for that livestock grazing or other use in accordance with applicable laws (including regulations).

(c) MANAGEMENT.—Except as provided in clause (i), the Secretary shall manage the Tenmile Recreation Management Area in a manner that conserves, protects, and enhances—

(i) the purposes of the Recreation Management Area described in subsection (b); and

(ii) recreation opportunities, including mountain biking, hiking, fishing, horseback riding, snowshoeing, climbing, skiing, camping, and hunting.

(d) TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.—The authority provided by this subsection terminates on the later of—

(1) the date described in subsection (d)(2); or

(2) the date described in subsection (b).

(e) WATER.—Nothing in this section affects the designation of the Federal land within the Recreation Management Area for purposes of—

(1) the purposes of the Recreation Management Area described in subsection (b); and

(2) any other applicable laws (including regulations), the purposes described in subsection (c) of title 49, United States Code.

(f) APPLICABLE LAW.—Nothing in this section affects the purposes described in subsection (b); and

(2) any other applicable laws (including regulations), the purposes described in subsection (c) of title 49, United States Code.

(g) APPLICABLE LAW.—Nothing in this section affects the purposes described in subsection (b); and

(2) any other applicable laws (including regulations), the purposes described in subsection (c) of title 49, United States Code.

(h) APPLICABLE LAW.—Nothing in this section affects the purposes described in subsection (b); and

(2) any other applicable laws (including regulations), the purposes described in subsection (c) of title 49, United States Code.

(i) APPLICABLE LAW.—Nothing in this section affects the purposes described in subsection (b); and

(2) any other applicable laws (including regulations), the purposes described in subsection (c) of title 49, United States Code.

(j) APPLICABLE LAW.—Nothing in this section affects the purposes described in subsection (b); and

(2) any other applicable laws (including regulations), the purposes described in subsection (c) of title 49, United States Code.

(k) APPLICABLE LAW.—Nothing in this section affects the purposes described in subsection (b); and

(2) any other applicable laws (including regulations), the purposes described in subsection (c) of title 49, United States Code.

(l) APPLICABLE LAW.—Nothing in this section affects the purposes described in subsection (b); and

(2) any other applicable laws (including regulations), the purposes described in subsection (c) of title 49, United States Code.

(m) APPLICABLE LAW.—Nothing in this section affects the purposes described in subsection (b); and

(2) any other applicable laws (including regulations), the purposes described in subsection (c) of title 49, United States Code.

(n) APPLICABLE LAW.—Nothing in this section affects the purposes described in subsection (b); and

(2) any other applicable laws (including regulations), the purposes described in subsection (c) of title 49, United States Code.

(o) APPLICABLE LAW.—Nothing in this section affects the purposes described in subsection (b); and

(2) any other applicable laws (including regulations), the purposes described in subsection (c) of title 49, United States Code.

(p) APPLICABLE LAW.—Nothing in this section affects the purposes described in subsection (b); and

(2) any other applicable laws (including regulations), the purposes described in subsection (c) of title 49, United States Code.

(q) APPLICABLE LAW.—Nothing in this section affects the purposes described in subsection (b); and

(2) any other applicable laws (including regulations), the purposes described in subsection (c) of title 49, United States Code.

(r) APPLICABLE LAW.—Nothing in this section affects the purposes described in subsection (b); and

(2) any other applicable laws (including regulations), the purposes described in subsection (c) of title 49, United States Code.

(s) APPLICABLE LAW.—Nothing in this section affects the purposes described in subsection (b); and

(2) any other applicable laws (including regulations), the purposes described in subsection (c) of title 49, United States Code.

(t) APPLICABLE LAW.—Nothing in this section affects the purposes described in subsection (b); and

(2) any other applicable laws (including regulations), the purposes described in subsection (c) of title 49, United States Code.

(u) APPLICABLE LAW.—Nothing in this section affects the purposes described in subsection (b); and

(2) any other applicable laws (including regulations), the purposes described in subsection (c) of title 49, United States Code.

(v) APPLICABLE LAW.—Nothing in this section affects the purposes described in subsection (b); and

(2) any other applicable laws (including regulations), the purposes described in subsection (c) of title 49, United States Code.

(w) APPLICABLE LAW.—Nothing in this section affects the purposes described in subsection (b); and

(2) any other applicable laws (including regulations), the purposes described in subsection (c) of title 49, United States Code.

(x) APPLICABLE LAW.—Nothing in this section affects the purposes described in subsection (b); and

(2) any other applicable laws (including regulations), the purposes described in subsection (c) of title 49, United States Code.

(y) APPLICABLE LAW.—Nothing in this section affects the purposes described in subsection (b); and

(2) any other applicable laws (including regulations), the purposes described in subsection (c) of title 49, United States Code.

(z) APPLICABLE LAW.—Nothing in this section affects the purposes described in subsection (b); and

(2) any other applicable laws (including regulations), the purposes described in subsection (c) of title 49, United States Code.
(ii) NEW OR TEMPORARY ROADS.—Except as provided in clause (iii) and subsection (e), no new or temporary road shall be constructed within the Wildlife Conservation Area.

(c) EXCEPTIONS.—Nothing in clause (i) or (ii) prevents the Secretary from—

(A) authorizing the use of motorized vehicles or mechanized transport for administrative purposes;

(B) constructing temporary roads or permitting the use of motorized vehicles or mechanized transport to carry out pre- or post-fire, insect, or disease protection projects;

(C) authorizing the use of motorized vehicles or mechanized transport to carry out activities described in subsection (d) or (e); or

(D) responding to an emergency.

(iii) COMMERCIAL TIMBER.—

(1) A regional transportation project, consistent with—

(A) highway widening or realignment; and

(B) construction of multimodal transport systems; or

(2) any infrastructure, activity, or safety measure associated with the implementation or use of a facility constructed under paragraph (1).

(ii) APPLICABLE LAW.—Nothing in this section affects the designation of the Federal land within the Wildlife Conservation Area for purposes of—

(A) highway widening or realignment; and

(B) construction of multimodal transport systems; or

(C) the purposes of the Historic Landscape, including with respect to the role of the Historic Landscape in local, national, and world history.

(2) MANAGEMENT PLAN.—

(A) A regional transportation project, consistent with—

(i) improving the interpretation of historic events, activities, structures, and artifacts of the Historic Landscape, including with regard to the conservation, protection, restoration, or enhancement of the scenic, watershed, and ecological resources of the Historic Landscape, including conducting the restoration and enhancement project under subsection (d); and

(ii) environmental remediation and, consistent with subsection (e)(2), the removal of unexploded ordnance.

(ii) EXPLOSIVE HAZARDS.—The Secretary shall provide to the Secretary of the Army a notification of any unexploded ordnance (as defined in section 10(e) of title 10, United States Code) that is discovered in the Historic Landscape.

(iii) CAMP HALE RESTORATION AND ENHANCEMENT PROJECT.—

(A) In general.—The Secretary shall conduct a restoration and enhancement project in the Historic Landscape to—

(1) improve aquatic, riparian, and wetland conditions in and along the Eagle River and tributaries of the Eagle River;

(2) to maintain or improve recreation and interpretive opportunities, with an emphasis on the activities related to the historic use of the Historic Landscape, including skiing, snowshoeing, snowmobiling, hiking, horseback riding, climbing, other road and trail-based activities, and other outdoor activities; and

(B) to conserve, protect, restore, and enhance for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations the scenic, watershed, and ecological resources of the Historic Landscape.

(C) In general.—The Secretary shall manage the Historic Landscape in accordance with—

(A) the purposes of the Historic Landscape described in subsection (b); and

(B) any other applicable laws (including regulations).

(d) MANAGEMENT PLAN.—

(A) In general.—Not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall prepare a management plan for the Historic Landscape.

(B) CONTENTS.—The management plan prepared under subparagraph (A) shall include plans for—

(i) improving the interpretation of historic events, activities, structures, and artifacts of the Historic Landscape, including with respect to the conservation, protection, restoration, or enhancement of the scenic, watershed, and ecological resources of the Historic Landscape, including conducting the restoration and enhancement project under subsection (d); and

(ii) environmental remediation and, consistent with subsection (e)(2), the removal of unexploded ordnance.

(2) EXPLOSIVE HAZARDS.—The Secretary shall provide to the Secretary of the Army a notification of any unexploded ordnance (as defined in section 10(e) of title 10, United States Code) that is discovered in the Historic Landscape.

(iii) CAMP HALE RESTORATION AND ENHANCEMENT PROJECT.—

(A) In general.—The Secretary shall conduct a restoration and enhancement project in the Historic Landscape to—

(1) improve aquatic, riparian, and wetland conditions in and along the Eagle River and tributaries of the Eagle River;

(2) to maintain or improve recreation and interpretive opportunities, with an emphasis on the activities related to the historic use of the Historic Landscape, including skiing, snowshoeing, snowmobiling, hiking, horseback riding, climbing, other road and trail-based activities, and other outdoor activities; and

(B) to conserve, protect, restore, and enhance for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations the scenic, watershed, and ecological resources of the Historic Landscape.

(C) In general.—The Secretary shall manage the Historic Landscape in accordance with—

(A) the purposes of the Historic Landscape described in subsection (b); and

(B) any other applicable laws (including regulations).

(d) MANAGEMENT PLAN.—

(A) In general.—Not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall prepare a management plan for the Historic Landscape.

(B) CONTENTS.—The management plan prepared under subparagraph (A) shall include plans for—

(i) improving the interpretation of historic events, activities, structures, and artifacts of the Historic Landscape, including with respect to the conservation, protection, restoration, or enhancement of the scenic, watershed, and ecological resources of the Historic Landscape, including conducting the restoration and enhancement project under subsection (d); and

(ii) environmental remediation and, consistent with subsection (e)(2), the removal of unexploded ordnance.

(2) EXPLOSIVE HAZARDS.—The Secretary shall provide to the Secretary of the Army a notification of any unexploded ordnance (as defined in section 10(e) of title 10, United States Code) that is discovered in the Historic Landscape.

(iii) CAMP HALE RESTORATION AND ENHANCEMENT PROJECT.—

(A) In general.—The Secretary shall conduct a restoration and enhancement project in the Historic Landscape to—

(1) improve aquatic, riparian, and wetland conditions in and along the Eagle River and tributaries of the Eagle River;

(2) to maintain or improve recreation and interpretive opportunities, with an emphasis on the activities related to the historic use of the Historic Landscape, including skiing, snowshoeing, snowmobiling, hiking, horseback riding, climbing, other road and trail-based activities, and other outdoor activities; and

(B) to conserve, protect, restore, and enhance for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations the scenic, watershed, and ecological resources of the Historic Landscape.

(C) In general.—The Secretary shall manage the Historic Landscape in accordance with—

(A) the purposes of the Historic Landscape described in subsection (b); and

(B) any other applicable laws (including regulations).

(d) MANAGEMENT PLAN.—

(A) In general.—Not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall prepare a management plan for the Historic Landscape.

(B) CONTENTS.—The management plan prepared under subparagraph (A) shall include plans for—

(i) improving the interpretation of historic events, activities, structures, and artifacts of the Historic Landscape, including with respect to the conservation, protection, restoration, or enhancement of the scenic, watershed, and ecological resources of the Historic Landscape, including conducting the restoration and enhancement project under subsection (d); and

(ii) environmental remediation and, consistent with subsection (e)(2), the removal of unexploded ordnance.

(2) EXPLOSIVE HAZARDS.—The Secretary shall provide to the Secretary of the Army a notification of any unexploded ordnance (as defined in section 10(e) of title 10, United States Code) that is discovered in the Historic Landscape.

(iii) CAMP HALE RESTORATION AND ENHANCEMENT PROJECT.—

(A) In general.—The Secretary shall conduct a restoration and enhancement project in the Historic Landscape to—

(1) improve aquatic, riparian, and wetland conditions in and along the Eagle River and tributaries of the Eagle River;
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SEC. 149. ROCKY MOUNTAIN NATIONAL PARK POSSIBLE WILDERNESS TO NON-WILDERNESS.

(a) FISH AND WILDLIFE.—Nothing in this part affects the jurisdiction of the State with respect to fish and wildlife in the State.

(b) NO BUFFER ZONES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this part or an amendment made by this part establishes a protective perimeter or buffer zone around—

(A) a covered area;

(B) a wilderness area or potential wilderness area designated by section 143;

(C) a Recreation Management Area;

(D) a Wildlife Conservation Area; or

(E) the Historic Landscape.

(2) OUTSIDE ACTIVITIES.—The fact that a nonwilderness activity or use on land outside of a covered area can be seen or heard from within the covered area shall not preclude the activity or use outside the boundary of the covered area.

(c) MAPS AND LEGAL DESCRIPTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall file a map and legal descriptions of each area described in subsection (b)(1) with—

(A) the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate.

(2) FORCE OF LAW.—Each map and legal description filed under paragraph (1) shall have the same force and effect as if included in this part, except that the Secretary may correct any typographical errors in the maps and legal descriptions.

(3) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—Each map and legal description filed under paragraph (1) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Forest Service.

(d) ACQUISITION OF LAND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may acquire any land or interest in land within the boundaries of an area described in subsection (b)(1) only through exchange, donation, or purchase from a willing seller.

(2) MANAGEMENT.—Any land or interest in land acquired under paragraph (1) shall be incorporated into, and administered as a part of, the Wilderness area, Recreation Management Area, Wildlife Conservation Area, or Historic Landscape, as applicable, in which the land or interest in land is located.

(e) RESTRICTION OF USE.—Nothing in this part or an amendment made by this part establishes a valid right in existence on the date of enactment of this Act, the areas described in subsection (b)(1) are withdraw from—

(A) entry, appropriation, and disposal under the public land laws;

(B) location, entry, and patent under mining laws; and

(C) operation of the mineral leasing, mineral materials, and geothermal leasing laws.

(f) MILITARY OVERFLIGHTS.—Nothing in this part or an amendment made by this part restricts or precludes—

(1) any low-level overflight of military aircraft over any area subject to this part or an amendment made by this part, including military overflights that can be seen, heard, or detected within such an area;

(2) flight testing or evaluation over an area described in paragraph (1); or

(3) the use or establishment of—

(A) any new unit of special use airspace over an area described in paragraph (1); or

(B) any military flight training or transportation over such an area.

PART II—SAN JUAN MOUNTAINS

SEC. 151. DEFINITIONS.

In this part:
(1) COVERED LAND.—The term "covered land" means—

(A) land designated as wilderness under paragraphs (27) through (29) of section 2(a) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1782) as redesignated by section 152(a)(1); and

(B) the Liberty Bell East Special Management Area designated by section 152(a)(2).

SEC. 152. ADDITIONS TO NATIONAL WILDERNESS PRESERVATION SYSTEM.

Section 2(a) of the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; Public Law 103–77) as amended by section 142(a)(2) is amended—

(1) by redesignating section 2408 (16 U.S.C. 460zzz–7) as subsection (a) of section 2408; and

(2) by inserting after section 2407 (16 U.S.C. 460zzz–6) the following:

"SEC. 2408. RELEASE.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Congress finds that, for the purposes of section 603(c) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1782(c)), the portions of the Dominguez Canyon Wilderness Study Area not designated as wilderness by this subtitle have been adequately studied for wilderness designation.

"(b) RELEASE.—Any public land referred to in subsection (a) that is not designated as wilderness by this subtitle—

"(1) is no longer subject to section 603(c) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1782(c)); and

"(2) shall be managed in accordance with this subtitle and any other applicable laws.

"(c) MAPS AND LEGAL DESCRIPTIONS.—

As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall file a map and a legal description of each wilderness area designated by paragraphs (27) through (29) of section 2(a) of the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993 (43 U.S.C. 1782 note; Public Law 103–77) (as added by section 152) with the appropriate State agencies.

SEC. 153. SPECIAL MANAGEMENT AREAS.

(a) DESIGNATION.—

(1) MCKENNA PEAK SPECIAL MANAGEMENT AREA.—The Federal land in the Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, and Gunnison National Forests in the State comprising approximately 7,235 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled "Proposed McKenna Peak Wilderness Area" and dated September 6, 2018, is designated as the McKenna Peak Wilderness Area.

(2) SHEEP MOUNTAIN SPECIAL MANAGEMENT AREA.—The Federal land in the Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, and Gunnison National Forests in the State comprising approximately 12,465 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled "Proposed Sheep Mountain Special Management Area" and dated September 6, 2018, is designated as the Sheep Mountain Special Management Area.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the Special Management Areas is to conserve and protect for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations the ecological, cultural, archaeological, paleontological, natural, scientific, recreational, wilderness, educational, historical, and scenic resources of the Special Management Areas.

(c) MANAGEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall manage the Special Management Areas in a manner that—

(A) conserves, protects, and enhances the resources and values of the Special Management Areas described in subsection (b);

(B) subject to paragraph (3), maintains or improves the wilderness character of the Special Management Areas and the suitability of the Special Management Areas for potential inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System; and

(C) is in accordance with—

(i) the National Forest Management Act of 1976 (16 U.S.C. 1606 et seq.);

(ii) this part; and

(iii) any other applicable laws.

(2) PROHIBITIONS.—The following shall be prohibited in the Special Management Areas:

(A) Permanent roads.

(B) Except as necessary to meet the minimum requirements for the administration of the Special Management Area, to provide access for abandoned mine cleanup, and to protect public health and safety—

(i) the use of motor vehicles, motorized equipment, or mechanical transport (other than as provided in paragraph (3)); and

(ii) the establishment of temporary roads.

(3) AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES.—

(A) In general.—The Secretary may allow any activities (including helicopter access for recreation and maintenance and the competitive running event permitted since 1992) that are necessary to—

(i) the use of motor vehicles, motorized equipment, or mechanical transport (other than as provided in paragraph (3)); and

(ii) the establishment of temporary roads.

(B) Maps and legal descriptions.—

As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary or the Secretary of the Interior, as appropriate, shall file a map and a legal description of each wilderness area identified in sections 5 and 6 of the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993 (Public Law 103–112 note; Public Law 103–77) (as added by section 152) with the appropriate State agencies.

SEC. 154. RELEASE OF WILDERNESS STUDY AREAS.

(a) DOMINGUEZ CANYON WILDERNESS STUDY AREA.—Subtitle E of title II of Public Law 111–8 (16 U.S.C. 460zzz–7) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection 2408 (16 U.S.C. 460zzz–7) as section 2409; and

(2) by inserting after section 2407 (16 U.S.C. 460zzz–6) the following:

"SEC. 2408. RELEASE.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Congress finds that, for the purposes of section 603(c) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1782(c)), the portions of the Dominguez Canyon Wilderness Study Area not designated as wilderness by this subtitle have been adequately studied for wilderness designation.

"(b) RELEASE.—Any public land referred to in subsection (a) that is not designated as wilderness by this subtitle—

"(1) is no longer subject to section 603(c) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1782(c)); and

"(2) shall be managed in accordance with this subtitle and any other applicable laws.

"(c) MAPS AND LEGAL DESCRIPTIONS.—

As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall file a map and a legal description of each wilderness area designated by paragraphs (27) through (29) of section 2(a) of the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993 (16 U.S.C. 1782 note; Public Law 103–77) (as added by section 152) with the appropriate State agencies.

SEC. 155. ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.

(a) FISH AND WILDLIFE.—Nothing in this title affects the jurisdiction or responsibility of the State with respect to fish and wildlife in the State.

(b) NO BUFFER ZONES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this part establishes a protective perimeter or buffer zone around covered land.

(2) ACTIVITIES OUTSIDE WILDERNESS.—The fact that a nonwilderness activity or use on land outside of the covered land can be seen or heard from within covered land shall not preclude the activity or use outside the boundary of the covered land.

(c) MAPS AND LEGAL DESCRIPTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall file a map and a legal description of each wilderness area designated by paragraphs (27) through (29) of section 2(a) of the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993 (16 U.S.C. 1782 note; Public Law 103–77) (as added by section 152) with the appropriate State agencies.

(2) ORGANIZATIONS.—No organization, group, or other entity may use the map and legal description filed under paragraph (1) to acquire or control any interest in, or use, the lands designated as wilderness by this Act.
in the State, as generally depicted on the pilot program map as “Fugitive Coal Mine Methane Use Pilot Program Area”, that would leak or be vented into the atmosphere from an active, or abandoned underground coal mine.

(2) PILOT PROGRAM.—The term “pilot program” means the Greater Thompson Divide Fugitive Coal Mine Methane Use Pilot Program established by section 165(a)(1).

(3) PILOT PROGRAM MAP.—The term “pilot program map” means the map entitled “Greater Thompson Divide Fugitive Coal Mine Methane Use Pilot Program Area” and dated June 17, 2019.

(4) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(5) THOMPSON DIVIDE LEASE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “Thompson Divide lease” means any oil or gas lease in effect on the date of enactment of this Act within the Thompson Divide Withdrawal and Protection Area.

(B) EXCLUSIONS.—The term “Thompson Divide lease” does not include any oil or gas lease that—

(1) is associated with a Wolf Creek Storage Field development right; or

(2) before the date of enactment of this Act, has expired, been cancelled, or otherwise terminated.

(6) THOMPSON DIVIDE MAP.—The term “Thompson Divide map” means the map entitled “Greater Thompson Divide Area Map” and dated June 13, 2019.

(7) WOLF CREEK STORAGE FIELD DEVELOPMENT RIGHT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “Wolf Creek Storage Field development right” means a development right for any of the Federal mineral leases numbered COC 007497, COC 007498, COC 007499, COC 007500, COC 007538, COC 008128, COC 015373, COC 0128018, COC 015615, and COC 015646, and generally depicted on the Thompson Divide map as the “Wolf Creek Storage Agreement”.

(B) EXCLUSIONS.—The term “Wolf Creek Storage Field development right” does not include any storage right or related activity within the area described in subparagraph (A).

SEC. 163. THOMPSON DIVIDE WITHDRAWAL AND PROTECTION AREA.

(a) THOMPSON DIVIDE WITHDRAWAL AND PROTECTION AREA.—The term “Thompson Divide Withdrawal and Protection Area” means the Federal land and minerals generally depicted on the Thompson Divide map as the “Thompson Divide Withdrawal and Protection Area”.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—The use of a credit issued under subsection (a) shall be subject to the laws (including regulations) applicable to the payments described in that subsection,

(c) CANCELLATION.—Effective on relinquishment under this section, and without any additional action by the Secretary, a Thompson Divide lease—

(1) shall be permanently cancelled; and

(2) shall not be reissued.

(d) CONDITIONS.—

(1) APPLICABLE LAW.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, each exchange under this section shall be conducted in accordance with—

(A) this subtitle; and

(B) other applicable laws (including regulations).

(2) ACCEPTANCE OF CREDITS.—The Secretary shall accept credits issued under subsection (a) in the same manner as cash for the payments described in that subsection.

(3) APPLICABILITY.—The use of a credit issued under subsection (a) shall be subject to the laws (including regulations) applicable to the payments described in that subsection, to the extent that the laws are consistent with this section.

(4) TREATMENT OF CREDITS.—All amounts in the form of credits issued under subsection (a) and acquired by the Secretary shall be considered to be amounts received for the purposes of—

(A) section 35 of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 191); and


(c) WOLF CREEK STORAGE FIELD DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS.

(1) CONVEYANCE TO SECRETARY.—As a condition precedent to the relinquishment of a Thompson Divide lease, any leaseholder with a Wolf Creek Storage Field development right shall permanently relinquish, transfer, and otherwise convey to the Secretary, in a form acceptable to the Secretary, all Wolf Creek Storage Field development rights of the leaseholder.

(2) LIMITATION OF TRANSFER.—An interest acquired by the Secretary under paragraph (1) shall be held in perpetuity; and shall not be—

(i) transferred;

(ii) reissued; or

(iii) otherwise used for mineral extraction.

SEC. 165. THOMPSON DIVIDE FUGITIVE COAL MINE METHANE USE PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) FUGITIVE COAL MINE METHANE USE PILOT PROGRAM.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Bureau of Land Management a pilot program, to be known as the “Greater
Thompson Divide Fugitive Coal Mine Methane Use Pilot Program.

(2) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the pilot program is to promote the capture, beneficial use, mitigation, and sequestration of fugitive methane emissions—

(A) to reduce methane emissions;
(B) to promote economic development;
(C) to produce bid and royalty revenues;
(D) to improve air quality; and
(E) to improve public safety.

(3) PROGRAM.—(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall develop a plan—

(i) to complete an inventory of fugitive methane emissions in accordance with subsection (b);
(ii) to provide for the leasing of fugitive methane emissions in accordance with subsection (c); and
(iii) to provide for the capping or destruction of fugitive methane emissions in accordance with subsection (d).

(B) COORDINATION.—In developing the plan under this paragraph, the Secretary shall coordinate with—

(i) the Council for Environmental Quality;
(ii) the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement;
(iii) the Environmental Protection Agency;
(iv) the States in the State; and
(v) other interested public entities.

(4) FUGITIVE METHANE EMISSION INVENTORY.

(I) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall complete an inventory of fugitive methane emissions.

(II) DESCRIPTION.—The inventory shall—

(A) be conducted by the Secretary in collaboration with appropriate entities; and
(B) include—

(i) the location and geographic coordinates of each vent, seep, or other source producing significant fugitive methane emissions;
(ii) an estimate of the volume and concentration of fugitive methane emissions from each source of significant fugitive methane emissions, including details of measurements taken and the basis for that estimate; and
(iii) the Environmental Protection Agency; the Mine Safety and Health Administration; the Colorado Department of Natural Resources; the Colorado Public Utility Commission; and the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement.

(5) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 4 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall transmit to Congress a report on the inventory and program.

(3) FUGITIVE METHANE EMISSIONS FROM ABANDONED COAL MINES.

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary deems appropriate to most significantly advance the public interest, the Secretary shall offer leases for a coal mine that is producing fugitive methane emissions for beneficial use, such as generating electrical power, producing usable heat, transporting the methane to market, or transforming the fugitive methane emissions into a different marketable material.

(B) CONDITIONS.—The Secretary shall take into consideration—

(i) the size of the overall decrease in the time-integrated radiative forcing of the fugitive methane emissions;
(ii) the impacts to other natural resource values, including wildlife, water, and air; and
(iii) other public interest values, including scenic, economic, recreation, and cultural values.

(C) LEASE FORM.—(i) IN GENERAL.—The lease shall provide for leasing of interest in coal fields in a manner that does not—

(A) endanger the safety of any coal mine worker or employee or road user;
(B) unreasonably interfere with any ongoing operation at a coal mine.

(ii) OTHER INTERESTED ENTITIES.—The Secretary shall—

(A) authorize the capture for use, or destruction by flaring, of fugitive methane emissions from abandoned coal mines.

(B) ROYALTIES.—The Secretary shall take into consideration—

(i) the statutory determination of the Secretary that the lease will result in the long-term sequestration of methane emissions on Federal land; and
(ii) the impacts to other natural resource values.

(C) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 4 years after the date of enactment of this Act.
the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Represen-tatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report detailing—

(1) the economic and environmental im-pacts of the pilot program, including infor-mation on increased royalties and estimates of avoided greenhouse gas emissions; and

(2) any recommendations by the Secretary on whether the pilot program could be ex-paned geographically to include other sig-nificant sources of fugitive methane emis-sions from coal mines.

SEC. 166. EFFECT.

Except as specifically provided in this part, nothing in this part—

(1) expands, diminishes, or impairs any valid existing mineral leases, mineral inter-est, or other property rights wholly or par-tially within the Thompson Divide Divi-de Withdrawal and Protection Area, including access to the leases, interests, rights, or land in ac-cordance with applicable Federal, State, and local laws (including regulations);

(2) prevents the capture of methane from any active, inactive, or abandoned coal mine covered by this part, in accordance with ap-plicable laws; or

(3) prevents access to, or the development of, any new or existing coal mine or lease in Delta or Gunnison County in the State.

PART IV—CURECANTI NATIONAL RECREATION AREA

SEC. 171. DEFINITIONS.

In this part—

(A) MAP.—The term "map" means the map entitled "Curecanti National Recreation Area, Proposed Boundary", numbered 616/ 100.48005, dated August 11, 2016.

(B) NATIONAL RECREATION AREA.—The term "National Recreation Area" means the Curecanti National Recreation Area established by section 172.

(C) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 172. CURECANTI NATIONAL RECREATION AREA

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Effective beginning on the earlier of the date on which the Secre-tary approves a request under subsection (c)(2)(B)(i) and the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, there shall be established as a unit of the National Park System a National Recreation Area in accordance with this subtitle, con-sisting of approximately 50,667 acres of land in the State, as generally depicted on the map as "Curecanti National Recreation Area Proposed Boundary".

(b) AVAILABILITY OF MAP.—The map shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the National Park Service.

(c) ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall ad-minister the National Recreation Area in ac-cordance with—

(A) this part; and

(B) the vision (including regulations) gen-erally applicable to units of the National Park System, including section 10010(a), chapter 1003, and sections 10075(a), 10075(2), and 10201 of title 54, United States Code.

(2) DAM, POWERPLANT, AND RESERVOIR MANAGE-MENT AND OPERATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall regu-late, subject to applicable law (including regulations), the use of the waters of the Colorado River and its tributaries, including any hydroelectric projects, by the Bureau of Reclamation under section 172.

(B) CLOSURES; DESIGNATED ZONES.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, acting through the Superintendent of the National Recreation Area, may designate any zones in which, and establish periods during which, no boating, hunting, or fishing shall be per-mitted in the National Recreation Area by the Secretary, if the Secretary determines that public safety, administration, or compliance with applicable laws is necessary.

(ii) consultaTion required.—Except in the case of an emergency, any closure pro-posed by the Secretary under clause (i) shall not take effect until after the date on which the Secretary consults with the National Recreation Area consults with—

(I) the appropriate State agency respon-sible for fishing and hunting activities; and

(II) the appropriate County or County Board of County Commissioners in each county in which the zone is proposed to be designated.

(3) LANDOWNER ASSISTANCE.—On the writ-ten request of an individual who owns pri-vate land located not more than 3 miles from the boundary of the National Recreation Area and that is occurring before the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in consultation with the individual, may enhance the long-term conservation of natural, cultural, recrea-tional, and scenic resources in and around the National Recreation Area by purchase, exchange, or donation, in accordance with section 173.

(B) by providing technical assistance to the individual, including cooperative assistance;

(C) through available grant programs; and

(D) by supporting conservation easement opportunities.

(6) WITHDRAWAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, all Federal land within the National Recreation Area is withdrawn from—

(A) by acquiring all or a portion of the pri-vate land or interests in private land located not more than 3 miles from the boundary of the National Recreation Area by purchase, exchange, or donation, in accordance with title 43;

(B) by providing technical assistance to the individual, including cooperative assistance;

(C) through available grant programs; and

(D) by supporting conservation easement opportunities.

(7) GRAZING.—

(A) STATE LAND SUBJECT TO A STATE GRAZ-ING LEASE.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—If State land acquired under this part is subject to a State grazing lease in effect on the date of acquisition, the Secretary shall review the lease to determine the terms and conditions and, if applicable, negotiate a new lease to the State or private landowner.

(B) WITHDRAWAL.—The Secretary, in accordance with applicable laws, authorize grazing on land acquired from the State or private landowners under title 173, if grazing was established before the date of acquisition.

(C) PRIVATE LAND.—On private land ac-cquired under section 173 for the National Recreation Area on which grazing is occurring before the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in consultation with the lessee, may allow the continuation and renewal of grazing on the land based on the terms of acquisition or by agreement be-tween the Secretary and the lessee, subject to applicable law (including regulations).

(D) FEDERAL LAND.—The Secretary shall—

(i) allow, consistent with the grazing leases, uses, and practices in effect as of the date of enactment of this Act, the continu-ation and renewal of grazing on Federal land located within the boundary of the National Recreation Area on which grazing is allowed before the date of enactment of this Act, un-der the applicable law (including regulations); and

(ii) make sure that any grazing on the Federal land would present unaccept-able impacts (as defined in section 1.4.7.1 of
the National Park Service document entitled “Management Policies 2006: The Guide to Managing the National Park System”) to the natural, cultural, recreational, and scenic resource values and the character of the land within the National Recreation Area; and

(ii) retain all authorities to manage grazing in the National Recreation Area;

(E) TERMINATION OF LEASES.—Within the National Recreation Area, the Secretary may—

(i) accept the voluntary termination of a lease or permit for grazing; or

(ii) in the case of a lease or permit vacated for a period of 3 or more years, terminate the lease or permit;

(B) WATER RIGHTS.—Nothing in this part—

(A) affects any use or allocation in existence on the date of enactment of this Act of any water, water right, or interest in water; or

(B) affects any vested absolute or decreed conditional water right in existence on the date of enactment of this Act, including any water right held by the United States;

(C) affects any interstate water compact in existence on the date of enactment of this Act;

(D) authorizes or imposes any new reserved Federal water right; or

(E) shall be considered to be a relinquishment or reduction of any water right reserved or held by the United States in the State on or before the date of enactment of this Act.

(F) FISHING BASEMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this part diminishes or alters the fish and wildlife program for the Aspinall Unit developed under section 6 of the Act of April 11, 1956 (commonly known as the Colorado River Storage Project Act”) (70 Stat. 110, chapter 203; 43 U.S.C. 620c), by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Fish and Wildlife Service (including any successor in interest to that division) that provides for the acquisition of public access fishing easements as mitigation for the Aspinall Unit (referred to in this paragraph as the “program”).

(B) ACQUISITION OF FISHING BASEMENTS.—The Secretary shall continue to fulfill the obligation of the Secretary under the program to acquire 26 miles of class 1 public fishing easements to provide to sportsmen access upstream from the Upper Gunnison Basin upstream of the Aspinall Unit, subject to the condition that no existing fishing access downstream of the Aspinall Unit shall be counted toward the minimum mileage requirement for the program.

(C) PLAN.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall—

(i) develop a plan for fulfilling the obligation of the Secretary described in subparagraph (B); and

(ii) submit to Congress a report that—

(I) includes the plan developed under clause (i); and

(II) describes any progress made in the acquisition of public access fishing easements as mitigation for the Aspinall Unit under the program.

SEC. 173. ACQUISITION OF LAND; BOUNDARY MANAGEMENT.

(a) ACQUISITION.

(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may acquire any land or interest in land within the boundary of the National Recreation Area.

(ii) MANNER OF ACQUISITION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), land described in paragraph (1) may be acquired under this subsection by—

(I) donation;

(II) purchase from willing sellers with donated or appropriated funds; or

(iii) transfer from another Federal agency; or

(iv) exchange.

(B) STATE LAND.—Land or interests in land owned by the State of the State may only be acquired by purchase, donation, or exchange.

(b) TRANSFER OF ADMINISTRATIVE JURISDICTION.

(1) FOREST SERVICE LAND.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Administrative jurisdiction over the approximately 2,500 acres of land identified as “F.O.S. National Park Service proposed transfer to the National Park Service” is transferred to the Secretary, to be administered by the Director of the National Park Service as part of the National Recreation Area.

(B) BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT.—The boundary of the Gunnison National Forest shall be adjusted to exclude the land transferred to the Secretary under subparagraph (A).

(2) BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT LAND.—Administrative jurisdiction over the approximately 5,040 acres of land identified on the map as “Bureau of Land Management proposed transfer to National Park Service” is transferred from the Director of the Bureau of Land Management to the Director of the National Park Service, to be administered as part of the National Recreation Area.

(3) WITHDRAWAL.—Administrative jurisdiction over the land identified on the map as “Proposed for transfer to the Bureau of Land Management, subject to Administration of Bureau of Reclamation withdrawal” shall be transferred to the Director of the Bureau of Land Management on relinquishment of the land by the Bureau of Reclamation and revocation by the Bureau of Land Management of any withdrawal may be necessary.

(c) POTENTIAL LAND EXCHANGE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The withdrawal for reclamation purposes of the land identified on the map as “Potential exchange lands” shall be relinquished by the Commissioner of Reclamation and revoked by the Director of the Bureau of Land Management and the land shall be transferred to the National Park Service.

(2) EXCHANGE; INCLUSION IN NATIONAL RECREATION AREA.—On transfer of the land described in paragraph (1), the transferred land—

(A) may be exchanged by the Secretary for private land described in section 172c(d)(5)—

(i) subject to a conservation easement remaining on the transferred land, to protect the scenic resources of the transferred land; and

(ii) in accordance with the laws (including regulations) and policies governing National Park Service land exchanges;

(B) if not exchanged under subparagraph (A), shall be added to, and managed as a part of, the National Recreation Area.

(d) ADDITION TO NATIONAL RECREATION AREA.—Any land within the boundary of the National Recreation Area that is acquired by the United States shall be added to, and managed as a part of, the National Recreation Area.

SEC. 174. GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN.

Not later than 3 years after the date on which funds are available to carry out this part, the Director of the National Park Service, in consultation with the Commissioner of Reclamation, shall prepare a general management plan for the National Recreation Area in accordance with section 100502 of title 54, United States Code.

SEC. 175. BOUNDARY SURVEY.

The Secretary, acting through the Director of the National Park Service, shall prepare a boundary survey and legal description of the National Recreation Area.
be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title I of division D, insert the following:

SEC. 1. FAIR TREATMENT UNDER THE ESSENTIAL AIR SERVICE PROGRAM.

The Secretary of Transportation shall institute Essential Air Service for fiscal year 2020 at any airport that received a subsidy under the Essential Air Service program in fiscal year 2019 and that has supplied data to the Secretary that demonstrate an average enplanements per day and a subsidy amount per passenger for fiscal year 2019 that meet the requirements of the Essential Air Service program (taking into account subsection (d) of section 426 of the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012, as added by section 458 of the FAA Reauthorization Act of 2018 (49 U.S.C. 41731 note)).

SA 987. Mr. MEEKLEY (for himself, Mr. BENNETT, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in division A, insert the following:

SEC. 1. REPORT CONCERNING THE EFFECTS OF STATE LEGALIZED MARIJUANA PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General shall:

(1) to complete a study, not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, on the effects of State legalized marijuana programs on criminal justice in the respective States; and

(2) upon the completion of the initial study pursuant to paragraph (1), to prepare or update a report on the results of such study and submit such report to the Congress.

(b) STUDY CONSIDERATIONS.—The study pursuant to subsection (a)(1) shall consider the effects of State legalized marijuana programs with respect to criminal justice, including the following:

(1) the rates of marijuana-related arrests for possession, cultivation, and distribution, and of these arrests, the percentages that involved conviction related to marijuana possession, cultivation, or distribution, including—

(A) the rates of such arrests at the Federal level, including the arrest of Federal prisoners so arrested, disaggregated by sex, age, race, and ethnicity; and

(B) the rates of such arrests at the State level, including the number of State prisoners so arrested, disaggregated by sex, age, race, and ethnicity.

The chief immigration judge may not impose production quotas or case completion deadlines in evaluating the performance of immigration judges.

SA 993. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 1. REPORT CONCERNING THE EFFECTS OF STATE LEGALIZED MARIJUANA PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General shall:

(1) to complete a study, not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, on the effects of State legalized marijuana programs on criminal justice in the respective States; and

(2) upon the completion of the initial study pursuant to paragraph (1), to prepare or update a report on the results of such study and submit such report to the Congress.

(b) STUDY CONSIDERATIONS.—The study pursuant to subsection (a)(1) shall consider the effects of State legalized marijuana programs with respect to criminal justice, including the following:

(1) the rates of marijuana-related arrests for possession, cultivation, and distribution, and of these arrests, the percentages that involved conviction related to marijuana possession, cultivation, or distribution, including—

(A) the rates of such arrests at the Federal level, including the arrest of Federal prisoners so arrested, disaggregated by sex, age, race, and ethnicity; and
other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In the appropriate place in title II of division A, insert the following:


(b) The 6th proviso under the heading “Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives—Salaries and Expenses” in title II of division B of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2010 (18 U.S.C. 923 note; Public Law 112–8; 123 Stat. 574–576) is amended by striking “beginning in fiscal year 2009 and thereafter” and inserting “in fiscal year 2008” through “(1);” and

(c) The 6th proviso under the heading “Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives—Salaries and Expenses” in title II of division B of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2008 (18 U.S.C. 923 note; Public Law 112–161; 123 Stat. 1903–1904) is amended by striking “beginning in fiscal year 2008 and thereafter” and inserting “in fiscal year 2008” through “(1);” and


(e) The 6th proviso under the heading in title I of division B of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2005 (18 U.S.C. 923 note; Public Law 108–147; 118 Stat. 2859–2860) is amended by striking “with respect to any fiscal year”. 

(f) The 6th proviso under the heading in title I of division B of the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2012 (18 U.S.C. 922 note; Public Law 112–55; 125 Stat. 632) is amended—

(1) by striking “for—” and all that follows through “(1)”; and

(2) by striking the semicolon and all that follows and inserting a period.

SA 994. Mr. MERRKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELY to the bill H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title I of division C, insert the following:

SEC. 1. There is appropriated $2,000,000 to the Director of the United States Geological Survey with the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and other Federal, State, Tribal, and local agencies, research universities, nonprofit organizations, and other partners to determine the science needs and develop an action plan for a multiyear integrated program to assess, monitor, and conserve saline lake ecosystems in Great Basin States and the wildlife that depend on those ecosystems, and to begin implementation of that program.

SA 995. Mr. BOOKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELY to the bill H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title I of division A, insert the following:

SEC. 1. None of the funds made available by this Act or any other Act with respect to any fiscal year may be used to include any information regarding United States citizenship in a tabulation of population reported or transmitted by the Secretary of Commerce under the last sentence of section 141(c) of title 13, United States Code.

SA 996. Mr. WYDEN for himself, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. MERRKLEY, Mr. RISCH, and Mr. MANCHIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELY to the bill H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 113 of division C and insert the following:

PAYMENT IN LIEU OF TAXES, SECURE RURAL SCHOOLS
SEC. 113. (a) Section 606 of title 31, United States Code, is amended, in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “fiscal year 2019” and inserting “fiscal year 2020”.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for fiscal year 2019—

(1) each eligible State, eligible county, and other eligible unit of local government shall be entitled to receive a payment under the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), subject to paragraph (3);

(2) $322,000,000 shall be made available to the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior for obligation and expenditure in accordance with that Act, subject to paragraph (3); and

(3) for purposes of paragraphs (1) and (2), the full funding amount for fiscal year 2019 shall be the full funding amount for fiscal year 2017.

SA 997. Mr. WYDEN for himself, Mr. RISCH, Mr. MERRKLEY, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CRAPO, and Mr. KING) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELY to the bill H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title II, insert the following:

DEFINITION OF RENEWABLE BIOMASS UNDER RENEWABLE FUEL PROGRAM
SEC. . Section 211(o)(1)(C) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545(o)(1)(C)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating clauses (iii) through (vii) clauses (v) through (ix), respectively; and

(2) by striking clause (ii) and inserting the following:

“(ii) Trees and residue from non-Federal land, including land belonging to an Indian tribe or an Indian individual that is held in trust by the United States or subject to a restriction against alienation imposed by the United States;”

“(iii) Any secondary, residual materials generated from forest manufacturing, including, but not limited to, sawdust, wood chips, shavings, bark, sander dust, and trimmings, regardless of whether the source of primary materials is derived from Federal or non-Federal land;”

“(iv) Biomass materials obtained from Federal land that—

“(I) are not harvested from old growth stands, unless the old growth stand is part of a science-based ecological restoration project authorized by the Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of the Interior, as applicable, that meets applicable protection and old growth enhancement objectives, as determined by the applicable Secretary; or

“(II) are slash, precommercial thinning, or derived from ecological restoration activities;”

“(v) are harvested in a manner consistent with applicable Federal laws (including regulations) and land management plans; and

“(vi) are derived within—

“(aa) the wildland-urban interface (as defined in section 101 of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6591)) from acreage included within a community wild fire protection plan (as so defined);

“(bb) a priority area on Federal land, as identified by the Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of the Interior, as applicable, in need of—

“(AA) ecological restoration; or


“(CC) a project carried out under section 602(d) of that Act (16 U.S.C. 6591d(a)); or

“(dd) an area identified as a priority area for fire threat reduction and State-wide strategy development in accordance with section 2A of the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 210a).”

SA 998. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELY to the bill H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title II, insert the following:

SEC. 2. None of the funds made available by this Act or any other Act with respect to any fiscal year may be used to include any information regarding United States citizenship in a tabulation of population reported or transmitted by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to finalize, implement, administer, or enforce the proposed rule entitled “HUD’s Implementation of the Fair Housing Act’s Disparate Impact Standard” (84 Fed. Reg. 42854 (August 19, 2019).

SA 999. Mr. WYDEN for himself, Mr. RISCH, Mr. CRAPO, and Mr. MERRKLEY) submitted an amendment intended to
be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title I of division C, insert the following:


(a) DEFINITION OF FULL FUNDING AMOUNT.—Section 102 of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7102) is amended by striking paragraphs (D) and (E) and inserting the following:

``D) for fiscal year 2017, the amount that is equal to 95 percent of the full funding amount for fiscal year 2015,''

``E) for fiscal year 2016, the amount that is equal to 95 percent of the full funding amount for fiscal year 2015,''

``F) for fiscal year 2017 and each fiscal year thereafter, the amount that is equal to the full funding amount for fiscal year 2017,''

(b) SECURE PAYMENTS FOR STATES AND COUNTIES CONTAINING FEDERAL LAND.—

(1) SECURE PAYMENTS.—Section 101 of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7102) is amended, in subsections (a) and (b), by striking ``2017'' each place it appears and inserting ``2018, 2019, and 2020.''

(2) PAYMENTS TO STATES AND COUNTIES.—

(A) ELECTION TO RECEIVE PAYMENT AMOUNT.—Section 102(b) of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7102) is amended—

(i) in paragraph (1)(D)—

(I) in the subparagraph heading, by striking 'POUR FISCAL YEARS 2017 AND 2018' and inserting 'POUR EACH OF FISCAL YEARS 2017 THROUGH 2020';

(II) by striking ''for fiscal years 2017 or 2018'' and inserting ''for each of fiscal years 2017 through 2020'';

(B) EXPENDITURE RULES FOR ELIGIBLE COUNTIES.—Section 102(d) of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7102) is amended—

(i) in paragraph (1)(F)—

(I) in the subparagraph heading, by striking 'POUR FISCAL YEARS 2017 AND 2018' and inserting 'POUR EACH OF FISCAL YEARS 2017 THROUGH 2020';

(II) by striking ''for fiscal years 2017 or 2018'' and inserting ''for each of fiscal years 2017 through 2020'';

(ii) in paragraph (2), in subparagraphs (A) and (B), by striking ''for fiscal years 2017 and 2018'' each place it appears and inserting ''for each of fiscal years 2017 through 2020'';

(C) DISTRIBUTION OF PAYMENTS TO ELIGIBLE COUNTIES.—Section 103 of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7113) is amended by striking ''through and for fiscal years 2017 and 2018'' and inserting ''through 2015 and for each of fiscal years 2017 through 2020'';

(D) EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO EXPEND COUNTY FUNDS.—Section 304 of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7144) is amended—

(i) in subsection (a), by striking ''2020'' and inserting ''2022''; and

(ii) in subsection (b), by striking ''2021'' and inserting ''2023''.

SA 1000. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

PAYMENT IN LIEU OF TAXES (PILT)

SEC. 113. Section 6606 of title 31, United States Code, as added by section 1501 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111–148; 124 Stat. 119) or of the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–152; 124 Stat. 1029), including any amendment made by such Acts, is unconstitutional or is invalid or unenforceable on any ground, including that certain provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act are not severable from section 1501 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as added by section 1501 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111–148; 124 Stat. 242).

SA 1001. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title V of division A, insert the following:

SEC. 2. (a) In the case of a contract for project-based assistance that terminates, if the Secretary does not transfer the assistance to 1 or more other multifamily housing projects in accordance with the conditions under section 210(c), effective—

(I) as of the date of termination of the contract;

(II) if the Secretary is unable to comply with those conditions by the date on which the contract terminates, as soon as practicable after that date.

(b) The Secretary shall maintain a publicly available list of multifamily housing projects that are eligible for project-based assistance for purposes of transfers under subsection (a).

(c) In this section, the terms 'multifamily housing project' and 'project-based assistance' have the meanings given those terms in section 210(d).

SA 1002. Mrs. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. REED) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 489, line 17, strike ''$2,761,000,000'' and insert ''$2,761,000,000''.

SA 1003. Ms. CANTWELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS RELATING TO ROADLESS MANAGEMENT IN THE TONGASS NATIONAL FOREST

SEC. 3. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to finalize the draft environmental impact statement described in section 28(b) of the Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7144) or of the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–152; 124 Stat. 1029), including any amendment made by such Acts, unless the regulations regarding the emergency medical equipment carried by passenger airlines, should continue to prioritize the demands of our nation's growing pandemic and take timely action to issue additional guidance to air carriers to ensure the expeditious inclusion of opioid antagonists in emergency medical kits.

SA 1004. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title V of division A, insert the following:

SEC. 3. None of the funds made available by this division may be used by the Department of Justice to argue, in the conduct of any litigation to which the United States, or an agency or officer thereof is a party, that any provision of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111–148; 124 Stat. 119) or of the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–152; 124 Stat. 1029), including any amendment made by such Acts, is unconstitutional or is invalid or unenforceable on any ground, including that certain provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act are not severable from section 1501 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as added by section 1501 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111–148; 124 Stat. 242).

SA 1005. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title I of division D, insert the following:

SEC. 3. SENSE OF CONGRESS. It is the sense of Congress that the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, as part of ongoing efforts to review regulations regarding the emergency medical equipment carried by passenger airlines, should continue to prioritize the demands of our nation's growing pandemic and take timely action to issue additional guidance to air carriers to ensure the expeditious inclusion of opioid antagonists in emergency medical kits.

SA 1006. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed
to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title II of division D, insert the following:

S 2. It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) more than 17,000,000 people live in manufactured homes and benefit from high-quality affordable homes which provide stability;

(2) manufactured homes hold disproportionately low-income households, and in 2013, the median annual household income for living in manufactured housing was $28,400;

(3) approximately 75 percent of manufactured home households earn less than $50,000 per year;

(4) more than 10 percent of veterans in the United States live in manufactured homes;

(5) in late 1990, manufactured housing represented 7% of the new affordable housing produced in the United States and remains a significant source of unsubsidized affordable housing in the United States;

(6) the average price per square foot for a new manufactured home was 48 dollars, less than half of the cost per square foot for a new-site built, structure-only home, which was $101;

(7) in 2009, 43 percent of all new homes that sold for less than $150,000 were manufactured homes;

(8) manufactured homes account for 23 percent of new home sales under $200,000;

(9) more than 50,000 manufactured home communities, also referred to as “mobile home parks”, exist throughout the United States;

(10) more than 2,900,000 manufactured homes are placed in manufactured home communities;

(11) manufactured home communities provide critical affordable housing, but receive very little Federal, State, or local funds to subsidize the cost of manufactured homes;

(12) manufactured home owners in such communities may own the home, but they do not own the land under the home, which leaves them vulnerable to increases, arbitrary rule enforcement, and in the case of a manufactured home community owner converting the land to some other use, community closure;

(13) an eviction or closure of a manufactured home community is very disruptive to a resident who may be unable to pay the thousands of dollars it takes to move the manufactured home or find a new location for the manufactured home;

(14) in an effort to preserve a crucial source of affordable housing within the past two decades, a national network of housing providers has helped residents purchase and own the land under the manufactured home community and manage the manufactured home community;

(15) nationwide, there are more than 1,000 stable, permanent ownership cooperatives or nonprofit-structured developments in more than a dozen States;

(16) members of manufactured home communities continue to own such homes individually or as an equal share of the land beneath the entire manufactured home community, participate in the governing of the community, and elect a board of directors who manage within the home have manufactured home community by a democratic vote;

(17) in New Hampshire, more than 30 percent of manufactured home communities are owned by residents;

(18) resident-owned cooperatives and non-profit owned were also flourished in Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Washington, Oregon, and Minnesota;

(19) nationwide, only 2 percent of all manufactured home communities are resident or nonprofit-owned;

(20) manufactured home community owners often prefer to devise such property taxes free, rather than selling the community, in order to avoid capital gain taxes;

(21) when the owner of a manufactured home community dies, the heirs of the owner frequently sell the community to the highest bidder which results in displacement for dozens and sometimes hundreds of families; and

(22) in order to preserve manufactured home communities in the future, a Federal tax benefit should be established to induce manufactured home community owners to sell such properties to residents that the owners have known for decades, or to nonprofit organizations.

SA 1007. Ms. ROSEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title II of division D, insert the following:

S 2. It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) in late 1990, manufactured housing represented 7% of the new affordable housing produced in the United States and remains a significant source of unsubsidized affordable housing in the United States;

(2) the average price per square foot for a new manufactured home was 48 dollars, less than half of the cost per square foot for a new-site built, structure-only home, which was $101;

(3) in 2009, 43 percent of all new homes that sold for less than $150,000 were manufactured homes;

(4) manufactured homes account for 23 percent of new home sales under $200,000;

(5) more than 50,000 manufactured home communities, also referred to as “mobile home parks”, exist throughout the United States;

(6) more than 2,900,000 manufactured homes are placed in manufactured home communities;

(7) manufactured home communities provide critical affordable housing, but receive very little Federal, State, or local funds to subsidize the cost of manufactured homes;

(8) manufactured home owners in such communities may own the home, but they do not own the land under the home, which leaves them vulnerable to increases, arbitrary rule enforcement, and in the case of a manufactured home community owner converting the land to some other use, community closure;

(9) an eviction or closure of a manufactured home community is very disruptive to a resident who may be unable to pay the thousands of dollars it takes to move the manufactured home or find a new location for the manufactured home;

(10) in an effort to preserve a crucial source of affordable housing within the past two decades, a national network of housing providers has helped residents purchase and own the land under the manufactured home community and manage the manufactured home community;

(11) nationwide, there are more than 1,000 stable, permanent ownership cooperatives or nonprofit-structured developments in more than a dozen States;

(12) members of manufactured home communities continue to own such homes individually or as an equal share of the land beneath the entire manufactured home community, participate in the governing of the community, and elect a board of directors who manage within the home have manufactured home community by a democratic vote;

(13) in New Hampshire, more than 30 percent of manufactured home communities are owned by residents;

(14) resident-owned cooperatives and non-profit owned were also flourished in Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Washington, Oregon, and Minnesota;

(15) nationwide, only 2 percent of all manufactured home communities are resident or nonprofit-owned;

(16) manufactured home community owners often prefer to devise such property taxes free, rather than selling the community, in order to avoid capital gain taxes;

(17) when the owner of a manufactured home community dies, the heirs of the owner frequently sell the community to the highest bidder which results in displacement for dozens and sometimes hundreds of families; and

(18) in order to preserve manufactured home communities in the future, a Federal tax benefit should be established to induce manufactured home community owners to sell such properties to residents that the owners have known for decades, or to nonprofit organizations.
and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title IV of division C, insert the following:

```
GREAT LAKES RESTORATION INITIATIVE

SEC. 4. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law or the amount made available for Geographic Programs under the heading “ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS AND MANAGEMENT” under the heading “ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY” under title II shall be increased by $19,000,000 to provide additional funding for the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative under section 118(c) of the Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1286(c)(7)).

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this division, the amount authorized to be transferred under the fourth paragraph under the heading “ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY (INCLUDING TRANSFERS)” under the heading “ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY” under title II shall be increased by $19,000,000.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of this division, funds made available for Operations and Administration under the heading “ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS AND MANAGEMENT” under the heading “ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY” under title II in the report accompanying this Act shall be reduced by $19,000,000.

SA 1014. Mr. CASSIDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 19, after line 25, insert the following:

```
FISHERY DISASTER ASSISTANCE

For an additional amount for “Fishery Disaster Assistance” for necessary expenses associated with the mitigation of fishery disaster, $100,000,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That such funds shall be used for mitigating the effects of commercial fishery failures and fishery resource disasters directed by the Secretary of Commerce: Provided further, That such amount is designated by Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 261(b)(2) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.
```

SA 1015. Mrs. FEINSTEIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 84, between lines 18 and 19, insert the following:

```
32,000 ............................... $91.59
31,000 ............................... $91.59
30,000 ............................... $93.31
29,000 ............................... $94.98
28,000 ............................... $94.98
27,000 ............................... $94.98
26,000 ............................... $94.98
25,000 ............................... $94.98
24,000 ............................... $93.31
23,000 ............................... $93.31
22,000 ............................... $93.31
21,000 ............................... $93.31
20,000 ............................... $93.31
19,000 ............................... $93.31
18,000 ............................... $93.31
17,000 ............................... $93.31
16,000 ............................... $93.31
15,000 ............................... $93.31
14,000 ............................... $93.31
13,000 ............................... $93.31
12,000 ............................... $93.31
11,000 ............................... $93.31
10,000 ............................... $93.31
9,000 ............................... $93.31
8,000 ............................... $93.31
7,000 ............................... $93.31
6,000 ............................... $93.31
5,000 ............................... $93.31
4,000 ............................... $93.31
3,000 ............................... $93.31
2,000 ............................... $93.31
1,000 ............................... $93.31
...
```

SA 1016. Mrs. FEINSTEIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title I of division C, insert the following:

```
OIL AND GAS DRILLING OFF WEST COAST OF THE UNITED STATES

SEC. 1. None of the funds made available by this or any other Act may be used by the Secretary of the Interior to issue leases for the exploration, development, or production of oil or natural gas in any area of the outer Continental Shelf off the coast of the States of California, Oregon, and Washington.
```

SA 1017. Mrs. FEINSTEIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In title V of division A, strike sections 526 through 527.

SA 1018. Mr. DAINES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title I of division C, insert the following:

```
ADJUSTMENT FOR LOW-POPULATION UNITS OF GENERAL LOCAL GOVERNMENT IN THE PAYMENT IN LIEU OF TAXES PROGRAM

SEC. 1. Section 6903(c) of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “4,999” and inserting “999”; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in the matter preceding the table, by striking “9,000” and inserting “1,000”; and

(B) by striking the table and inserting the following:

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>$254.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>$320.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>$322.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>$384.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>$386.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>$394.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>$396.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>$421.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>$424.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>$430.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>$427.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>$415.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>$418.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>$411.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>$411.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>$410.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>$406.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>$406.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>$405.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>$403.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>$401.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>$400.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>$398.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>$396.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>$394.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>$393.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>$392.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>$390.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29,000</td>
<td>$389.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>$387.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31,000</td>
<td>$386.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32,000</td>
<td>$385.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33,000</td>
<td>$383.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34,000</td>
<td>$382.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>$380.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>$379.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37,000</td>
<td>$378.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38,000</td>
<td>$376.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39,000</td>
<td>$375.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>$373.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41,000</td>
<td>$372.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42,000</td>
<td>$371.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43,000</td>
<td>$369.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44,000</td>
<td>$368.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>$366.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46,000</td>
<td>$365.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47,000</td>
<td>$364.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>$362.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49,000</td>
<td>$361.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>$360.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

SA 1019. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

```
SEC. 2. REDUCTION IN AMOUNT OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Each amount made available under division A, B, C, or D of this Act (in this session referred to as a “fiscal year 2020 amount”) shall be reduced by an amount necessary for the fiscal year 2020 amount to be equal to the amount that is 2 percent less than the
```
amount made available for fiscal year 2019 for the purposes for which the fiscal year 2020 amount is being made available.

SA 1020. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title VII of division B, insert the following:

SEC. 7. (a) The Secretary of Agriculture shall revise any regulation of the Secretary of Agriculture relating to the definition of the term ‘fish’ to ensure that the definition includes any aquatic gilled animal, and any mollusk, crustacean, or other invertebrate, that exists in the wild or is produced under controlled conditions in ponds, lakes, streams, or similar holding areas.

(b) Section 343(a) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1991(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “in, fish farming” and inserting the following: “—

(A) utilizes a portion of the energy of a single cartridge.

(B) in the case of assistance under subtitle B, commercial fishing”; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking “shall” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting the following: “includes—

(A) fishing; and

(B) the case of assistance under subtitle B, commercial fishing.”

SA 1021. Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. Cramer, Ms. Cortez Masto, Mr. Van Hollen, Mr. Perdue, and Mr. Jones) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title II of division B, insert the following:

SEC. 2. (a) The United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 3(a) (42 U.S.C. 1437a(a)), by adding at the end the following:

“8) Carbon Monoxide Alarms.—Each public housing agency shall ensure that carbon monoxide alarms or detectors are installed in each dwelling unit in public housing owned or operated by the public housing agency that meets or exceeds—

(A) the standards described in chapters 9 and 11 of the 2018 publication of the International Fire Code, as published by the International Code Council; or

(B) any other standards as may be adopted by the Secretary, including any relevant updates to the International Fire Code, through a notice published in the Federal Register.”;

(2) in section 8 (42 U.S.C. 1437f)—

(A) by inserting after subsection (i) the following:

“(J) Carbon Monoxide Alarms.—Each owner of a dwelling unit receiving project-based assistance under this section shall ensure that carbon monoxide alarms or detectors are installed in the dwelling unit in a manner that meets or exceeds—

(1) the standards described in chapters 9 and 11 of the 2018 publication of the International Fire Code, as published by the International Code Council; or

(2) any other standards as may be adopted by the Secretary, in collaboration with the Department of Housing and Urban Development, including any relevant updates to the International Fire Code, through a notice published in the Federal Register;”;

(B) in subsection (o), by adding at the end the following:

“(21) Carbon Monoxide Alarms.—Each dwelling unit receiving tenant-based assistance under this section shall have carbon monoxide alarms or detectors installed in the dwelling unit in a manner that meets or exceeds—

(A) the standards described in chapters 9 and 11 of the 2018 publication of the International Fire Code, as published by the International Code Council; or

(B) any other standards as may be adopted by the Secretary, including any relevant updates to the International Fire Code, through a notice published in the Federal Register.”;

(2) in section 515 (42 U.S.C. 1485)—

(A) in subsection (m), by inserting “(1)” before “The Secretary shall establish”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) Housing and related facilities rehabilitated or repaired with amounts received under a loan made or insured under this section shall contain installed carbon monoxide alarm or detectors that meet or exceed—

(A) the standards described in chapters 9 and 11 of the 2018 publication of the International Fire Code, as published by the International Code Council; or

(B) any other standards as may be adopted by the Secretary, in collaboration with the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, including any relevant updates to the International Fire Code, through a notice published in the Federal Register.”;

(c) Section 111(j) of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 8013(j)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(7) Carbon Monoxide Alarms.—Each dwelling unit assisted under this section shall contain installed carbon monoxide alarms or detectors that meet or exceed—

(A) the standards described in chapters 9 and 11 of the 2018 publication of the International Fire Code, as published by the International Code Council; or

(B) any other standards as may be adopted by the Secretary, including any relevant updates to the International Fire Code, through a notice published in the Federal Register.”;

(d) Section 856 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 12905) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(1) Carbon Monoxide Alarms.—Each dwelling unit assisted under this subtitle shall contain installed carbon monoxide alarms or detectors that meet or exceed—

1. the standards described in chapters 9 and 11 of the 2018 publication of the International Fire Code, as published by the International Code Council; or

2. any other standards as may be adopted by the Secretary, in collaboration with the Department of Housing and Urban Development, including any relevant updates to the International Fire Code, through a notice published in the Federal Register.”;

(e) Title V of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U.S.C. 1471 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 514 (42 U.S.C. 1484), by adding at the end the following:

“(J) Housing and related facilities constructed or reconstructed under this section shall contain installed carbon monoxide alarms or detectors that meet or exceed—

(A) the standards described in chapters 9 and 11 of the 2018 publication of the International Fire Code, as published by the International Code Council; or

(B) any other standards as may be adopted by the Secretary, in collaboration with the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, including any relevant updates to the International Fire Code, through a notice published in the Federal Register.”;

(f) Section 290 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting after paragraph (29) the following:

“(30) The term ‘semiautomatic pistol’ means any repeating pistol that—

1. utilizes a portion of the energy of a cartridge to extract the fired cartridge case from the chamber that precedes each round; and

2. requires a separate pull of the trigger to fire each cartridge.

Title —ASSAULT WEAPONS BAN OF 2019

SEC. 1. SHORT TITLE. This title may be cited as the ‘‘Assault Weapons Ban of 2019’’.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS. (a) Section 921(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting after paragraph (29) the following:

“(30) The term ‘semiautomatic pistol’ means any repeating pistol that—

(A) utilizes a portion of the energy of a firing cartridge to extract the fired cartridge case from the chamber that precedes each round; and

(B) requires a separate pull of the trigger to fire each cartridge.
“(II) The term ‘semiautomatic shotgun’ means any repeating shotgun that—

“(A) utilizes a portion of the energy of a firing cartridge to extract the fired cartridge case and chamber the next round; and

“(B) requires a separate pull of the trigger to fire each cartridge.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(O) any firearm that has a fixed magazine with the capacity to accept more than 5 rounds.

“(P) any firearm that has a fixed magazine with the capacity to accept more than 10 rounds.

“(Q) any firearm that has a fixed magazine with the capacity to accept any 1 of the following:

“(i) A folding, telescoping, or detachable stock, or is otherwise foldable or adjustable in a manner that operates to reduce the length, size, or any other dimension, or otherwise enhances the concealability, of the weapon.

“(ii) A grenade launcher.

“(v) A barrel shroud.

“(vi) A barrel shroud.

“(vii) A stabilizing brace or similar component, device, attachment, or accessory that is designed or functions to accelerate the rate of fire of a semiautomatic rifle but not convert the semiautomatic rifle into a machinegun.

“(Q) any firearm that has the capacity to accept a detachable magazine and any 1 of the following:

“(i) A threaded barrel.

“(ii) A second pistol grip.

“(iii) A threaded barrel.

“(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(O) any firearm that has a fixed magazine with the capacity to accept more than 10 rounds, except for an attached tubular device designed to accept, and capable of operating or only with, .22 caliber rimfire ammunition.

“(C) any part, combination of parts, component, device, attachment, or accessory that is designed or functions to accelerate the rate of fire of a semiautomatic rifle but not convert the semiautomatic rifle into a machinegun.

“(D) any part, combination of parts, component, device, attachment, or accessory that is designed or functions to accelerate the rate of fire of a semiautomatic rifle but not convert the semiautomatic rifle into a machinegun.

“(E) any part, combination of parts, component, device, attachment, or accessory that is designed or functions to accelerate the rate of fire of a semiautomatic rifle but not convert the semiautomatic rifle into a machinegun.

“(F) any part, combination of parts, component, device, attachment, or accessory that is designed or functions to accelerate the rate of fire of a semiautomatic rifle but not convert the semiautomatic rifle into a machinegun.

“(G) any part, combination of parts, component, device, attachment, or accessory that is designed or functions to accelerate the rate of fire of a semiautomatic rifle but not convert the semiautomatic rifle into a machinegun.

“(H) any part, combination of parts, component, device, attachment, or accessory that is designed or functions to accelerate the rate of fire of a semiautomatic rifle but not convert the semiautomatic rifle into a machinegun.

“(I) any part, combination of parts, component, device, attachment, or accessory that is designed or functions to accelerate the rate of fire of a semiautomatic rifle but not convert the semiautomatic rifle into a machinegun.

“(J) any part, combination of parts, component, device, attachment, or accessory that is designed or functions to accelerate the rate of fire of a semiautomatic rifle but not convert the semiautomatic rifle into a machinegun.

“(K) any part, combination of parts, component, device, attachment, or accessory that is designed or functions to accelerate the rate of fire of a semiautomatic rifle but not convert the semiautomatic rifle into a machinegun.

“(L) any part, combination of parts, component, device, attachment, or accessory that is designed or functions to accelerate the rate of fire of a semiautomatic rifle but not convert the semiautomatic rifle into a machinegun.

“(M) any part, combination of parts, component, device, attachment, or accessory that is designed or functions to accelerate the rate of fire of a semiautomatic rifle but not convert the semiautomatic rifle into a machinegun.

“(N) any part, combination of parts, component, device, attachment, or accessory that is designed or functions to accelerate the rate of fire of a semiautomatic rifle but not convert the semiautomatic rifle into a machinegun.

“(O) any part, combination of parts, component, device, attachment, or accessory that is designed or functions to accelerate the rate of fire of a semiautomatic rifle but not convert the semiautomatic rifle into a machinegun.

“(P) any part, combination of parts, component, device, attachment, or accessory that is designed or functions to accelerate the rate of fire of a semiautomatic rifle but not convert the semiautomatic rifle into a machinegun.

“(Q) any part, combination of parts, component, device, attachment, or accessory that is designed or functions to accelerate the rate of fire of a semiautomatic rifle but not convert the semiautomatic rifle into a machinegun.

“(R) any part, combination of parts, component, device, attachment, or accessory that is designed or functions to accelerate the rate of fire of a semiautomatic rifle but not convert the semiautomatic rifle into a machinegun.

“(S) any part, combination of parts, component, device, attachment, or accessory that is designed or functions to accelerate the rate of fire of a semiautomatic rifle but not convert the semiautomatic rifle into a machinegun.

“(T) any part, combination of parts, component, device, attachment, or accessory that is designed or functions to accelerate the rate of fire of a semiautomatic rifle but not convert the semiautomatic rifle into a machinegun.

“(U) any part, combination of parts, component, device, attachment, or accessory that is designed or functions to accelerate the rate of fire of a semiautomatic rifle but not convert the semiautomatic rifle into a machinegun.

“(V) any part, combination of parts, component, device, attachment, or accessory that is designed or functions to accelerate the rate of fire of a semiautomatic rifle but not convert the semiautomatic rifle into a machinegun.

“(W) any part, combination of parts, component, device, attachment, or accessory that is designed or functions to accelerate the rate of fire of a semiautomatic rifle but not convert the semiautomatic rifle into a machinegun.

“(X) any part, combination of parts, component, device, attachment, or accessory that is designed or functions to accelerate the rate of fire of a semiautomatic rifle but not convert the semiautomatic rifle into a machinegun.

“(Y) any part, combination of parts, component, device, attachment, or accessory that is designed or functions to accelerate the rate of fire of a semiautomatic rifle but not convert the semiautomatic rifle into a machinegun.

“(Z) any part, combination of parts, component, device, attachment, or accessory that is designed or functions to accelerate the rate of fire of a semiautomatic rifle but not convert the semiautomatic rifle into a machinegun.

“2. the term ‘large capacity ammunition feeding device’—

“(A) means a magazine, belt, drum, feed strip, or similar device, including any such device joined or coupled with another in any manner, that has an overall capacity of, or that can be readily restored, changed, or
(B) does not include an attached tubular device designed to accept, and capable of operating only with, .22 caliber rimfire ammunition.

(b) RELATED DEFINITIONS.—Section 922(a) of title 18, United States Code, as amended by this title, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(39) The term 'barrel shroud' means a shroud that is attached to, or partially or completely encircles, the barrel of a firearm so that the shroud protects the user of the firearm from heat generated by the barrel.

"(40) The term 'does not include——

"(i) a slide that partially or completely encloses the barrel; or

"(ii) an extension of the stock along the bottom of the barrel which does not encircle or substantially encircle the barrel.

"(39) The term 'detachable magazine' means an ammunition feeding device that can be removed from a firearm without disassembly of the firearm action.

"(40) The term 'fixed magazine' means an ammunition feeding device that is permanently fixed to the firearm in such a manner that it cannot be removed without disassembly of the firearm action.

"(41) The term 'folding, telescoping, or detachable stock' means a stock that folds, telescopes, detaches or otherwise operates to reduce the length, size, or any other dimension, or otherwise enhances the concealability of a firearm.

"(42) The term 'forearm' means a grip located forward of the trigger that functions as a pistol grip.

"(43) The term 'grip' means a grip, a thumbhole stock or Thordsen-type grip or stock, or any other characteristic that can function as a grip.

"(44) The term 'threaded barrel' means a feature or characteristic that is designed in such a manner as to allow for the attachment of a device such as a firearm silencer or a flash suppressor.

"(45) The term 'qualified law enforcement officer' has the meaning given the term in section 921(a) of this title.

"(46) The term 'reneged launcher' means an attachment or device on a firearm that is designed to propel a grenade or other similar destructive device.

"(47) The term 'permanently inoperable' means an ammunition feeding device that is incapable of discharging a shot by means of an explosive and incapable of being readily restored to a firing condition.

"(48) The term 'rifle', 'rifle ammunition', and 'ammunition feeding device' means a firearm, ammunition, or feeding device otherwise lawfully possessed under Federal law on the date of enactment of the Assault Weapons Ban of 1994.

"(49) Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any firearm that—

("A) is manually operated by bolt, pump, lever, or slide action;

("B) has been remade permanently inoperable; or

("C) is an antique firearm, as defined in section 921(a)(39) of title 18, United States Code.

"(50) Paragraph (1) shall not apply to—

"(A) the importation, for, sale, or transfer to, or possession by the United States or a department or agency of the United States or a State or a department, agency, or political subdivision of a State, or a sale or transfer to or possession by a licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, or licensed dealer, to store or keep under the control of the Attorney General; or

"(B) the importation, sale, manufacture, transfer, or possession of any large capacity ammunition feeding device.
retrieve and use the grandfathered semiautomatic assault weapon as if the grandfathered semiautomatic assault weapon were carried on the person; or

(2) locked by a secure gun storage or safety device that the prohibited individual has no ability to access.”.

(b) Identification Markings for Semiautomatic Assault Weapons.—Section 922(i) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(b) Identification Markings for Semiautomatic Assault Weapons.—Section 922(i) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following: “The serial number of any semiautomatic assault weapon manufactured after the date of enactment of the Assault Weapons Ban of 2019 shall clearly show the date on which the weapon was manufactured, or made, legibly and conspicuously engraved or cast on the weapon, and such other identification as the Attorney General shall by regulations prescribe.”.

(c) Identification Markings for Large Capacity Ammunition Feeding Devices.—Section 922(i) of title 18, United States Code, as amended by this title, is amended by adding at the end the following: “A large capacity ammunition feeding device manufactured after the date of enactment of the Assault Weapons Ban of 2019 shall clearly show the serial number and the date on which the device was manufactured, or made, legibly and conspicuously engraved or cast on the device, and such other identification as the Attorney General shall by regulations prescribe.”.

(d) Seizure and Forfeiture of Large Capacity Ammunition Feeding Devices.—Subsection (d) of section 922 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by inserting “or large capacity ammunition feeding device” after “firearm or ammunition” each time it appears;

(B) by inserting “or large capacity ammunition feeding device” after “firearms or ammunition” each time it appears; and

(C) by striking “or (k)” and inserting “(k)”;

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (C), by inserting “or large capacity ammunition feeding device” after “firearms or quantities of ammunition”; and

(3) in paragraph (3)—

(A) in subparagraph (E), by inserting “or large capacity ammunition feeding device” after “firearms or ammunition” each time it appears; and

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(C) by striking “or (k)” and inserting “(k),”;

(2) in paragraph (4), by inserting “or large capacity ammunition feeding device” after “firearms or quantities of ammunition” each time it appears; and

(e) by adding at the end the following:

“APPENDIX A—FIREARMS EXEMPTED BY THE ASSAULT WEAPONS BAN OF 2017—CENTERFIRE RIFLES—AUTOLOADERS

Benelli R1 Rifle

Browning BAR Mark II Safari Magnum Rifle

Browning BAR Mark II Safari Semi-Auto Rifle

Browning BAR Stalker Rifles

Browning High-Power Rifle

Browning Longtrac Rifle

Browning Shorttrac Rifle

Heckler & Koch HK430

Heckler & Koch HK770

Heckler & Koch HK940

Heckler & Koch Model 300 Rifle

Heckler & Koch SK7 Rifle

Iver Johnson 50th Anniversary Model 1 Carbine

Iver Johnson M-1 Carbine (w/o folding stock)

Iver Johnson M-1 Carbine

Johnson’s Carbine (w/o folding stock)

M-1 Carabine with standard fixed stock

M-1 Carbine with standard adjustable sights

Marlin Model 9 Camp Carbine

Marlin Model 45 Carbine

Remington Model 81

Remington Model 740

Remington Model 742

Remington Model 750 Synthentic

Remington Model 750 Woodmaster

Remington Model 7400 Rifle

Remington Model 7400 Special Purpose Auto Rifle

Remington Nylon 66 Auto-Loading Rifle

Ruger Mini 30

Ruger PC9 (w/o folding or telescoping stock or pistol grip)

Ruger PC9

SKS-type rifles with fixed 10 round magazine and standard fixed stock

Winchester Model SXR

‘CENTREFIRE RIFLES—LEVER & SLIDE’

Action Arms Timber Wolf Pump Action

Beretta 1873 U.S. Model Lever Action

Beretta Gold Rush Slide Action

Big Horn Armony Model 89

Browning BLR Model 181 Lever Action, All Models

Browning BPR Pump Rifle

Browning Model 53 Lever Action

Browning Model 65 Grade 1 Lever Action Rifle

Browning Model 71 Rifle and Carbine

Browning Model 81 BLR

Browning Model 81 BLR Lever-Action Rifle

Browning Model 81 Long Action BLR

Browning Model 1866 High Grade Carbine

Browning Model 1866 Lever-Action Carbine

Charles Daly Model 1892 Lever Action, All Models

Chiappa 1866 Lever Action Rifles

Cimarron 1860 Henry Replica

Cimarron 1866 Winchester Replicas

Cimarron 1873 30” Express Rifle

Cimarron 1873 Short Rifle

Cimarron 1873 Sporting Rifle

Cimarron 1873 Winchester Replicas

Dixie Engraved 1873 Rifle

Dixie Lightning Rifle and Carbines

E.M.F. 1860 Henry Rifle

E.M.F. 1866 Yellowboy Lever Actions

E.M.F. Model 73 Lever-Action Rifle

E.M.F. Model 1873 Lever Actions

Henry .30-30 Lever Action Carbine

Henry Big Boy .357 Magnum

Henry Big Boy .44 Magnum

Henry Big Boy .45 Colt

Henry Big Boy Deluxe Engraved .44 Magnum

Henry Big Boy Deluxe Engraved .45 Colt

Marlin Model 30A5 Lever-Action Carbine

Marlin Model 62 Lever Action

Marlin Model 93 Lever Action

Marlin Model 170 Pump Action

Marlin Model 308MX

Marlin Model 336 Deluxe

Marlin Model 336C

Marlin Model 336S 7.62x39mm Lever-Action Carbine

Marlin Model 336DL Lever Action

Marlin Model 336SS

Marlin Model 336W

Marlin Model 336XLR

Marlin Model 338MX

Marlin Model 338XLR

Marlin Model 44

Marlin Model 44 Lever-Action

Marlin Model 44XLR

Marlin Model 1894 Marlin Model 1894 Cowboy

Marlin Model 1894 Lever Action, All Models

Marlin Model 1894C

Marlin Model 1894CL Classic

Marlin Model 1894CS Carbine

Marlin Model 1894S Lever Action Carbine

Marlin Model 1894SS

Marlin Model 1895

Marlin Model 1895 Bullboy

Marlin Model 1895 Lever Action, All Models

Marlin Model 1895GS

Marlin Model 1895MS

Marlin Model 1895MSXLR

Marlin Model 1895SS Lever-Action Rifle

Marlin Model 1895XLR

Marlin XLR Lever Action Rifles

Mitchell 1863 Henry Rifle

Mitchell 1866 Winchester Replica

Mitchell 1873 Winchester Replica

Mossberg 464 Lever Action Rifle

Mossberg 500 472 Lever Action

Mossberg Model 479 Lever Action

Navy Arms 1866 Yellowboy Rifle

Navy Arms 1873 Sporting Rifle

Navy Arms 1874 Winchester-Style Rifle

Navy Arms 1892 Short Rifle

Navy Arms Henry Carbine

Navy Arms Henry Trapper

Navy Arms Iron Frame Henry

Navy Arms Military Henry Rifle

Puma Bounty Hunter Rifle

Puma Model 92 Rifles & Carbines

Remington 7600 Slide Action

Remington Model 6 Pump Action

Remington Model 14, 14.5 Pump Actions

Remington Model 141 Pump Action

Remington Model 760 Slide Actions

Remington Model 760 Special Purpose Slide Action

Remington Model 7600 Synthetic

Remington Model 7615 Camo Hunter

Remington Model 7615 Ranch Carbine

Remington Model 7615 SPS

Rossi M292 SRC Slide-Ring Carbine

Rossi M293 SRS Short Carbine

Rossi 432 Lever Action Carbines

Ruger Model 96/44 Lever Action

Savage 99C Lever-Action Rifle

Savage Model 170 Pump Action

C.D. Taylor & Co., Inc. 1865 Spencer Carbine/Rifle

Taylor’s & Co., Inc. 1892 Carbine/Rifle

U.S. Fire Arms Standard Lightning Magazine Rifle

Uberti 1866 Sporting Rifle Uberti 1873 Sporting Rifle

Uberti 1876 Rifle

Uberti 1883 Burgess Lever Action Rifle/Carbine

Uberti Henry Rifle

Uberti Lightning Rifle/Carbine

Wheeler & Co., Hunter Carbines

Wheeler Lever Actions, All Other Center Fire Models

Winchester Model 94 Big Bore Side Eject

Winchester Model 94 Ranger Side Eject

Winchester Model 94 Side Eject Lever-Action Rifle

Winchester Model 94 Side Eject Lever-Action Rifle

Winchester Model 94 Trapper Side Eject

Winchester Model 1895 Safari Centennial

CENTERFIRE RIFLES—BOLT ACTION

Accurate Arms Raptor & Backpack Bolt Action Rifles

Alpine Bolt-Action Rifle

Anschutz 1700D Bavarian Bolt-Action Rifle

Anschutz 1700D Classic Rifles

Anschutz 1700D German Rifles

Anschutz 173SD Mannlicher Rifle

Arnold Arms African Safari & Alaskan Trophy Rifles

A-Square Caesar Bolt-Action Rifle

A-Square Genghis Khan Bolt Action Rifle

A-Square Hamilcar Bolt Action Rifle

A-Square Hannibal Bolt-Action Rifle

Augusta Franchotte Bolt-Action Rifles

Bannons Ultimate Bolt Action Rifles

Beeman/HW 60J Bolt-Action Rifle

Benton & Brown Firearms, Inc. Model 93 Bolt Action Rifle

Blackheart International BBG Hunter Bolt Action
``Blackheart International LLC BBG Light
Sniper Bolt Action
``Blaser R9 Professional
``Blaser R84 Bolt-Action Rifle
``Blaser R85 Bolt-Action Rifle
``BRNO 537 Sporter Bolt-Action Rifle
``BRNO ZKB 527 Fox Bolt-Action Rifle
``BRNO ZKB 600, 602 Bolt-Action Rifles
``Brown Precision Company Bolt Action Sporter
``Browning A-Bolt Gold Medallion
``Browning A-Bolt Left Hand
``Browning A-Bolt Micro Medallion
``Browning A-Bolt Rifle
``Browning A-Bolt Short Action
``Browning Euro-Bolt Rifle
``Browning High-Power Bolt Action Rifle
``Browning X-Bolt Action Rifle
``Carbol One Bolt Action Rifle
``Carl Gustaf 2000 Bolt-Action Rifle Century
``Centurion 14 Sporter
``Century Enfield Sporter #4
``Century M70 Sporter
``Century Mauser 98 Sporter
``Century Swedish Sporter #38
``Cheytac M40A3
``Cheytac M70 Sporter
``Cooper Model 21 Bolt Action Rifle
``Cooper Model 22 Bolt Action Rifle
``Cooper Model 75 Centerfire Sporter
``Cooper Model 56 Bolt Action Rifles
``CZ 527 Bolt Action Rifles
``CZ 550 M, S, S/T
``CZ 750 Sniper Rifle
``Dakota 22 Sporter Bolt-Action Rifle
``Dakota 76 Classic Bolt-Action Rifle
``Dakota 76 Safari Bolt-Action Rifle
``Dakota 76 Short Action Rifles
``Dakota 97 Bolt Action Rifle
``Dakota 416 Rigby African
``Dakota Predator Rifle
``DSA DS-MP1 Bolt Action Rifle
``E.A.A./Sabatti Rover 870 Bolt-Action Rifle
``EAA/Zastava M-83 Black Arrow Rifle
``Ed Brown Hunting and Model 704 Bolt Action Rifles
``Heym Bolt Action Rifles
``Heym Magnum Express Series Rifle
``Haw Boys Action Rifle
``Haw Lightning Bolt-Action Rifle
``Haw Realtree Camo Rifle
``H-S Precision Left-Hand Rifle
``Interarms Mark X Bolt Action Rifles
``Interarms Mark X Viscount Bolt-Action Rifle
``Interarms Mark X Whitworth Bolt-Action Rifle
``Interarms Mini-Mark X Rifle
``Interarms Whitworth Express Rifle
``Iver Johnson Model 500A1 Long-Range Rifle
``KDF K15 American Bolt-Action Rifle
``Keen-Barrett Bolt Action Rifle
``Kimber Bolt Action Rifles
``Krico Model 600 Bolt-Action Rifle
``Krico Model 700 Bolt-Action Rifles
``Magnum Research Mount Eagle Rifles
``Marlin Model XL7
``Marlin Model XL7C
``Marlin Model XL7L
``Marlin Model XL7W
``Marlin Model X8T
``Marlin Model X8TC
``Marlin Model XST
``Marlin Model XS7
``Marlin Model XS7C
``Marlin Model XT9
``Marlin XP-177 Bolt Action Rifle
``Mauzer Model 66 Bolt-Action Rifle
``Mauzer Model 99 Bolt-Action Rifle
``McMillan Classic Stainless Sporter
``McMillan Signature Alaskan
``McMillan Signature Classic Sporter
``McMillan Signature Super Varminter
``McMillan Signature Titanium Mountain Rifle
``McMillan Talon Safari Rifle
``McMillan Talon Sporter Rifle
``Merkel KRG Bolt Action Rifle
``Midland 1500S Survivor Rifle
``Mossberg Model 100 ATR (All-Terrain Rifle
``Navy Arma TU-340 Carbine
``Nosler Model 48 Varmint Rifle
``Parker Hale Bolt Action Rifles
``Parker-Hale Model 81 Classic African Rifle
``Parker-Hale Model 81 Classic Rifle
``Parker-Hale Model 1000 Rifle
``Parker-Hale Model 1100 Lightweight Rifle
``Parker-Hale Model 1100M African Magnum
``Parker-Hale Model 1200 Super Clip Rifle
``Parker-Hale Model 1200 Super Rifle
``Parker-Hale Model 1300C Scout Rifle
``Parker-Hale Model 2100 Midland Rifle
``Parker-Hale Model 3700 Lightweight Rifle
``Parker-Hale Model 2900 Midland Rifle
``Remington 700 ADL Bolt-Action Rifle
``Remington 700 BDL Bolt-Action Rifle
``Remington 700 BDL European Bolt-Action Rifle
``Remington 700 BDL Left Hand
``Remington 700 BDL SS Rifle
``Remington 700 BDL Varmint Special
``Remington 700 Compact Synthetic Rifle
``Remington 700 Classic Rifle
``Remington 700 Custom K5 Mountain Rifle
``Remington 700 Mountain Rifle
``Remington 700 SS Bolt Action Rifles
``Remington 700 Safari
``Remington 700 Stainless Synthetic Rifles
``Remington 700 Varmint Bolt Action Synthetic Rifle
``Remington Model 4-X Bolt Action Rifles
``Remington Model 700 Alaskan Tactical Rifle
``Remington Model 700 Bolt Action Rifles
``Remington Model 700 CDL
``Remington Model 700 CDL ‘Boone and Crockett’ Edition
``Remington Model 700 CDL Left-Hand
``Remington Model 700 CDL SF Limited Edition
``Remington Model 700 CDL SS Rifle
``Remington Model 700 Mountain LSS
``Remington Model 700 Sendero SF II
``Remington Model 700 SPS
``Remington Model 700 SPS Buckmasters Edition
``Remington Model 700 SPS Buckmasters Edition ‘Young Bucks’ Youth
``Remington Model 700 SPS Stainless
``Remington Model 700 SPS Tactical Rifle
``Remington Model 700 SPS Varmint
``Remington Model 700 SPS Varmint (Left-Hand)
``Remington Model 700 SPS Youth Synthetic Left-Hand
``Remington Model 700 VL SS Thumbhole
``Remington Model 700 VLS
``Remington Model 700 VLS SP II
``Remington Model 700 VTR
``Remington Model 700 XCR
``Remington Model 700 XCR Camo
``Remington Model 700 XCR Compact Tactical Rifle
``Remington Model 700 XCR Left-Hand
``Remington Model 700 XCR Tactical Long Range Rifle
``Remington Model 715
``Remington Model 770
``Remington Model 770 Bolt Action Rifles
``Remington Model 770 Stainless Camo
``Remington Model 770 Youth
``Remington Model 798
``Remington Model 798 Safari
``Remington Model 798 SPS
``Remington Model 799
``Remington Model Seven 25th Anniversary
``Remington Model Seven Bolt Action Rifles
``Remington Model Seven CDL
``Remington Model Seven Custom KS
``Remington Model Seven Custom MS Rifle
``Remington Model Seven Delux
``Remington Model Seven Youth Rifle
``Ruger M77 Hawkeye African
``Ruger M77 Hawkeye Alaskan
``Ruger M77 Hawkeye All-Weather
``Ruger M77 Hawkeye All-Weather Ultra Light
``Ruger M77 Hawkeye Compact
``Ruger M77 Hawkeye International
``Ruger M77 Hawkeye Laminate Compact
``Ruger M77 Hawkeye Laminate Left-Handed
``Ruger M77 Hawkeye Predator
``Ruger M77 Hawkeye Sporter
``Ruger M77 Hawkeye Standard
``Ruger M77 Hawkeye Standard Left-Handed
``Ruger M77 Hawkeye Tactical
``Ruger M77 Hawkeye Ultra Light
``Ruger M77 Mark II All-Weather Stainless Rifle
``Ruger M77 Mark II Express Rifle
``Ruger M77 Mark II Magnum Rifle
``Ruger M77 Mark II Rifle
``Ruger M77 Mark II Target Rifle
``Ruger M77 RSI International Carbine
``Ruger M77
``Ruger Compact Magnum
``Ruger M77R1 Ultra Light
``Ruger M77V1 Target Rifle
``Ruger Model 77 Bolt Action Rifles
``Sako Bolt Action Rifles
``Sako Classic Bolt Action
``Sako Deluxe Lightweight
``Sako FiberClass Rifle
``Sako Hunter Left-Hand Rifle
``Sako Hunter L8 Rifle Sako Hunter Rifle
``Sako Mannlicher-Style Carbine
``Sako Safari Bolt Action
``Sako Super Deluxe Sporter
``Sako TRG-S Bolt-Action Rifle
``Sako Varmint Heavy Barrel
``Sauer 90 Bolt-Action Rifle
``Savage 16/16 rifles
``Savage 110 Bolt Action Rifles
``Savage 110CY Youth/Lady Rifle
``Savage 110F Bolt-Action Rifle
``Savage 110FF Police Rifle
``Savage 110FX Bolt-Action Rifle
``Savage 110G Bolt-Action Rifle
``Savage 110GV Varmint Rifle
``Savage 110GXP Bolt-Action Rifle
``Savage 110WLE One of One Thousand Limited Edition Rifle
``Savage 112 Bolt Action Rifles
``Savage 112FV Varmint Rifle
``Savage 116 Bolt Action Rifle
``Savage 116F Bolt Action Rifle
``Savage Axis Series Bolt Action Rifles
``Savage Model 10 Bolt Action Rifles
``Savage Model 10GXP Package Guns
``Savage Model 1111 Series Bolt Action Rifles
``Savage Model 12 Series Rifles
``Savage Model 14/114 Series Rifles
``Savage Model 25 Bolt Action Rifles
``Savage Model 110GXP Package Guns
``Savage Model 112BHV Heavy Barrel Varmint Rifle
``Savage Model 112FVS Varmint Rifle
``Savage Model 116FSK Kodiak Rifle
``Shilen Rifles Inc. DGA Bolt Action Rifles
``Smith & Wesson M-1 Bolt Rifle
``Steyr Scout Bolt Action Rifle
``Steyr SSG 69 PII Bolt Action Rifle
``Steyr Scout Bolt Action Rifle
``Stereotype Model L, M, S
``Steyr-Mannlicher Model L, M, S
``Steyr-Mannlicher Model M Professional Rifle
``Steyr-Mannlicher Sporter Models SL, L, M, S, ST
``Thompson/Center ICON Bolt Action Rifles
``Thompson/Center Icon Classic Long Action Rifle
``Thompson/Center Icon Medium Action Rifle
``Thompson/Center Icon Precision Hunter
``Thompson/Center Icon Weather Shield Long Action Rifle
``Thompson/Center Icon Weather Shield Medium Action Rifle
```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rifle Model</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marlin Model 69C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlin Model 68BS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlin Model 68S–CF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlin Model 68SN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlin Model 68L Self-Loading Rifle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlin Model 70 Auto-loading Rifles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlin Model 70HC Auto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlin Model 70P Papoose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlin Model 710PS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlin Model 795</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlin Model 795SS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlin Model 922 Magnum Self-Loading Rifle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlin Model 990L Self-Loading Rifle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlin Model 996 Self-Loading Rifle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mossberg Model 72 Pump Rifle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norinco Model 22 ATD Rifle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remington 552BDL Speedmaster Rifle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remington Model 522 Viper Auto-loading Rifle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remington Model 597 Blaze Camo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remington Model 597 Pink Camo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remington Model 597 Synthetic Scope Combo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruger 10/22 Autoloading Carbine (w/o folding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stock)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruger 10/22 Compact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruger 10/22 Target</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survival Arms AR-7 Explorer Rifle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Remington Revolving Carbine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson/Center R-55 All-Weather</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson/Center R-55 Benchmark</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson/Center R-55 Classic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson/Center R-55 rifles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson/Center R-55 Sporter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voere Model 2115 Auto Rifle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIFLE RIFLES—LEVER &amp; SLIDE ACTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browning BL-22 Lever Action Rifle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Lever Action 22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Lever Action 22 Magnum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Lever Action .22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Lever Carbine .22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Lever Octagon .22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Lever Octagon .22 Magnum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Lever Youth Model .22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Pump Action Octagon .22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Pump Action Octagon 22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Varmint Express .17 HMR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlin 9TD6 Carbine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlin Model 9A Golden Lever Action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlin Model 9AAS Golden Lever-Action Rifle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mossberg Model 464 Rimfire Lever Action Rifle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norinco EM-321 Pump Rifle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remington 572BDL Fieldmaster Pump Rifle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rossi Model 62 SA Pump Rifle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rossi Model 62 SAC Carbine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rossi Model 62 Gallery Rifle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruger Model 96 Lever-Action Rifle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taurus Model 62-Pump</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taurus Model 72 Pump Rifle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winchester Model 9422 Lever-Action Rifle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winchester Model 9422 Magnum Lever-Action Rifle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIMFIRE RIFLES—BOLT ACTIONS &amp; SINGLE SHOTS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anschutz 1416D/1516D Classic Rifles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anschutz 1418D/1518D Mannlicher Rifles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anschutz 1700 FWT Bolt-Action Rifle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anschutz 1700D Bavarian Bolt-Action Rifle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anschutz 1700D Classic Rifles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anschutz 1700D Custom Rifles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anschutz 1700D Graphite Custom Rifle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anschutz 1702 H B Classic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anschutz 1713 Silhouette</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anschutz Achiver</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anschutz Achiver Bolt-Action Rifle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anschutz All other Bolt Action Rimfire Models</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anschutz Kadett</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anschutz Model 1502 D Classic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anschutz Model 1517 D Classic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anschutz Model 1517F MPR Multi Purpose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anschutz Model 1518 D MPB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anschutz Model 1710 D KL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anschutz Model 1717 Classic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anschutz Model 1717 Silhouette Sporter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anschutz Model 1717F MPR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anschutz Model 1717F Woodchucker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armscor Model 14P Bolt-Action Rifle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armscor Model 15P Bolt-Action Rifle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beeman HW 60-J-ST Bolt-Action Rifle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRNO ZKM 452 Deluxe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRNO ZKM 456 Lux Sporter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRNO ZKM 552 Deluxe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browning A-Bolt 22 Bolt-Action Rifle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browning A-Bolt Gold Medallion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browning B-T Bolt Rimfire Rifle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabanillas 22 T Bolt Action Rifle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabanillas 22T Bolt Action Rifle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabanillas Master Bolt-Action Rifle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabanillas Phaser Rifle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chipmunk Single Shot Rifle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooper Arms Model 368 Sporter Rifle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooper Model 57-M Bolt Action Rifle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ 452 Bolt Action Rifles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dakota 22 Sporter Bolt-Action Rifle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davey Crickett Single Shot Rifle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrington &amp; Richardson Sportster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrington &amp; Richardson Sportster 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hornaday Master R-55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voere Model 2115 Auto Rifle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition Rifles—Centerfire &amp; Rimfire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anschutz 1830D Intermediate Match</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anschutz 1838D RT Super Match 54 Target</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anschutz 1837B Biathlon Rifle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anschutz 1837BFT Fortner Biathlon Rifle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anschutz 1906 Rifles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anschutz 1907 Match Rifle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anschutz 1910 Super Match II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anschutz 1911 Match Rifle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anschutz 1912 Rifles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anschutz 1913 Super Match Rifle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anschutz 54.18MS REP Deluxe Silhouette Rifle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anschutz 54.18MS Silhouette Rifle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anschutz 64 MP R Silhouette Rifle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anschutz 64-MS Left Silhouette</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anschutz Super Match 54 Target Model 2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anschutz Super Match 54 Target Model 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beeman/Feinwerkbau 2600 Target Rifle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooper Arms Model TRF-1 ISU Standard Rifle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.A.A./HW 60 Target Rifle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.A.A./HW 600 Match Rifle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.A.A./HW 800 Match Rifle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Brown Model 7014, 4442A2 Marine Sniper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish Lion Standard Target Rifle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krico Model 366B Biathlon Rifle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krico Model 366S Biathlon Rifle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krico Model 400 Match Rifle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krico Model 500 Kricotronic Match Rifle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krico Model 600 Match Rifle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krico Model 600 Sniper Rifle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakefield Arms Model 90B Target Rifle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakefield Arms Model 91T Target Rifle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakefield Arms Model 92S Silhouette Rifle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlin Model 2000 Target Rifle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauser Model 66–SR Specialty Rifle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMillan 300 Phoenix Long Range Rifle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMillan Long Range Rifle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMillan M-86 Sniper Rifle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMillan M-89 Sniper Rifle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMillan National Match Rifle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker-Hale M-45 Sniper Rifle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker-Hale M-67 Target Rifle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remington 40-X Bolt Action Rifles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remington 40-XR Rangemaster Target Centerfire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remington 40-XBKR KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remington 40-RC KS National Match Course Rifle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remington 40-XR KS Rimfire Position Rifle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shotgun Model</td>
<td>Year of Introduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretta Xtrema2</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breda Altair</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breda Altair Special</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breda Aries 2</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breda Astra</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breda Astralux</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breda Echo</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breda Ermes Series</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breda Gold Series</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breda Grizzly</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breda Mira</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breda Standard Series</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breda Xeno</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brolin BL-12</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brolin SAS-12</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browning A-9000 Auto Shotgun</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browning A-9000 Sporting Clays</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browning A-9000 Auto Shotgun</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browning Auto-5 Light 12 and 20</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browning Auto-5 Magnum 20</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browning Auto-5 Stalker</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browning B3000 Series</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browning BSA 10 Auto Shotgun</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browning BSA 10 Stalker Auto Shotgun</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browning Gold Series</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browning Maxus Series</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Daly Field Gear Series</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Daly Novomatic Series</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churchill Standard Model</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churchill Turkey Automatic Shotgun</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churchill Windsor</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cosmi Automatic Shotgun</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ 712</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ 720</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ 912</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escort Escort Series</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European American Armony (EAA)</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabarres Elieli Series</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabarms Lion Series</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabarms Tactical</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNI USA Model SLP</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franchi 610V5</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franchi 612 Series</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franchi 620</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franchi 712</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franchi 720</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franchi 912</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franchi AL 48</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franchi Elite</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franchi 1-12 Inertia Series</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franchi Prestige</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H&amp;K Model 512</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H&amp;K M1900</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H&amp;K Model 403</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi-Standard 10A</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi-Standard 10B</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi-Standard Semi Automatic Model</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi-Standard Supermatic Series</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ithaca Mag-10</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ithaca Model 51 Series</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ithaca Model 84 Series</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaSalle Semi-automatic</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ljutic Batic Automatic Loader</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luger Ultra-light Model</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlin 12 Series</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maverick Model 50 Auto Shotgun</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maverick Model 90 Auto Shotgun</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mossberg 1000</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mossberg Model 600 Auto Shotgun</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mossberg Model 2000 Auto Shotgun</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mossberg Model 630 Slugster</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mossberg Model 930 Turkey</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mossberg Model 930 Waterfowl</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mossberg Model 930 Magnum Combus</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mossberg Model 935 Magnum Flyway Series</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mossberg Model 935 Magnum Grand Slam Series Turkey</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mossberg Model 935 Magnum Turkey</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mossberg Model 935 Magnum Waterfowl</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New England Firearms Excell Auto Synthetic</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New England Firearms Excell Auto Turley</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New England Firearms Excell Auto Walnut</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New England Firearms Excell Auto Waterfowl</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nighthawk Tactical Semi-auto</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottomanungs Sultan Series</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remington 100G 20-Gauge Deer Gun</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remington 1100 10-Gauge Auto</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remington 1100 10-Gauge Tournament Skeet</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remington 11 Special Field</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remington 11-48 Series</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remington 11-49 Series</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remington Model 1100 Classic Trap</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remington Model 1100 Competition</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remington Model 1100 G3</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remington Model 1100 Series</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remington Model 1100 Slugger</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remington Model 1100 Sporting Series</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remington Model 11-87 Sportsman Camo</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remington Model 11-87 Sportsman Super Mag Synthetic</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remington Model 11-87 Sportsman Super Mag Waterfowl</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remington Model 11-87 Sportsman Youth Synthetic</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remington Model 48 Series</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remington Model 68 Series</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remington Model 870 Classic Trap</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remington Model 878A Automaster</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remington Model SP-10 Magnum Satin</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remington Model SP-10 Waterfowl</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remington Model SPR553</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remington Versa-Max Series</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savage Model 720</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savage Model 726</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savage Model 740C</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savage Model 758 Series</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savage Model 773 Series</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scattergun Technologies K-9</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scattergun Technologies SWAT</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scattergun Technologies Urban Sniper Model</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKB 1300 Upland</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKB 1900</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKB 300 Series</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKB 900 Series</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKS 3000</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith &amp; Wesson Model 1000</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith &amp; Wesson Model 1012 Series</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spartan Gun Works SPR553</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOZ Model H-170</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri-Star Diana Series</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri-Star Phantom Series</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri-Star Sapper Series</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tula Arms Plant TOZ 87</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verona 401 Series</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verona 405 Series</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verona 406 Series</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verona SX801 Series</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weatherby Centurion Series</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weatherby Field Grade</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weatherby Model 82</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weatherby SA-06 Series</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weatherby SA-459 TR</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weatherby SAS Series</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winchester 1500</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winchester 1500 Model</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winchester Model 50</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winchester Model 59</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winchester Super X1 Series</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winchester Super X2 Series</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winchester Super X3 Series</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SHOTGUNS—SLIDE ACTIONS**

- ADCO Diamond Grade
- ADCO Diamond Series Shotguns
- ADCO Mariner Model
- ADCO Sales Inc. Gold Elite Series
- Armscor M-39 Series
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mossberg Model 335 Series Pump Shotgun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mossberg Model 353 Ulti-Mag</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mossberg Turkey Model 500 Pump</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Wild Turkey Federation (NWTF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banquet Guns of the Year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New England Firearms Pardner Pump Combo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New England Firearms Pardner Pump Field</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New England Firearms Pardner Pump Slug Gun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthetic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey Gun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New England Firearms Pardner Pump Walnut</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New England Firearms Pardner Pump-Compact Field</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New England Firearms Pardner Pump-Compact Synthetic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compact Walnut</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norinco Model 98 Field Series</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norinco Model 984</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norinco Model 985</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norinco Model 987</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Varsity Series</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniplume Limited Edition Pump Shotguns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remington 870 Express</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remington 870 Express Rifle Sighted Deer Gun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remington 870 Express Series Pump Shotguns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remington 870 Express Turkey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remington 870 High Grade Series</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remington 870 High Grades</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remington 870 Marine Magnum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remington 870 Special Field</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remington 870 Special Purpose Deer Gun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remington 870 Special Purpose Synthetic Gun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remington 870 Super Special Magnum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remington 870 SP8–BG–Camo Deer/Turkey Shot Gun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remington 870 SP8–Deer Shotgun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remington 870 SP8–T Camo Pump Shotguns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remington 870 TC Trap</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remington 870 Wingmaster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remington 870 Wingmaster Series</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remington 870 Wingmaster Small Gauges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remington Model 11–87 XCS Super Magnum Waterfowl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remington Model 870 Ducks Unlimited Series Dinner Pump Shotguns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remington 870 Express</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remington 870 Express JR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remington Model 870 Express Shurshot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthetic Cantilever</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remington Model 870 Express Super Magnum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remington Model 870 Express Synthetic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remington Model 870 Express Youth Gun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remington Model 870 Express Youth Synthetic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remington Model 870 SPS ShareShot Synthetic Cantilever</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remington Model 870 SPS ShareShot Synthetic Turkish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remington Model 870 SPS Special Purpose Magnum Series Pump Shotguns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remington Model 870 SPS Super Mag Max Gobbler</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remington Model 870 XCS Marine Magnum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remington Model 870 XCS Super Magnum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winchester 12 Commercial Riot Gun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winchester 97 Commercial Riot Gun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winchester Model 12 Pump Shotgun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winchester Model 1200 Series Shotgun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winchester Model 1300 Ranger Pump Gun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winchester Model 1300 Series Shotgun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winchester Model 1300 Slug Hunter Deer Gun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winchester Model 1300 Turkey Gun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winchester Model 1300 Walnut Pump</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winchester Model 42 High Grade Shotgun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winchester Speed Pump Defender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winchester SXP Series Pump Shotgun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoli Pump Action Shotgun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHOTGUNS—OVER/UNDERS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Arms Franchi Falconet 2000 0/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Arms Lince</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Arms Silver 1 O/U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Arms Silver II Shotgun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Arms Silver Skeet O/U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Arms Silver Sporting O/U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Arms Silver Trap O/U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Arms WS/OU 12, TS/OU 12 Shotguns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Arms WT/OU 10 Shotgun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Arms Franchi Sporting 2000 0/U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armaport 2700 O/U Goose Gun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ArmaSport 2700 Series O/U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ArmaSport 2900 Tri-Barrel Shotgun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYA Augusta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYA Coral A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYA Coral B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYA Excelsior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYA Model 97 Super</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYA Model 77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYA Model 79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Breton Over/Under Shotgun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baikal IZH27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baikal MP310</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baikal MP333</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baikal MP97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretta 90 DE LUXE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretta 682 Gold E Skeet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretta 682 Gold E Trap</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretta 682 Gold E Trap Bottom Single</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretta 882 Series</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretta 886 Series</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretta 886 White Onyx</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretta 886 White Onyx Sporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretta 887 EELL Classic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretta 887 EELL Diamond Pigeon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretta 887 EELL Diamond Pigeon Sporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretta 887 series</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretta 887 EELL Sporting O/U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretta Alpha Series</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretta America Standard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretta A5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretta ASE 90 Competition O/U Shotgun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretta ASE 90 Gold Skeet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretta ASE Gold</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretta ASE Series</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretta ASEL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretta BR Series</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretta DT10 Series</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretta DT10 Trident EELL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretta DT10 Trident L Sporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretta DT10 Trident Skeet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretta DT10 Trident Sporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretta DT10 Trident Trap Combo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretta Europa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretta Field Shotguns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretta Gamma Series</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretta Giubileo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretta Grade Four</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretta Grade One</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretta Grade Three</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretta Grade Two</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretta Milano</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretta Model 686 Ultralight O/U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretta Model S05, S06, S09 Shotguns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretta Onyx Hunter Sport O/U Shotgun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretta Over/Under Field Shotguns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretta Royal Pigeon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretta SS6 Series</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretta SS8 Series</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model Name</td>
<td>Company/Manufacturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretta Series 682 Competition Over/Under</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretta Silver Pigeon II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretta Silver Pigeon II Sporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretta Silver Pigeon III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretta Silver Pigeon III Sporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretta Silver Pigeon IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretta Silver Pigeon 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretta Silver Pigeon 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretta Silver Snipe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretta Skeet Set</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretta SO-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretta SO-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretta SO-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretta SO-4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretta SO6 EELL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretta SO-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretta SO10 EELL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretta Sportclay Shotgun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretta SV10 Perennia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretta Ultralight</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretta Ultralight Deluxe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretta SO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bretschi Zeus Series</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Besch Boxlock Model</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Bear Arms LJ-38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Bear Arms Sterling Series</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Bear LJ-27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blaser F3 Series</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosis Challenger Titanium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosis Laura</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosis Michaelangelo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosis Wild Series</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boss Custom Over/Under Shotguns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boss Merlin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boss Pendragon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breda Pegaso Series</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breda Siro Standard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breda Vega Series</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brette Baby Standard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bretteon Sprint Deluxe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRNO 300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRNO 502</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRNO 601</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRNO 602</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRNO BS-571</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRNO BS-762</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRNO ZH-400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRNO ZH-401</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRNO ZH-502</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRNO ZH-303</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browning 325 Sporting Clays</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browning 625 Series</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browning B-25 Series</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browning B-26 Series</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browning B-125 Custom Shop Series</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browning Citori 525 Series</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browning Citori GTI Sporting Clays</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browning Lightning Sport Clays</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browning Citori OU Shotgun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browning Citori OU Skeet Models</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browning Citori OU Trap Models</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browning Citori Plus Trap Combo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browning Citori Plus Trap Gun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browning Cynergy Series</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browning Diana Grade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browning Diamatic Lighting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browning Micro Citori Lighting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browning Midas Grade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browning Special Sporting Clays</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browning Sporter Model</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browning ST-100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browning Superlight Citori Over/Under</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browning Superlight Citori Series</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browning Superlight Feather</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browning Superposed Pigeon Grade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browning Superposed Standard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSA Falcon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSA O/U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSA Silver Eagle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabela’s Volo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caprinius Sweden Model</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centauria Over Under Shotgun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Century Arms Arthemis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapuis Over/Under Shotgun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Daly Country Squire Model</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Daly Deluxe Model</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Daly Diamond Series</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Daly Empire Series</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Field Grade O/U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Daly Lux Over/Under</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Daly Maxi-Mag</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Daly Model 105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Daly Model 106</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Daly Model 206</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Daly Over/Under Shotguns, Japanese Manufactured</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Daly Over/Under Shotguns, Prussian Manufactured</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Daly Presentation Model</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Sporting Clay Models</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Daly Superior Model</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Daly UL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churchill Imperial Model</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churchill Match</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churchill Premier Model</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churchill Regent Trap and Skeet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churchill Regent V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churchill Sporting Clays</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churchill Windsor III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churchill Windsor IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connolly 20 Gauge Woodward Type</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut Shotgun Company A-10 American</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut Valley Classics Classic Field</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary Arms Centaure Series</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cortona Over/Under Shotguns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ 581 Solo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ Canvasback 103D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ Limited Edition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ Mallard 104A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ Redhead Deluxe 105FE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ Sporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ Super Scroll Limited Edition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ Upland Ultralight</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ Wingshooter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dakin Arms Model 170</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darne SB1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darne SB2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darne SB3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depar ATAK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doumoulin Supersposed Express</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ducks Unlimited Dinner Guns/Guns of the Year, Over/Under Models</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumoulin Boss Royal Supersposed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.A.A. Falcon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.A.A. Boccaccio Series</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.A.A. Sabatti Falcon-Mon Over/Under</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.A.A. Sabatti Sporting Clays Pro-Gold O/U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERA Over/Under</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Famars di Abbiatico &amp; Salvinelli Aries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Famars di Abbiatico &amp; Salvinelli</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Famars di Abbiatico &amp; Salvinelli</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Famars di Abbiatico &amp; Salvinelli</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Famars di Abbiatico &amp; Salvinelli</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Famars di Abbiatico &amp; Salvinelli</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Famars di Abbiatico &amp; Salvinelli</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Famars di Abbiatico &amp; Salvinelli</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Famars di Abbiatico &amp; Salvinelli</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Famars di Abbiatico &amp; Salvinelli</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Famars di Abbiatico &amp; Salvinelli</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Famars di Abbiatico &amp; Salvinelli</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The list continues with various model names and companies/manufacturers.*
Remington Premier Series
Remington Premier STS Competition
Remington Premier Upland
Richland Arms Model 41
Richland Arms Model 767
Richland Arms Model 737
Richland Arms Model 787
Richland Arms Model 808
Richland Arms Model 810
Richland Arms Model 828
Rigby #1 Sidelock
Rota Model 850
Rota Model 105 Series
Royal American Model 100
Ruger Red Label O/U Shotgun
Ruger Sporting Clays O/U Shotgun
Ruger Woodside Shotgun
Ruten Model RM 100
San Marco 10-Ga. O/U Shotgun
San Marco 12-Ga. Wildflower Shotgun
San Marco Field Special O/U Shotgun
Sauer Model 66 Series
Savage Model 242
Savage Model 420/430
Sig Sauer Aurora Series
Sig Sauer SA-3
Sig Sauer SA-5
Silma Model 70 Series
SKB Model 85 Series
SKB Model 500 Series
SKB Model 505 Deluxe Over/Under Shotgun
SKB Model 505 Series
SKB Model 600 Series
SKB Model 605 Series
SKB Model 680 Series
SKB Model 685 Over/Under Shotgun
SKB Model 685 Series
SKB Model 700 Series
SKB Model 785 Series
SKB Model 801 800 Series
SKB Model 880 Series
SKB Model 885 Over/Under Trap, Skeet, Sporting Clays
SKB Model 885 Series
SKB Model 5900 Series
SKB Model 5950 Series
Skeet Model GC-7 Series
Spartan SPR310/320
Stevens Model 240
Stevens Model 512
Stoeger/IAGA ERA 2000 Over/Under Shotgun
Techni-Mec Model 610 Over/Under
Tikka Model 412S Field Grade Over/Under Classic Field Series
Traditions Classic Upland Series
Traditions Gold Wing Series
Traditions Real 16 Series
Tri Star Model 330 Series
Tri-Star Hunter EX
Tri-Star Sporting Classic
Tri-Star Turkey Series
Tri-Star Sporting Model
TULA 120
TULA 200
TULA 200/201
TULA TOZ 2014
Universal 7112
Universal 7312
Universal 7412
Universal 7712
Universal 7812
Universal 7912
Verona 501 Series
Verona 680 Series
Verona Series
Verona LX92 Series
Verona LX980 Series
Weatherby Athena Grade IV O/U Shotguns
Weatherby Athena Grade V Classic Field O/U
Weatherby Athena Series
Weatherby Classic Field Models
Weatherby II, III Classic Field O/U
Weatherby Orion II Classic Sporting Clays O/U
Weatherby Orion II Series
Weatherby Orion II Sporting Clays O/U
Weatherby Orion III Series
Weatherby Orion O/U Shotguns
Winchester Model 91
Winchester Model 96
Winchester Model 99
Winchester Model 101 All Models and Grades
Winchester Model 1001 O/U Shotgun
Winchester Model 1001 Series
Winchester Model 1001 Sporting Clays O/U
Winchester Model G5500
Winchester Model G6500
Winchester Select Series
Zoli Condor
Zoli Deluxe Model
Zoli Dove
Zoli Field Special
Zoli Pigeon Model
Zoli Silver Snake
Zoli Snake
Zoli Special Model
Zoli Target Series
Zoli Texas
Zoli Z Series
Zoli Z-90 Series
Zoli Z-Sport Series
"SHOTGUNS—SIDE BY SIDES"
Armas Azor Sideway
Armas Azor Sidelock
Armas Azor Side-by-Side
Armasaz Sideway
Armasaz Sidelock
Armasaz Side-by-Side
Armasaz Model 32 Double Shotgun
Armasaz Series S/3/5 10 Double Shotguns
Armasz TS/SS 12 Side-by-Side
Armasz TS/SS Series
Armasz WS/SS 10
Armasz Model 32 Double Shotgun
Armasz de Chasse Sideway and Sidelock Shotguns
Armasport 1650 Series Double Shotguns
Arrieta Sidelock Double Shotguns
Auguste Francotte Boxlock Shotgun
Auguste Francotte Sideway
AYA Boxlock Shotguns
AYA Sideway Double Shotguns
Baikal IZH-41 Series Shotguns
Baikal MP211 Series Shotguns
Baikal MP213 Series Shotguns
Baikal M970 Series Shotguns
Baker Gun Sidelock Models
Baltimore Arms Co. Style 1
Baltimore Arms Co. Style 2
Bayard Boxlock and Sidelock Model Shotguns
Beretta 458 Series Shotguns
Beretta 451 Series Shotguns
Beretta 452 Series Shotguns
Beretta 470 Series Shotguns
Beretta Custom Grade Shotguns
Beretta Francisca Standard
Beretta Imperial Monte Carlo
Beretta Model 452 Sidelock Shotgun
Beretta Omega Standard
Beretta Side-by-Side Field Shotguns
Beretta Verona Series
Bertuzzi Ariete Hammer Gun
Bertuzzi Model Orione
Bertuzzi Venere Series Shotguns
Beschi Sidelock and Boxlock Models
Bill Hans Birdgun Doubles
Bosis Country SxS
Bosis Hammer Gun
Bosis Queen Sideway
Bosco Robertson SxS
Bosco SxS
Bosco SxS
Boxlock Shotguns

- ''Dumoulin Liege Model''
- ''Dumoulin Europa Model''
- ''Dumoulin Continental Model''
- ''Dumoulin Etandard Model''
- ''Dumoulin Europa Model''
- ''Dumoulin Liege Model''
- ''E.A.A. SABA''
- ''E.A.A./Sabatti Saba-Mon Double Shotgun''
- ''E.M.P. Stagecoach SxS Model''
- ''ERA Quail SxS''

- ''ERA Riot SxS''
- ''ERA SxS''
- ''Famars Boxlock Models''
- ''Famars Castore''
- ''Famars Andromeda Special''
- ''Fausti Caledon''
- ''Fausti Class''
- ''Fausti Class Round Body''
- ''Fausti IIB Series Shotguns''
- ''Ferlil Mignon Hammer Model''
- ''Ferlil Model FVII Double Shotgun''
- ''FN Anson SxS Standard Grade''
- ''FN Lyddon Standard Grade''
- ''FN Sidelock Standard Grade''
- ''Fox Higher Grade Models (A-F)''
- ''Fox Stock Model Series''
- ''Franchi Airone''
- ''Franchi Astore Series''
- ''Franchi Destino''
- ''Franchi Highlander''
- ''Franchi Sidelock Double Barrel''
- ''Francotte Boxlock Shotgun''
- ''Francotte Jubilee Model''
- ''Francotte Sidelock Shotgun''
- ''Gafe' Silver Hawk SxS''
- ''Gal' Zabala SxS''
- ''Garbi Model 100''
- ''Garbi Model 103A, B SxS''
- ''Garbi Model 200 Side-by-Side''
- ''Gastinne Model 105''
- ''Gastinne Model 202''
- ''Gastinne Model 333''
- ''Gastinne Model 98''
- ''Gib 10 Gauge Magnum''
- ''Gill Ahambel''
- ''Gill Diamond''
- ''Gill Laga''
- ''Gill Olimpia''
- ''Greener Sidelock SxS Shotguns''
- ''Griffin & Howe Britte''
- ''Griffin & Howe Continental Sidelock''
- ''Griffin & Howe Bobwhite Game Gun''
- ''Griffin & Howe Traditional Game Gun''
- ''Grulla 217 Series''
- ''Grulla 219 Series''
- ''Grulla Consort''
- ''Grulla Model 209 Holland''
- ''Grulla Model 215''
- ''Grulla Model 216 Series''
- ''Grulla Number 1''
- ''Grulla Royal''
- ''Grulla Super MH''
- ''Grulla Supreme''
- ''Grulla Windsor''
- ''H&K Anson & Deely SxS''
- ''H&K Model 494''
- ''H&K Small Bore SxS Hammer Gun''
- ''Hatfield Uplander Shotgun''
- ''Henry Atkin Boxlock Model''
- ''Henry Atkin Sidelock Model''
- ''Holland & Holland Cavalier Boxlock''
- ''Holland & Holland Dominon Game Gun''
- ''Holland & Holland Northwood Boxlock''
- ''Holland & Holland Round Action Sidelock''
- ''Holland & Holland Round Action Sidelock Paradox''
- ''Holland & Holland Royal Hammerless Ejector Sidelock''
- ''Holloway Premier SxS Shotguns''
- ''Holloway Premier Double Barrel''
- ''Hopkins & Allen Boxlock and Sidelock Models''
- ''Huglu SxS Shotguns''
- ''Husqvarna SxS Shotguns''
- ''IGA Deluxe Model''
- ''IGA Turkey Series Model''
- ''Interstate Arms Model 90 Coach Gun''
- ''Itaca Classic Doubles Series Shotguns''
- ''Itaca Hammerless Series''
- ''Iver Johnson Hammerless Model Shotguns''
- ''Jeffery Boxlock Shotguns''
- ''Jeffery Sidelock Shotguns''
- ''K.B.I. Grade II SxS''
- ''Khan Coach Gun''
- ''Kimmer Valery Series''
- ''Krieghoff Essencia Boxlock''
- ''Krieghoff Essencia Sidelock''
- ''Lanber Imperial Sidelock''
- ''Laurona Boxlock Models''
- ''Laurona Sidelock Models''
- ''Lefever Grade A Field Model''
- ''Lefever Grade A Skeet Model''
- ''Lefever New''
- ''Lefever Model''
- ''Lefever Nitro Special''
- ''Lefever Sideplate Models''
- ''Lefgeron Boxlock Ejector''
- ''Lefgeron Sidelock Ejector''
- ''Liberty Coach Guns''
- ''MacNaughton Sidelock Model''
- ''Malin Boxlock Model''
- ''Malin Sidelock''
- ''Masquerier Boxlock Model''
- ''Masquerier Sidelock Model''
- ''Medwell SxS SideLock''
- ''Merkel Model 8, 47E Side-by-Side Shotguns''
- ''Merkel Model 47LSC Sporting Clay Double''
- ''Merkel Model 47S, 147S Side-by-Sides''
- ''Merkel Model 76E''
- ''Merkel Model 122E''
- ''Merkel Model 126E''
- ''Merkel Model 280 Series''
- ''Merkel Model 360 Series''
- ''Merkel Model 447SL''
- ''Merkel Model 1620 Series''
- ''Mossberg Onyx Reserve Sporting''
- ''Mossberg Silver Reserve Field''
- ''Navy Arms Model 100''
- ''Navy Arms Model 150''
- ''Orvis Custom Uplander''
- ''Orvis Field Grade''
- ''Orvis Fine Grade''
- ''Orvis Rounded Action''
- ''Orvis Waterfowler''
- ''Parker Fluid Steel Barrel Models (All Grades)''
- ''Parker Reproductions Side-by-Side''
- ''Pederson Model 200''
- ''Pederson Model 2500''
- ''Perazzi DiBO Models''
- ''Perugini Ausonia''
- ''Perugini Classic Model''
- ''Perugini Liberty''
- ''Perugini Regina Model''
- ''Perugini Romagna Gun''
- ''Piotti Hammer Gun''
- ''Piotti King Extra Side-by-Side''
- ''Piotti King No. 1 Side-by-Side''
- ''Piotti Lunik Side-by-Side''
- ''Piotti Monaco Series''
- ''Piotti Monte Carlo''
- ''Piotti Pluma Side-by-Side''
- ''Piotti Westlake''
- ''Precision Sports Model 600 Series Doubles''
- ''Premier Italian made SxS Shotguns''
- ''Premier Spanish made SxS Shotguns''
- ''Purdy Best Quality Game Gun''
- ''Remington Model 1900 Hammerless''
- ''Remington Model SP2220''
- ''Remington Model SP2220 Cowboy''
- ''Remington Premier SxS''
- ''Richland Arms Co. Italian made SxS Models''
- ''Richland Arms Co. Spanish made SxS Models''
- ''Richie Boxlock Shotgun''
- ''Rigby Hammer Shotgun''
- ''Rizzini Boxlock Side-by-Side''
- ''Rizzini Sidelock Side-by-Side''
- ''Rossi Overlund''
- ''Rossi Squire''
- ''Rota Model 105''
- ''Rota Model 106''
- ''Rota Model 411 Series''
- ''Royal American Model 600 Boxlock''
- ''Royal American Model 800 Sidelock''
- ''Ruger Gold Label''
- ''S.A.E Model 2915''
- ''S.A.E Model 2105''
- ''S.A.E Model 340X''
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“Sarasota Mammerless Sidelock
“Sarasota Model 3 Boxlock
“Sauer Boxlock Model Shotguns
“Sauer Sidelock Model Shotguns
“Savage Fox Model FA-1
“Savage Model 550
“Scott Blenheim
“Scott Bowood
“Scott Chatterworth
“Scott Kimmington
“SIACE Italian made SxS Shotguns
“SKB Model 100
“SKB Model 150
“SKB Model 200
“SKB Model 230
“SKB Model 300
“SKB Model 385
“SKB Model 400
“SKB Model 480
“SKB Model 485
“Smith & Wesson Elite Gold Series Grade I
“Smith & Wesson Elite Silver Grade I
“Smith, L.C. Boxlock Hammerless Shotguns
“Smith, L.C. Sidelock Hammerless Shotguns
“Spartan SPR Series Shotguns
“Stevens Model 311/315 Series
“Stoeger/IGA Uplander Side-by-Side Shotgun
“Taylor’s SxS Model
“Tri-Star Model 311
“Tri-Star Model 411 Series
“Ugartechea 12-Ga. Magnum Shotgun
“Universal Double Wing SxS
“Vouelaud Model 315 Series
“Walther Model WSP
“Walther Model WSPD
“Weatherby Athena
“Weatherby D’Italia Series
“Weatherby Orion
“Westley Richards Best Quality Sidelock
“Westley Richards Boxlock Shotguns
“Westley Richards Connoquah Model
“Westley Richards Hand Detachable Lock Model
“William Douglas Boxlock
“Winchester Model 21
“Winchester Model 24
“Zoli Alley Cleaner
“Zoli Classic
“Zoli Falcon II
“Zoli Model Quail Special
“Zoli Pheasant
“Zoli Silver Hawk
“Zoli Silver Snipe
“SHOTGUNS—BOLT ACTIONS & SINGLE SHOTS
“ADCC Diamond Folding Model
“American Arms Single-Shot
“ARMSCOR 30A
“Armsport Single Barrel Shotgun
“Baikal MP18
“Beretta 471 EL Silver Hawk
“Beretta 471 Silver Hawk
“Beretta Beta Single Barrel
“Beretta MKII Trap
“Beretta Model 412
“Beretta Model FS
“Beretta TR-1
“Beretta TR-1 Trap
“Beretta Vandalia Special Trap
“Browning BT-99 Competition Trap Special
“Browning BT-99 Plus Micro
“Browning BT-99 Plus Trap Gun
“Browning Micro Recoiless Trap Shotgun
“Browning Recoiless Trap Shotgun
“Crestone Single Shot Models
“CZ Cottontail
“Desert Industries Big Twenty Shotgun
“Fefever Long Range Field
“Frigon FS-4
“Frigon FT-1
“Frigon Model C
“Gibbs Midland Stalker
“Greener General Purpose GP MKI/MKII
“H&amp;R Survivor
“H&amp;R Tracker Slug Model
“Harrington & Richardson N.W.T.F. Turkey Model
“Harrington & Richardson Pardner
“Harrington & Richardson Pardner Classic
“Harrington & Richardson Pardner Compact Turkey
“Harrington & Richardson Pardner Screw-In Choke
“Harrington & Richardson Pardner Turkey Gun
“Harrington & Richardson Pardner Turkey Gun Camo
“Harrington & Richardson Pardner Waterfowl
“Harrington & Richardson Tamer
“Harrington & Richardson Tamer 20
“Harrington & Richardson Topper Classic Youth Shotgun
“Harrington & Richardson Topper Deluxe Classic
“Harrington & Richardson Topper Deluxe Model 098
“Harrington & Richardson Topper Junior
“Harrington & Richardson Topper Model 098
“Harrington & Richardson Topper Trap Gun
“Harrington & Richardson Tracker II Slug Gun
“Harrington & Richardson Ultra Slug Hunter
“Harrington & Richardson Ultra Slug Hunter Compact
“Harrington & Richardson Ultra Slug Hunter Deluxe
“Harrington & Richardson Ultra Slug Hunter Thumholo Stock
“Hi-Standard 514 Model
“Holland & Holland Single Barrel Trap
“IGA Reuna Model
“IGA Single Barrel Classic
“Ithaca Model 66
“Ithaca Single Barrel Trap
“Iver Johnson Champion Series
“Iver Johnson Commemorative Series Single Shot
“Iver Johnson Excel
“Krieghoff K-80 Single Barrel Trap Gun
“Krieghoff KS-5 Special
“Llefever Trap Gun
“Llujic LTX Super Deluxe Mono Gun
“Llujic Mono Gun Single Barrel
“Llujic Recoiless Space Gun Shotgun
“Marlin Model 55 Goose Gun Bolt Action
“Marlin Model 60 Single Shot
“Marocchi Model 2000
“Mossberg Models G-4, 70, 73, 73B
“Mossberg Models 75 Series
“Mossberg 835, 83B, 83D
“Mossberg 173 Series
“Mossberg Model 183 Series
“Mossberg Model 185 Series
“Mossberg Model 190 Series
“Mossberg Model 195 Series
“Mossberg Model 385 Series
“Mossberg Model 390 Series
“Mossberg Model 595 Series
“Mossberg Model 695 Series
“New England Firearms N.W.T.F. Shotgun
“New England Firearms Standard Pardner
“New England Firearms Survival Gun
“New England Firearms Tracker Slug Gun
“New England Firearms Turkey and Goose Gun
“Parker Single Barrel Trap Models
“Perazzi TMT Single Special Trap
“Remington 90-T Super Single Shotgun
“Remington Model 11
“Remington Model 310 Skeet
“Remington Model No. 3
“Rossi Circuit Judge Lever Action Shotgun
“Rossi Circuit Judge Shotgun
“Ruger Single Barrel Trap
“S&W Derringer
“Savage Kimber Kamper Single Shot
“Savage Model 210F Slug Warrior
“Savage Model 212 Slug Gun
“Savage Model 220 Slug Gun
“SEITZ Single Barrel Trap
“SKB Century II Trap
“SKB Century Trap
“SKB Model 505 Trap
“SKB Model 605 Trap
“Smith, L.C. Single Barrel Trap Models
“Snake Charmer II Shotgun
“Stoeger/IGA Reuna Single Barrel Shotgun
“Tangfolio Model RS-G-16
“Tangfolio Blockcard Model
“Tangfolio Model DS-9
“Tangfolio Model RS-G-12 Series
“Tangfolio Model RS-G-20
“Tangfolio RS-Tactical
“Taurus Circuit Judge Shotgun
“Thompson/Center Encore Shotgun
“Thompson/Center Pro Hunter Turkey Shotgun
“(t)(1) Beginning on the date that is 90 days after the date of enactment of the Assault Weapons Ban of 2019, it shall be unlawful for any person who is not licensed under this chapter to transfer a grandfathered semi-automatic assault weapon to any other person who is not licensed under this chapter, unless a licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, or licensed dealer has first taken custody of the grandfathered semi-automatic assault weapon for the purpose of complying with subsection (s). Upon taking custody of the grandfathered semi-automatic assault weapon from the licensed importer’s inventory to the unlicensed transferee.
“(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply to a temporary transfer of possession for the purpose of participating in a shooting at a licensed target facility or established range if—
“(A) the grandfathered semiautomatic assault weapon is, at all times, kept within the premises of the target facility or range; and
(B) the transferee is not known to be prohibited from possessing or receiving a grandfathered semiautomatic assault weapon.

“(3) For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘transfer’—

‘‘(A) shall include a sale, gift, or loan; and
‘‘(B) does not include temporary custody of the grandfathered semiautomatic assault weapon for purposes of examination or evaluation of the firearms by a prospective transferee.

“(4)(A) Notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, the Attorney General may implement this subsection with regulations.

“(B) Regulations promulgated under this paragraph—

‘‘(i) shall include a provision setting a maximum fee that may be charged by licensees for services provided in accordance with paragraph (1); and
‘‘(ii) shall not include any provision imposing recordkeeping requirements on any unlicensed transferor or requiring licensees to facilitate transfers in accordance with paragraph (1).

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) SECTION 922.—Section 922(y)(2) of title 18, United States Code, is amended, in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ‘‘, (g)(5)(B), and (s)(3)(B)(v)(II)’’ and inserting ‘‘and (s)(3)(B)(v)(II)’’.

(2) SECTION 925A.—Section 925A of title 18, United States Code, is amended, in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ‘‘subsection (s) or (t) of section 922’’ and inserting ‘‘subsection (s) or (t) of section 922’’.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 06. USE OF BYRNE GRANTS FOR BUY-BACK PROGRAMS FOR SEMIAUTOMATIC ASSAULT WEAPONS AND LARGE CAPACITY AMMUNITION FEEDING DEVICES.

Section 501(a)(1) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 1061(a)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

‘‘(1) Compensation for surrendered semiautomatic assault weapons and large capacity ammunition feeding devices, as those terms are defined in section 921 of title 18, United States Code, under buy-back programs for semiautomatic assault weapons and large capacity ammunition feeding devices.’’.

SEC. 07. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this title, an amendment made by this title, or the application of such provision or amendment to any person or circumstance is held to be unconstitutional, the remainder of this title, the amendments made by this title, and the application of such provision or amendment to any person or circumstance shall not be affected thereby.

SA 1023. Ms. SMITH (for herself and Mrs. MURRAY, and Mrs. SHAHEEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 156, line 4, strike ‘‘third proviso’’ and insert ‘‘fourth proviso’’.

SA 1024. Ms. SMITH (for herself and Mrs. SHAHEEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate point at title III of division B, insert the following:

SEC. 3. ... In providing assistance under title V of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U.S.C. 1471 et seq.), using amounts made available under this title under the heading “RURAL HOUSING SERVICE”, the Secretary of Agriculture shall prioritize the maintenance needs for utilities and staff needs, which shall include prioritizing—

(1) capital repairs for aging properties participating in the rental housing programs of the Rural Housing Service; and

(2) the needs of staff overseeing the Rural Housing Service and field staff conducting housing inspections.

SEC. 1025. Ms. SINEMA submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 253, line 2, strike ‘‘costs’’ and insert the following:

‘‘costs: Provided further. That not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Bureau of Indian Affairs shall submit to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives a report describing the facilities investments required to improve the direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of development on the air quality, including air and water quality;’’.

SA 1026. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title I of division C, insert the following:

SEC. 1. ... REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTAIN BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT LAND SALES.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

‘‘(1) AFFECTED BUREAU LAND.—The term “affected Bureau land” means any land that—

(A) is located within 15 miles of Service land or water;

(B) is located within 3 miles of Service land or water under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service;

(C) is located within 5 miles of Service land or water;

(D) BUREAU.—The term “Bureau” means the Bureau of Land Management.

(E) SERVICE LAND OR WATER.—The term “Service land or water” means land or water under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service.

(f) REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, before offering for competitive, public sale any affected Bureau land, the State Director of each State in which the affected Bureau land is located shall—

(A) complete formal consultation with the applicable Superintendents of the National Park Service regarding—

(i) the impact of the proposed sale on—

(I) natural, cultural, and historic resources; and

(II) visitor use and enjoyment of park resources; and

(ii) the cumulative impacts of the proposed sale on National Park Service resources, including air and water quality;

(B) achieve compliance with the applicable requirements of section 306108 of title 54, United States Code, taking into consideration the means by which the proposed sale may impact historic property, historic objects, traditional cultural properties, archeological sites, or cultural landscapes;

(C) consider the effects of the proposed sale on—

(i) wildlife migration corridors and habitat connectivity; and

(ii) recreational opportunities on and off the applicable Service land and water, through consultation with affected recreations user groups;

(D) conduct a viewed analysis with respect to all potential points of view within the affected Service land or water;

(E) consult with relevant agencies to evaluate—

(i) the direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of development on the air quality, including visibility, of affected Service land and water to ensure compliance with all applicable air quality requirements; and

(ii) the impacts of development on water quality and groundwater;

(F) provide a period of not less than 30 days for public review and comment with respect to environmental analyses and findings of no significant impact for sales of affected Bureau land; and

(G) post a final notice of the proposed sale not later than the date that is 90 days before the sale date to ensure a period of not less than—

(i) 30 days for public participation; and

(ii) 60 days for review by the Bureau.

(2) CONSIDERATION OF LEASE SALES.—The Director of the Bureau shall consider lease sales of affected Bureau land not more frequently than once each calendar year.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—In any case in which an application for a permit to drill on affected Bureau land is approved, the State Director of each State in which the affected Bureau land is located shall ensure that compliance with applicable Bureau and National Park Service best management practices to reduce light pollution is achieved.

SA 1027. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year
end pending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title IV of division C, insert the following:

SEC. 1. FOREST SERVICE LEGACY ROADS AND TRAILS REMEDIATION PROGRAM.

Public Law 88–657 (16 U.S.C. 532 et seq.) (commonly known as the "Forest Roads and Trails Act") is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 8. FOREST SERVICE LEGACY ROADS AND TRAILS REMEDIATION PROGRAM.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary, acting through the Chief of the Forest Service, shall establish, and develop a process to carry out, a program, to be known as the 'Forest Service Legacy Roads and Trails Remediation Program', within the National Forest System (as defined in section 11(a) of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1609(a))),

"(1) to carry out critical maintenance and urgent repairs and improvements on National Forest System roads, trails, and bridges;

"(2) to restore fish and other aquatic organism habitats by removing or replacing unnatural barriers to the passage of fish and other aquatic organisms;

"(3) to decommission unneeded roads and trails;

"(4) to carry out activities associated with the activities described in paragraphs (1) through (3).

"(b) PRIORITY.—In implementing the program under this section, the Secretary shall give priority to any project that protects or enhances:

"(1) water quality;

"(2) a watershed that feeds a public drinking water system; or

"(3) habitat for threatened, endangered, or sensitive fish or wildlife species.

"(c) NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM.—Except as authorized under section 323 of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999 (16 U.S.C. 1011a), each project carried out under this section shall be on a National Forest System road or trail.

"(d) UNNEEDED ROADS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall identify for each unit of the National Forest System (as defined in section 11(a) of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1609(a))) the minimum road system necessary for—

"(A) safe and efficient travel within the National Forest System; and

"(B) the administration, use, and protection of the National Forest System.

"(2) REQUIREMENTS.—Each minimum road system identified under paragraph (1) for a unit of the National Forest System shall—

"(A) meet the resource and other management objectives adopted in the land and resource management plan applicable to the unit;

"(B) meet all applicable statutory and regulatory requirements;

"(C) be in accordance with long-term funding expectations; and

"(D) minimize any adverse environmental impacts associated with the construction, reconstruction, decommissioning, and maintenance of the minimum road system.

"(e) CONTENTS.—In identifying minimum road systems under subsection (b)(1), the Secretary shall—

"(1) incorporate a science-based roads analysis at the appropriate scale;

"(2) incorporate a long-term fiscal analysis that includes an assessment of maintenance costs;

"(3) identify as unneeded any roads that—

"(A) are no longer necessary to meet forest resource management objectives; or

"(B) may be decommissioned or considered for trails; and

"(4) consult with—

"(A) appropriate State, Tribal, and local governmental entities; and

"(B) members of the public.

"(f) REVISION.—The Secretary shall regularly update the Infra database of the Secretary to record—

"(1) each road identified as unneeded under subsection (c)(3) as soon as practicable after making the identification under that subsection;

"(2) PRIORITY.—In decommissioning unneeded roads under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall prioritize the decommissioning of roads that—

"(A) to public safety;

"(B) of environmental degradation.

"(g) RECORDS.—The Secretary shall regularly update the Infra database of the Secretary to record—

"(1) each road identified as unneeded under subsection (c)(3); and

"(2) each road decommissioned under subsection (d)(1).

"(h) REVISION.—The Secretary shall review, and may revise, an identification made under subsection (b)(1) for a unit of the National Forest System during a revision of the land and resource management plan applicable to the unit.

SA 1028.

Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. CRAMER, and Ms. SMITH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 389, line 22, strike "Act." and insert "Act: Provided further, That of the funds included under this heading, $3,000,000 shall be designated for conducting research in communities identified as having an elevated cancer risk due to emissions of ethylene oxide by the most recent National Air Toxics Assessment, and shall be administered by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

SA 1030.

Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 947 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title VII of division B, insert the following:

SEC. 1. None of the funds provided by this Act may be used by the Secretary of Health and Human Services to issue a marketing order under subsection (c)(1)(A)(i) of section 910 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 387i) or a substantial order of section (a)(2)(A)(i) of such section 910, for any electronic nicotine delivery system, including any liquid, solution, or other component or part of its aerosol, that contains an artificial or natural flavor (other than tobacco) that is a characterizing flavor, unless the Secretary of Health and Human Services issues an order finding that the manufacturer has demonstrated that use of the characterizing flavor—

"(1) will increase the likelihood of smoking cessation among current users of tobacco products;

"(2) will not increase the likelihood of youth initiation of nicotine or tobacco products; and

"(3) will not increase the likelihood of harm to the person using the characterizing flavor.

SA 1031.

Ms. ROSEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title VII of division B, insert the following:

SEC. 1. None of the funds provided by this Act may be used by the Secretary of Health and Human Services to issue a marketing order under subsection (c)(1)(A)(i) of section 910 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 387i) or a substantial order of section (a)(2)(A)(i) of such section 910, for any electronic nicotine delivery system, including any liquid, solution, or other component or part of its aerosol, that contains an artificial or natural flavor (other than tobacco) that is a characterizing flavor, unless the Secretary of Health and Human Services issues an order finding that the manufacturer has demonstrated that use of the characterizing flavor—

"(1) will increase the likelihood of smoking cessation among current users of tobacco products;

"(2) will not increase the likelihood of youth initiation of nicotine or tobacco products; and

"(3) will not increase the likelihood of harm to the person using the characterizing flavor.

SA 1032.

Mr. DUCKWORTH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 947 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Amendment SA 947 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:
At the appropriate place in title II of division D, insert the following:

SEC. 2. An additional $2,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2023, shall be available for payment to the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation for use in neighborhood reinvestment activities, as authorized by the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation Act (42 U.S.C. 801 et seq.), and the funds available under this title for the Office of Administration under the heading "ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT OFFICES" under the heading "MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION" shall be decreased by $3,000,000.

SA 1032. Ms. BALDWIN (for herself and Mr. BURR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 123, line 14, strike "$15,500,000" and insert "$5,500,000".

On page 131, line 4, strike "$509,082,000" and insert "$516,082,000".

On page 131, line 8, insert "That the amount specified in that table for the Farm and Ranch Stress Assistance Network shall be increased by $7,000,000: Provided further, after Provided.",

SA 1033. Mr. TILLIS (for himself and Mr. BURASSO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 223, between lines 13 and 14, insert the following:

SEC. 7. Notwithstanding subsections (d) and (e) of section 3 of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act (15 U.S.C. 714c) or any other provision of law, tobacco shall be an eligible agricultural commodity under the Market Facilitation Program conducted pursuant to that section.

SA 1034. Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. CARPER, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. CARDIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

DIVISION E—SAVING OUR AMERICAN ROADS

SEC. 1. REPEAL OF EXCISE.

(1) In general.—Section 1438 of the FAST Act (Public Law 114–94; 129 Stat. 1432) is repealed.

(2) Clerical amendment.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the FAST Act (Public Law 114–94; 129 Stat. 1312) is amended by striking the item relating to section 1438.

(b) BUDGETARY EFFECTS.—

(1) PAYGO SCORECARDS.—The budgetary effects of this section and the amendments made by this section shall not be entered on either PAYGO scorecard maintained pursuant to section 4(d) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (2 U.S.C. 933(d)).

(2) PAYGO SCORECARDS.—The budgetary effects of this section and the amendments made by this section shall not be entered on any PAYGO scorecard maintained pursuant to section 4016 of H. Con. Res. 71 (116th Congress).

(3) CLASSIFICATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.—Notwithstanding Rule 3 of the Budgetary Guidelines, article V in the joint explanatory statement of the committee of conference accompanying Conference Report 105–217 and section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900(c)(8)), the budgetary effects of this section and the amendments made by this section shall not be estimated—

(A) for purposes of section 251 of such Act (2 U.S.C. 901); and

(B) for purposes of paragraph (4)(C) of section 3 of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (2 U.S.C. 932) as being included in an appropriation Act.

SA 1035. Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Mr. JONES) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 161, line 21, strike "$1,500,000" and insert "$15,500,000".

SA 1036. Ms. SMITH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in division C, insert the following:

SEC. 7. In addition to other amounts made available under this division to continue a Specialty水果 in the Apple Fruit Program as authorized by Public Law 116–6, there shall be available to the Director of the Indian Health Service, $40,000,000 to be used as otherwise provided for under this division to carry out such Program.

SA 1037. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title VII of division B, insert the following:

SEC. 7. (a) In general.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall submit to Congress a report that describes the economic and environmental impacts of importing orchids in growing media; and

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—The report under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) a description of—

(A) the economic impact of importing orchids in growing media on a State-by-State basis, with data collected from local growers; and

(B) any incidents of pests detected on orchids imported with growing media; and

(2) an analysis with respect to the additional resources that are necessary to prevent and mitigate the introduction of pests resulting from importing orchids in growing media.

SA 1038. Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 1. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the amount appropriated under this Act to the Department of Justice for "State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance" shall be $1,790,200,000, of which $12,500,000 shall be for the court-appointed special advocate program, as authorized by section 217 of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (Public Law 101–647).

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the amount appropriated under this Act to the Department of Justice for "Salaries and Expenses, General Legal Activities" shall be $923,500,000.

SA 1040. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 289, line 22, strike the period at the end and insert ": Provided further, That the funds included under this heading, $3,000,000 shall be made available to the Office of Transportation and Air Quality of the Office of Air and Radiation of the Environmental Protection Agency to approve, not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, not less than 2 pending applications under the electric pathway under the renewable fuel program under section 211(e) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545(e))."

SA 1041. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of
Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title IV of division C, insert the following:

DIVISION E—FAIR COMPENSATION FOR LOW-WAGE CONTRACTOR EMPLOYEES

SEC. 1. SHORT TITLE.

This division may be cited as the ‘‘Fair Compensation for Low-Wage Contractor Employees Act of 2019’’.

SEC. 2. APPROPRIATION.

There is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and as may be necessary, to remain available until expended, for each Federal agency subject to the lapse in appropriations that began on or about December 22, 2018, for adjustments in the price of contracts of such agency under section 3.

SEC. 3. BACK COMPENSATION FOR LOW-WAGE CONTRACTOR EMPLOYEES IN CONNECTION WITH THE LAPSE IN APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) In general.—Each Federal agency subject to the lapse in appropriations that began on or about December 22, 2018, shall adjust the price of any contract of such agency for which the contractor was ordered to suspend, delay, or interrupt all or part of the work of such contract, or stop all or any part of the work called for in such contract, as a result of the lapse in appropriations to compensate the contractor for reasonable costs incurred—

(1) to provide compensation, at an employee’s standard rate of compensation, to any employee who was furloughed or laid off, or who was not working, who experienced a reduction of hours, or who experienced a reduction in compensation, as a result of the lapse in appropriations (for the period of the lapse); or

(2) to restore paid leave taken by any employee during the lapse in appropriations, if the contractor required employees to use paid leave as a result of the lapse in appropriations.

(b) LIMITATION ON AMOUNT OF WEEKLY COMPENSATION COVERED BY ADJUSTMENT.—The maximum amount of weekly compensation of an employee for which an adjustment may be made under subsection (a) may not exceed the lesser of—

(1) the employee’s actual weekly compensation; or

(2) $962.

(c) TIMING OF ADJUSTMENTS.—The adjustments required by subsection (a) shall be made as soon as practicable after the enactment of this Act.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) the term ‘‘compensation’’ has the meaning given that term in section 6701 of title 41, United States Code.

(2) The term ‘‘employee’’ means the following:

(A) A ‘‘service employee’’ as that term is defined in section 6701 of title 41, United States Code, except that the term also includes service employees described in subparagraph (C) of that section notwithstanding that subparagraph.

(B) A ‘‘laborer or mechanic’’ covered by section 3142 of title 40, United States Code.

SEC. 4. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This division shall take effect upon the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 5. BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

(a) CLASSIFICATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.—Notwithstanding Rule 3 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, the joint explanatory statement of the committee of conference committee accompanying Conference Report 105–217 and section 250(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, the budgetary effects of this division shall not be estimated—

(1) for purposes of section 251 of such Act; and

(2) for purposes of paragraph (4)(C) of section 3 of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 as being included in an appropriation Act.

(b) DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.—The budgetary effects of this division, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled ‘‘Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation’’ for this division, submitted by the Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

SA 1045. Mr. HEINRICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 169, line 10, insert ‘‘: Provided, That 10 percent of the amount made available for tribal outreach and technical assistance grants’’ before the period at the end.

SA 1046. Mr. HEINRICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title II of division D, insert the following:

SEC. 2. APPROPRIATION.

(b) On page 7, line 22, strike ‘‘$221,500,000’’ and insert ‘‘$279,500,000’’.

On page 7, line 24, insert ‘‘, and of which $17,000,000 shall be for assistance to nuclear power plant closure communities’’ after ‘‘12’’.

SA 1043. Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. JONES) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 223, between lines 13 and 14, insert the following:

SEC. 1. APPROPRIATION.

There is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and as may be necessary, to remain available until expended, for each Federal agency subject to the lapse in appropriations that began on or about December 22, 2018, for adjustments in the price of contracts of such agency under section 3.
acquire the firearm and, if different, the law enforcement authorities of the State of residence of the person—

(a) that the notice was provided;

(b) the receipt of the notice by the law enforcement provision of law that would have been violated;

(c) the date and time the notice was provided;

(d) the location where the firearm was sought to be acquired; and

(E) the identity of the person; and

(2) where practicable, report the incident to local, State, and Federal law enforcement authorities and State and local prosecutors in the jurisdiction where the firearm was sought and in the jurisdiction where the person resides.

(b) Requirements for Report.—A report is made in accordance with this subsection if the report is made within 24 hours after the provision of the notice described in subsection (a), except that the making of the report may be delayed for so long as is necessary to avoid compromising an ongoing investigation.

(c) Amendment of Report.—If a report is made in accordance with this subsection and, after such report is made, the Federal Bureau of Investigation or the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives determines that the receipt of a firearm by a person for whom the report was made would not violate subsection (g) or (n) of section 922 of this title, the Attorney General shall, in accordance with subsection (b), notify any law enforcement authority and any prosecutor to whom the report was made of that determination.

(d) Rule of Construction.—Nothing in subsection (a) shall be construed to require a report with respect to the person to be made to the State and local authorities that originally issued the notice with respect to the person.

(2) Clerical Amendment.—The table of sections for such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 925A the following:

"925B. Reporting of background check denials to State authorities."

(c) Annual Report to Congress.

(1) In General.—Chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, as amended by subsection (b), is amended by inserting after section 925B the following:

"§ 925B. Annual report to Congress. "Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, and annually thereafter, the Attorney General shall submit to Congress a report detailing the following, broken down by judicial district:

(1) With respect to each category of persons prohibited by subsection (g) or (n) of section 922 of this title or State law from receiving or possessing a firearm who are so denied a firearm—

(A) the number of denials;

(B) the number of denials referred to the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives; and

(C) the number of denials for which the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives determines that the person denied was not prohibited by subsection (g) or (n) of section 922 of this title or State law from receiving or possessing a firearm;

(2) the number of denials overturned through the national instant criminal background check system appeals process and the reasons for overturning the denial;

(3) the number of denials with respect to which an investigation was opened by a field division of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives; and

(E) the number of convictions obtained by Federal authorities in connection with a denial;

(2) The number of background check notices processed by Federal authorities pursuant to section 925B (including the number of the notices that would have been so reported for section 925B(c).

(2) Clerical Amendment.—The table of sections for such chapter, as amended by subsection, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 925B the following:

"925C. Annual report to Congress."

SA 1048. Mrs. GILLIBRAND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. HADIVA PENDLETON AND NYASIA PRYEAR-YARD GUN TRAFFICKING AND CRIME PREVENTION ACT OF 2021.

(a) Short Title.—This section may be cited as the "Hadiva Pendleton and Nyasia Pryear-Yard Gun Trafficking and Crime Prevention Act of 2021.

(b) Firearm Trafficking.

(1) in General.—Chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"932. Trafficking in firearms

(1) OFFENSE.—It shall be unlawful for any person, regardless of whether anything of value is exchanged—

"(1) to ship, transport, transfer, or otherwise dispose to a person, 2 or more firearms in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce, if the transferor knows or has reasonable cause to believe that such shipping, transportation, transfer, or disposition of the firearm would be in violation of, or would result in a violation of any Federal, State, or local law punishable by a term of imprisonment exceeding 1 year;

"(2) to receive from a person, 2 or more firearms in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce, if the person knows or has reasonable cause to believe that such receipt would be in violation of, or would result in a violation of any Federal, State, or local law punishable by a term of imprisonment exceeding 1 year;

"(3) to make to a licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, or licensed dealer relating to the purchase, receipt, or acquisition from a licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, or licensed dealer of 2 or more firearms that have moved in or affected interstate or foreign commerce that—

"(A) is material to—

"(i) the identity of the actual buyer of the firearms; or

"(ii) the intended trafficking of the firearms; and

"(B) the person knows or has reasonable cause to believe is false; or

"(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections applicable to persons convicted under section 932 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"935. Trafficking in firearms.

(2) Clerical Amendment.—The table of sections for such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 925B the following:

"925C. Annual report to Congress."

SA 1049. Ms. KLOBUCHAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title V of division A, insert the following:

SEC. OFFICE FOR THE PREVENTION OF FRAUD TARGETING SENIORS.

(a) Establishment of Advisory Office.—The Federal Trade Commission, as directed in this section as the "Commission") shall establish an advisory office within the Bureau of Consumer Protection for the purpose of advising the Commission on the prevention of fraud targeting seniors and to assist the Commission with the following:

(1) Oversight.—The advisory office shall maintain a website for fraud warning and protective resources, monitored by trained counselors, online resource directory, and consumer education programs; and

(b) Penalties.—

(1) In General.—Any person who violates, or conspires with another person to violate, subsection (a) shall be fined under this title, imprisoned for not more than 20 years, or both.

(2) Civil Penalties.—If a violation of subsection (a) is committed by a person in concert with 5 or more other persons with respect to whom such person occupies a position of organizer, a supervisory position, or any other position of management, such person may be sentenced to an additional term of imprisonment of not more than 5 consecutive years.

(c) Definitions.—In this section—

(1) the term 'actual buyer' means the individual for whom a firearm is being purchased, received, or acquired; and

(2) the term 'term of imprisonment exceeding 1 year' does not include any offense classified by the applicable jurisdiction as a minor misdemeanor and punishable by a term of imprisonment of 2 years or less.

(2) Technical and Conforming Amendment.—The table of sections for chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"932. Trafficking in firearms."

(3) Directive to the Sentencing Commission.—

(a) In General.—Pursuant to its authority under section 994(p) of title 28, United States Code, the United States Sentencing Commission shall review and, if appropriate, amend the Federal sentencing guidelines and policy statements applicable to firearm offenses involving offenses under section 932 of title 18, United States Code (as added by paragraph (1)).

(b) Requirements.—In carrying out this subsection, the Commission shall—

(i) review the penalty structure that the guidelines currently provide based on the number of firearms involved in an offense and determine whether any changes to that penalty structure are appropriate in order to reflect the intent of Congress that such penalties reflect the gravity of the offense; and

(ii) review and amend, if appropriate, the guidelines and policy statements to reflect the intent of Congress that such penalties for violations of section 922 of title 18, United States Code, and similar offenses be increased substantially when committed by a person who is a member of a gang, cartel, organized crime ring, or other such enterprise or in concert with another person who is a member of a gang, cartel, organized crime ring, or other such enterprise.
Postmaster General, the Chief Postal Inspector for the United States Postal Inspection Service, and other relevant agencies—

(A) disseminate to seniors and families and caregivers of seniors information on reporting complaints of fraud targeting seniors either to the national toll-free telephone number established by the Commission for reporting such complaints, or to the Consumer Sentinel Network, operated by the Commission, for review and action by the Federal, State, and local law enforcement authorities; and

(B) maintain a website to serve as a resource for seniors and families and caregivers of seniors regarding mail, television, internet, telemarketing, robocall fraud, and other identified fraud targeting seniors.

SA 1052. Mrs. FEINSTEIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELY to the bill H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title VII of division B, insert the following:

Sect. 7. Funds appropriated to the Forest Service shall not be made available for the destruction of healthy, unadopted, wild horses and burros in the care of the Forest Service or contractors of the Forest Service, or for the destruction of horses that results in the destruction of the sold wild horses or burros for processing into commercial products.

SA 1053. Mrs. FEINSTEIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELY to the bill H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 230, line 10, strike “products,” and insert “products, except that appropriations shall be made available for humane fertility control of wild horses and burros in the care of the Bureau or its contractors.”

SA 1055. Mrs. FEINSTEIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELY to the bill H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title V of division A, insert the following:

None of the funds made available under this Act may be used to remove the prohibition on pelagic longline fishing gear under the Fishery Management Plan for U.S. West Coast Fisheries for Highly Migratory Species issued by the Pacific Fishery Management Council.

SA 1056. Mrs. FEINSTEIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELY to the bill H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 263, line 9, strike “$136,244,000” and insert “$125,755,000”. On page 299, line 5, strike “$4,247,028,000” and insert “$4,257,517,000”. On page 299, line 19, strike “$19,511,000” and insert “$30,000,000”. on the table; as follows:

Sect. 6. None of the funds made available under this Act shall be used to support the use of phthalates, including dibutyl phthalate, di(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate, and benzyl butyl phthalate, in baby diapers, adult diapers, menstrual products, and obstetrical and gynecological devices described in parts 884.5450, 884.5455, 884.5460, 884.5470, or 884.5900 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation).

SA 1057. Mrs. FEINSTEIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELY to the bill H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for
other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title VII of division B, insert the following:

Scc. Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commissioner of Food and Drugs shall submit a report to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives a report that describes the efforts of the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum to support memory and education programs relating to the Holocaust.

SA 1061. Ms. CORTEZ MASTO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

Scc. Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Transportation shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives a report on efforts by the Department of Transportation to engage with the local communities, metropolitan planning organizations, and regional transportation commissions on advancing data analytics and intelligent transportation systems in technologies and other smart cities solutions.

SA 1062. Ms. CORTEZ MASTO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title VII of division B, insert the following:

Scc. None of the funds made available by this Act shall be used to terminate the Intelligent Transportation System Program Advisory Committee established under section 5305(c) of SAFETEA-LU (23 U.S.C. 512 note; Public Law 109-59).

SA 1063. Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself and Mr. PORTMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title VII of division B, insert the following:

SEC. 7. There is appropriated $499,000 to support the above equivalent employees and administrative costs associated with the development by the Council on Rural Community Innovation and Economic Development established under section 656E of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018 (7 U.S.C. 2294b-3) of reports and resource guides and for the establishment of a Federal support team for rural jobs accelerators.

SA 1064. Ms. CORTEZ MASTO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 422, line 13, insert “Provided, further, That $80,000 of the amount provided under this heading shall be available to personnel and personnel benefits for adding additional stops along the California Zephyr Line;” after “regulation.”.

SA 1065. Mr. INHOFE (for himself and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

...brought by governmental entities to educate, train and prepare officers so that they are equipped to appropriately interact with mentally ill individuals.”.

SA 1066. Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 948 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 8. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING OPIOID LITIGATION SETTLEMENTS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Thousands of lawsuits have been brought in every State against manufacturers and suppliers of opioids seeking compensation for costs and damages that governments have incurred due to the opioid epidemic. Any potential funds paid by opioid industry defendants to governmental entities pursuant to opioid litigation settlements should be used to reduce the current public health crisis of opioid addiction and abuse.

(2) Opioid litigation settlements have resulted in payments of billions of dollars, to date, from opioid manufacturers and suppliers to governmental entities, with the potential for additional settlements providing more funds to governmental entities.

(3) Only 8 percent of tobacco litigation settlement funds paid to governmental entities as part of the 1998 Master Settlement Agreement have been devoted toward addressing the public health harms of tobacco addiction and death and preventing further harm.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that, to the greatest extent practicable, any potential funds paid by opioid industry defendants to governmental entities pursuant to opioid litigation settlements should be prioritized for activities and services that respond to the public health crisis of opioid addiction and abuse and that help prevent further drug addiction-related harms.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. MCconnell. Mr. President, I have 4 requests for committees to meet during today’s session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.
Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today’s session of the Senate:

**COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION**

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 23, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

**COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS**

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 23, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

**COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS**

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 23, 2019, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

**SUBCOMMITTEE ON SEAPOWER**

The Subcommittee on Seapower of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 23, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

**PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR**

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator MERKLEY’s intern, Thomas Sipp, have privileges of the floor for the remainder of the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

**ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, OCTOBER 24, 2019**

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Thursday, October 24; 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 their use later in the day, morning business be closed, and the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Walker nomination under the previous order; finally, that the Senate recess from 10:30 a.m. until 12 noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

**ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW**

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:15 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, October 24, 2019, at 10 a.m.
HONORING THE 74TH BIRTHDAY AND 40 YEARS OF SERVICE OF JUDGE WAYNE C. SHELTON

HON. ANDY LEVIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 23, 2019

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Robert Beato, Principal of South Lake High School in St. Clair Shores, who was named the 2019 Michigan Principal of the Year by the Michigan Association of Secondary School Principals (MASSP).

Mr. Beato has spent his entire career at South Lake High School, beginning in 1999 when he started teaching history, world history, and government. Currently in his third year as Principal, Mr. Beato served as Dean of Students and as Assistant Principal at South Lake.

The MASSP requires nominees for Principal of the Year to demonstrate collaborative leadership; involvement in curriculum, instruction, and assessment; and personal involvement with students, their families, and staff. After being selected as Principal of the Year, Mr. Beato summed up his philosophy to the St. Clair Shores Sentinel, saying “I pretty much want to do everything I can for my staff. Therefore, they can do everything they can for the students . . . at the end of the day, if it works for kids, let’s try it; let’s do it.” Students at South Lake High School certainly believe that he lives up to his words, as several of them told the Sentinel that he inspires them to learn, to achieve their goals, and to make their voices heard about issues important to them.

His South Lake colleagues also agree, including Assistant Principal Rebecca Scholl-Riedel, who nominated Beato and who said, “He’s my sixth principal that I’ve worked for, and it’s what he was meant to do.”

As Vice Chair of the Education and Labor Committee, I strongly believe that students can achieve their goals with the support of people like Mr. Beato in leadership positions: leaders who focus on the academic and personal well-being of their students, leaders who promote collaboration among the education professionals in their schools, and leaders who inspire excellence and celebrate the achievements of everyone in their schools—even in unconventional ways. Mr. Beato has been known to tell high school juniors that if their class earns a higher SAT score than the previous year’s juniors, he will shave his head. Mr. Beato has focused on meeting the individual needs of the students he serves. He further exhibited selfless volunteerism in his work with Lions International where he was recognized for his service as a recipient of the highest honor, the Melvin Jones Fellowship and Jack Welch Fellowship. His work with Lions continued in his active roles with both the Plano Early Lions Club and the McKinney Morning Pride Lions where he assisted in efforts to provide services for the vision impaired and those with diabetes. As a member of the Collin County Marine Corps League, he volunteered his time in programs including Toys for Tots and the Marine Corps Ball. Mr. Chapman also serves as a Court Appointed Special Advocate where he actively works to support children who have been removed from their home environment due to neglect or abuse.

Sergeant Douglas Chapman proudly served in the United States Marine Corps from 1964 to 1969. During a tour of duty in Vietnam, Sergeant Chapman was stationed in Da Nang where he provided service to four different types of aircraft in his capacity as an Aviation Photographic Electronics Technician. He also provided training on specialized reconnaissance equipment repair to the Air Force, and was deployed to Yuma, Arizona; Key West, Florida; and Guantanamo Bay, Cuba. For his outstanding and dedicated service, Sergeant Chapman was awarded the Vietnam Service Medal, Good Conduct Medal, Vietnam Campaign Medal, National Defense Service Medal, Presidential Unit Citation, Combat Action Ribbon, and the Rifle Marksmanship Badge.

Followings his time in uniform, Mr. Chapman received degrees from Saddleback College, California State University-Fullerton, and his Teaching Credential from National University in Quanton. Having been recognized as a State of Texas Educator of the Year by Project Learning Tree, and as the Math and Science Teacher of the Year by the Air Force Association’s State of Texas Chapter, Mr. Chapman has focused on meeting the individual needs of the students he serves. He further exhibited selfless volunteerism in his work with Lions International where he was recognized for his service as a recipient of the highest honor, the Melvin Jones Fellowship and Jack Welch Fellowship. His work with Lions continued in his active roles with both the Plano Early Lions Club and the McKinney Morning Pride Lions where he assisted in efforts to provide services for the vision impaired and those with diabetes. As a member of the Collin County Marine Corps League, he volunteered his time in programs including Toys for Tots and the Marine Corps Ball. Mr. Chapman also serves as a Court Appointed Special Advocate where he actively works to support children who have been removed from their home environment due to neglect or abuse.

Sergeant Douglas Chapman is a wonderful home environment due to neglect or abuse. It is my extreme honor to award him the 2019 Congressional Veteran Commendation.

In recognition of Access’s 12th Annual Domestic Violence Program Dinner

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 23, 2019

Mrs. DINGELL, Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 12th Annual Domestic Violence Program Dinner.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.
Violence Program Dinner hosted by the Arab Community Center for Economic and Social Services. The organization’s commitment to supporting our Arab American community is worthy of commendation.

The Arab Community Center for Economic and Social Services (ACCESS) is the largest Arab American Community nonprofit organization in the nation. Founded by a group of volunteers in 1971, ACCESS was created to help the Arab immigrant population adapt to life within the United States. Ever since, ACCESS has been devoted to promoting a just and equitable society where all can flourish. Today, with 11 locations, ACCESS provides community members a wide range of educational, social, economic, and health services to assist, improve, and empower people in need.

The 12th Annual Domestic Violence Program Dinner exemplifies ACCESS’s continued commitment to assisting people in distress. Every year, the dinner brings countless community members together to raise proceeds to benefit survivors of domestic violence. In addition, the important program generates a greater awareness for the prevalence of domestic violence and its negative impacts on children, families, and even entire communities. ACCESS is a vital resource for people facing domestic violence, and the organization’s annual dinner dedicated to empowering hundreds of survivors truly makes a difference in our community.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the Arab Community Center for Economic and Social Services as they host their 12th Annual Domestic Violence Program Dinner. ACCESS’s mission to assist, improve, and empower people in our community truly changes lives, and I am deeply appreciative of and empower people in need.

In the civic life, Mr. Deffibaugh has volunteered as a Scoutmaster, Little League Coach, and church deacon. He is also a founding member of the Jacob D. Hayes Marine Corps League, where he has tirelessly coordinated the Collin County Toys for Tots program and led the organization as the Chaplain. Sergeant Steven Deffibaugh has led a remarkable life of service to his community and is to be commended for his tireless efforts.

Today a grateful Nation thanks Sergeant Deffibaugh for his exceptional service and congratulates him on this recognition. May his steadfast example of leadership inspire others to live a life of service to a cause greater than themselves. It is my extreme honor to award him the 2019 Congressional Veteran Commendation for the Third District of Texas.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JACKIE WALORSKI
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 23, 2019

Mrs. WALORSKI. Madam Speaker, due to Ways & Means Committee business, I was unavoidably detained and missed the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 573.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF WAYNE COUNTY PARKS

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 23, 2019

Mrs. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 100th anniversary of Wayne County Parks. Its century of dedication to the Wayne County community is worthy of commendation, and it is my honor and privilege to recognize their important milestone today.

In 1919, Elizabeth Park in Trenton was donated to Wayne County by the children of Elizabeth Scolum. The acceptance of this donation marks the beginning of the Wayne County Park System, the first county park system in the state of Michigan. In the years and decades that followed, the county began to accumulate different outdoor locations throughout...
the area to add to its park system, seeking to
discover new outdoor recreational opportuni-
ties that could enhance the quality of life for
the families and residents of Wayne County.

Over the course of 100 years, the Wayne
County Park System has significantly trans-
formed. From humble beginnings in Elizabeth
Park in 1919, Wayne County Parks have
become an invaluable pillar of our community,

serving as spaces for community members
to gather and enjoy the outdoors, compete in
sports, participate in various community events, and simply have fun. Today, nearly 40
parks including nature trails, golf courses, play
scapes, swimming pools, dog parks, picnic
shelters, and baseball diamonds, to name a
few, comprise the entire Wayne County Park
System. Without a doubt, Wayne County
Parks play an important role in our community
and have been improving the lives of our resi-
dents for a century. Wayne County Parks truly
foster inclusive, lively, and enjoyable environ-
ments where all feel welcome, and I cannot
thank the Wayne County Parks System enough for its century of exceptional service to our
community.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join
me today in honoring the centennial anniver-
sary of Wayne County Parks. We are grateful
for their impactful contributions to our community and wish the parks many more years of
continued success.

RECOGNIZING THE IMPORTANCE
OF THE MALTA CONFERENCES

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 23, 2019

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I rise
to recognize the greatest example of science diplomacy, the Malta Conferences, their found-
er and president Professor Zafra Lerman, and
the important work that the conferences facili-
tate. This year marks the ninth meeting of the Malta Conferences. The conferences help
identify unique opportunities for collaboration
to meet the scientific and technological chal-

lenges of the Middle East region. In the Malta
Conferences, the common language of
science is used for science diplomacy, which
serves as a bridge to peace, tolerance and understanding.

These peace congresses have made it pos-
sible for scientists from countries that are
often on opposing sides of political and cul-
tural conflicts to meet in a politically neutral
environment, where they can collaborate on
solving regional problems, and forge relation-
ships that bridge deep chasms of mistrust and
tolerance. These unique gatherings draw sci-
entists from many Middle East countries, in-
cluding Bahrain, Egypt, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Jor-
dan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Oman, Pal-
estine, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Turkey and the United Arab Emirates.

In each of the Malta Conferences, Middle East scientists meet with science Nobel Laure-
ates to catalyze enduring collaborations on scientific and technological problems, includ-
ing water scarcity, environmental degradation, nu-
clear and chemical security, science and tech-
nology education for all, energy, and climate
change.

The founder and president of the Malta
Conferences, Professor Zafra Lerman, is my
friend and constituent. Professor Lerman is a
life-long champion for human rights, freedom, and peace. For more than four decades, she
has worked tirelessly to promote peace and
justice around the globe, especially among na-
tions whose governments are hostile to one
another.

Professor Lerman has received over 40
international awards, including the Presidential Award for Excellence in Science, Math-
ematics, and Engineering Mentoring from Presi-
dent Clinton, the Royal Society of Chemistry
Phyllis Woolf Education Award, the American
Chemical Society George C. Pimentel Award,
the American Association for the Advance-
ment of Science (AAAS) Award for Science and
Diplomacy, the American Physical Society
Andre Sakharov Prize, and the UN NOVUS Summit Peace and Justice Award. Professor
Lerman received her bachelor’s and master’s
degrees in chemistry at Technion-Israel Insti-
tute of Technology, and her Ph.D. from the
Weizmann Institute of Science.

Despite many obstacles to success, the Malta Conferences have developed several
avenues for change: Jordan, Palestine, Israel,
Egypt, and Kuwait formed a working group on
Drinking Water management in the Middle
East; Palestinian students from Al Quds University in Palestine are pursuing PhD studies
at Weizmann Institute of Science in Israel; a
women’s group was formed in order to em-
power women scientists across the region,
and encourage young girls to pursue careers
in STEM; and a unified science curriculum for
the Middle East is being developed which will
include climate change, chemistry, nuclear se-
cURITY, and ethics. More than 700 Middle East
scientists and 15 Nobel Laureates are now
in the network.

I would like to thank Professor Zafra Lerman
and the Malta Conferences for their continued hard work to bring peace to the Middle East.

RECOGNIZING CORPORAL RONNIE
“RD” FOSTER, RECIPIENT OF TEXAS’
THIRD DISTRICT 2019 CONGRESSIONAL
VETERAN COMMEMULATION

HON. VAN TAYLOR
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 23, 2019

Mr. TAYLOR. Madam Speaker, today, it is
my privilege to honor twelve distinguished mili-
tary veterans from Texas’ Third Congressional
District who answered the call to serve their
Nation honorably, both in uniform and fol-
lowing their return to civilian life. The recipi-

ents of the 2019 Congressional Veteran Com-
memulation exemplify the time-honored quali-
ties of patriotism, service before self, and bold
leadership. Following their time in service,
their efforts in our community have earned
these fine individuals recognition as the recipi-

ents of this prestigious commendation. Their
service will encourage future generations
to pursue a life dedicated to the values we cherish as Americans: faith, free-
dom, and democracy. One such hero is Cor-
poral Ronnie “RD” Foster of Anna, Texas.

Corporal Ronnie Davenport Foster, known
to his friends as “RD” served in the United
States Marine Corps from 1966 to 1969. Origi-
nally from Farmersville, Texas, as the son of a
WWII veteran, Ronnie’s sense of patriotism
was developed early on. Shortly after grad-
uating from high school, RD would be as-
signed to the 1st Force Logistics Command
driving resupply and cargo trucks out of Da
Nang, Vietnam in 1967 as a part of the
“Rough Riders” motor transport Battalion.
For his efforts, RD was awarded the National De-
service Medal, Vietnam Service Medal, Good
Conduct Medal, and Rifle Sharpshooter
Badge.

In the decades that would follow, RD pur-
sued a music career as a singer songwriter
and worked as a tour bus operator for famed
musicians and performers. In an effort to rec-
ognize the patriotism of our Vietnam Veterans
who were often shunned upon their return
from service, RD organized a concert to raise
awareness and funds for the Texas Vietnam
Veterans Memorial in Fair Park in the 1980s.
Later, RD would embark on an extensive mis-

tion to identify all the men and women from
Collin County who died while serving our Na-

tion going back to the Great War. Upon con-

cclusion of his painstaking research efforts,
he would lobby local governmental entities and
spearhead a fundraising effort to construct a
Veterans Memorial to remember and honor
the legacies of our fallen warriors from Collin
County. In response, the City of McKinney
created the Armed Services Memorial Board,
of which RD was a founding member. The re-

\result was the Collin County Veterans Memorial,
which was dedicated in November 2011. Fur-
ther, in 2013, RD cofounded the Collin County
Fallen Warrior Portrait Project which has re-

sulted in 70 portraits of fallen warriors on per-
manent display at the Collin County Court-
house. Corporal Foster would also organize
the efforts to rename Courthouse to the Rus-
sell A. Steinbamm Courts Building in honor of
the posthumously awarded Medal of Honor re-
cipient. Foster’s recognitions include Patriot of
the Year by the Texas Veterans Commission and
recognition as a recipient of the Distingui-

ished Citizens Medal from the Daughters of
the American Revolution.

Today a grateful Nation thanks Corporal
Foster for his exceptional service and con-
gratulates him on this recognition. May his
steadfast example of leadership inspire others
to live a life of service to a cause greater
than themselves. It is my extreme honor to
award him the 2019 Congressional Veteran Com-
memulation for the Third District of Texas.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BILL FOSTER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 23, 2019

Mr. FOSTER. Madam Speaker, I was not
present for a vote on Tuesday, October 23,
2019. Had I been present, I would have voted on rolcall No. 573, “aye.”
INTRODUCTION OF WHITE HOUSE ACCOUNTABILITY FOR DIVERSITY ACT

HON. J. LUIS CORREA
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 23, 2019

Mr. CORREA. Madam Speaker, after President Trump’s inauguration, the White House deleted Spanish-language content from the official White House website. At the time, the White House claimed that a Spanish-language site was under development, but, more than two years later, such a website has yet to materialize. Meanwhile, the previous two administrations offered Spanish-language content on the official White House website.

There are many taxpayers whose first language is not English. Spanish, Chinese, Tagalog, Vietnamese, and French are among the most spoken languages in the United States. People benefit tremendously from having different options to access their government and receive information that may impact their lives. This is why it is imperative that the White House and federal agencies continue to be accessible to all taxpayers.

Therefore, I am reintroducing the White House Accountability for Diversity Act. It is vital for all taxpayers to be able to follow issues that affect their lives. This legislation will allow for content to be translated into Spanish, Chinese, Tagalog, Vietnamese, French and any other language deemed necessary by the Office of Management and Budget. This will ensure that all taxpayers have the option of accessing up-to-date information in their preferred language.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE DEDICATION OF THE BOB AND ANNA RENAUD TRAIN BARN

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 23, 2019

Mrs. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Renaud Family and celebrate the opening of the “Bob and Anna Renaud Train Barn.” The Renaud Family’s generosity and life-long commitment to our community are worthy of commendation.

The Renaud Family is a central fixture of our community. Since moving to Southgate in 1947, Bob and Anna Renaud have fully dedicated their lives to serving the city. Anna, a retired councilwoman, served on the Southgate City Council for 16 years, and her husband Bob was a United States veteran who dutifully served our country in World War II. Throughout the decades, Bob and Anna have become pillars of Southgate and are widely recognized for their lifetime of generosity and philanthropy. To the great sadness of our community, Bob Renaud passed away last August, yet his remarkable work alongside his wife will always be remembered, honored, and appreciated.

The opening of the Bob and Anna Renaud Train Barn was only made possible due to the continued generosity of the Renaud Family. Named in recognition of Anna and in honor of the legacy of Bob, the barn will provide the Great Lakes Live Steamers crews a place to store and work on their trains. More importantly, the barn will serve as a welcoming place for our community to gather and learn more about something Bob loved: trains.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today in celebrating the dedication of the Bob and Anna Renaud Train Barn. We are grateful for Bob and Anna’s 70 years of meaningful service to Southgate and their efforts are truly deserving of this recognition. The Renaud Family is cherished by so many within our community, and I am glad the train barn will bear their name for generations to come.

RECOGNIZING SPECIALIST ERIC HALL, RECIPIENT OF TEXAS’ THIRD CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT 2019 CONGRESSIONAL VETERAN COMMEMDATION

HON. VAN TAYLOR
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 23, 2019

Mr. TAYLOR. Madam Speaker, today, it is my privilege to honor twelve distinguished military veterans from Texas’ Third Congressional District who answered the call to serve their Nation honorably, both in uniform and following their return to civilian life. The recipients of the 2019 Congressional Veteran Commendation exemplify the time-honored qualities of patriotism, service before self, and bold leadership. For their unselfish service, their efforts in our community have earned these fine individuals recognition as the recipients of this prestigious commendation.

Their stories of sacrifice will encourage future generations to pursue a life dedicated to the very values we cherish as Americans: faith, freedom, and democracy. One such hero is Specialist Eric Hall of Frisco, Texas.

Specialist Eric Hall began his career in the United States Army as an infantryman, in both Scout and Reconnaissance Platoons. He was deployed to Iraq and continued his active duty service until June 2010. For his valiant efforts in the Army, he was awarded the Army Commendation Medal, Army Good Conduct Medal, National Defense Service Medal, Global War on Terrorism Medal, Iraq Campaign Medal with Campaign Star, Army Service Ribbon, Overseas Service Ribbon, and Combat Infantry Badge to name a few.

Mr. Hall would spend the next few years of his career in the Army National Guard, during which time he attended the University of Texas at Dallas, earning a Bachelor of Art in Political Science and a Masters in Constitutional Law. As a student, Eric developed a passion for servant leadership in organizations including the Young Conservatives of Texas, Kappa Sigma Fraternity, the Cares Team, and as a member of the Rugby team. His deep desire to ensure equality as instilled by the teachings of family members, led him to continue to serve in a multitude of organizations including the Equal Rights Voting Institute, 22 Fellowship Program, and as a Board Member for the DFW Chapter of the Martin Luther King Jr. Association of Texas.

As an advocate for our military and veterans, Eric has maintained an active role in organizations including the Association of the United States Army, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and Carry the Load. Specialist Eric Hall is a leader of service and sacrifice who is wholly deserving of this recognition.

Today a grateful Nation thanks Specialist Hall for his exceptional service and congratulates him on this recognition. May his steadfast example of leadership inspire others to live a life of service to a cause greater than themselves. It is my extreme honor to award him the 2019 Congressional Veteran Commendation for the Third District of Texas.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DOUG COLLINS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 23, 2019

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, on October 22, 2019, I was absent for a vote on H.R. 2426, the CASE Act of 2019, due to a family emergency. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on Roll Call No. 578.

RECOGNIZING SGT. JEFF HEWITT AND DEPUTY JARED S. HEWITT

HON. NEAL P. DUNN
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 23, 2019

Mr. DUNN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Sgt. Jeff Hewitt and Deputy Jared S. Hewitt of the Franklin County Sheriff’s Office for their courageous actions during the Eastpoint, FL fire that took place last June devastating the community and stretching over 1,000 acres.

The father and son received a call over dispatch that a family was trapped in a burning vehicle, and without hesitation, the two of them hurried to the scene. Placing their lives at risk, they fought through the heavy smoke and engulfing fire to free a young boy, his parents, and their cat from the emblazoned truck.

Because of their bravery and swift action, this family was safely rescued and there were no deaths as a result of the horrific fire in Eastpoint.

Their heroic actions have not gone unnoticed. Sgt. Jeff Hewitt and Deputy Jared Hewitt were named as the 2019 Law Enforcement Officers of the Year at the Florida Sheriff’s Association annual summer conference. As a nation, we are indebted to our first responders and law enforcement officers for their daily acts of heroism.

Madam Speaker, please join me in thanking this father and son for risking their lives not only during this fire, but every day to ensure that the people of Franklin County can live safe and prosperous lives.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DWIGHT EVANS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 23, 2019

Mr. EVANS. Madam Speaker, I was attending a committee meeting. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on Roll Call No. 579.
RECOGNIZING SPECIALIST PAUL HUFF, RECIPIENT OF TEXAS’ THIRD CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT 2019 CONGRESSIONAL VETERAN COMMENDATION

HON. VAN TAYLOR
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2019

Mr. TAYLOR. Madam Speaker, today, it is my privilege to honor twelve distinguished military veterans from Texas’ Third Congressional District who answered the call to serve their Nation honorably, both in uniform and following their return to civilian life. The recipients of the 2019 Congressional Veteran Commendation exemplify the time-honored qualities of patriotism, service before self, and bold leadership. Following their time in service, their efforts in our community have earned these men and women the appreciation and recognition they so richly deserve.

Mr. HUFF was promoted to a Specialist E–6 rank under the United States Army Intelligence Training Center in Fort Ritchie, Maryland. Mr. HUFF was awarded the National Defense Medal, Good Conduct Medal, Vietnam Service Medal with 1 Bronze Star, and Republic of Vietnam Gallantry Cross with the Palm Unit Citation Badge.

Upon reentering civilian life, Paul worked in the computer and data processing field before later retiring. Since that time, Paul has dedicated his life to assisting veterans and furthering the cause of those who have worn the uniform as his role as President of the Collin County Vietnam Veterans of America (Chapter 1122), and active membership in the Veterans of Foreign Wars (Allian Post 2195), American Legion (Bill Bryan Post 110), and the Association of the United States Army (Audie Murphy Chapter).

In his role as Treasurer for the Disabled American Veterans (McKinney Chapter 38), Paul is certified as a certified DAV Chapter Service Advisor where he has assisted many veterans obtain Compensation and Pension benefits from the Veterans Benefits Administration. Mr. HUFF further demonstrates his ability to benefit the lives of those around him by giving seriously of his time with the Veterans Center of North Texas, an all-volunteer organization that serves as a free resource center for veterans offering health, employment, housing, mental health and benefits assistance. Mr. Paul Huff has continuously found new ways to exhibit service before self to those he serves, and our community and deserves our unwavering gratitude for his many efforts.

Today a grateful Nation thanks Specialist Huff for his exceptional service and congratulates him on this recognition. May his steadfast example of leadership inspire others to live a life of service to a cause greater than themselves. It is my extreme honor to award him the 2019 Congressional Veteran Commendation for the Third District of Texas.

IN RECOGNITION OF DETECTIVE SERGEANT JASON HOHNER

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 2019

Mrs. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Detective Sergeant Jason Hohner and congratulate him on receiving The Washntenaw 100 Law Enforcement Officer of the Year Award. Detective Sergeant Jason Hohner’s selfless dedication to protecting the Washtenaw County community is worthy of commendation.

The Washtenaw 100 is a non-profit organization committed to supporting our community’s firefighters and law enforcement officers and serves as a great way to recognize their outstanding efforts. This year, The Washtenaw 100 is proud to recognize Detective Sergeant Jason Hohner as the 2019 Law Enforcement Officer of the Year.

Detective Sergeant Jason Hohner is an experienced and valuable member of the Pittsfield Police Department. Nominated by Chief Matthew Harsherger, Det. Sgt. Hohner is a leader who consistently goes above and beyond what is expected of him in his position. Although Det. Sgt. Hohner has a host of outstanding accomplishments that make him deserving of the Law Enforcement Officer of the Year Award, some of his most noteworthy achievements include his leadership in a recent homicide investigation that involved over 90 law enforcement personnel and his crucial coordination between the Pittsfield Police Department and a variety of other agencies to ensure crucial information was not left unnoticed. Det. Sgt. Hohner is known amongst his peers as a driven problem-solver who humbly strives for excellence without seeking praise or recognition for any of his remarkable accomplishments.

Today, we celebrate the many humanitarian efforts and accomplishments of Mahomed Akbar Khan. His commitment to serving his local and global community by continuing to advocate for tolerance, peace, and non-violence.

Mr. CORREA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Mahomed Akbar Khan for his dedication to our youth and our community. With over 30 years of commitment to the people of Southern California, Mr. Khan has focused on conflict resolution, interfait programs, humanitarian aid, and youth development.

In 1970, at age 9, Mr. Khan’s family immigrated to the United States from South Africa during the apartheid. By the early 1990s, Mr. Khan co-founded over 25 Muslim student unions and campus organizations across the United States, including the Muslim Youth of North America (M.Y.N.A) which is the largest American Muslim youth organization today.

Mr. Khan’s 30 years of experience in interfaith dialog and conflict resolution is exemplified by his notable accomplishments. As a student, he served as a Muslim Chaplain and provided impactful religious services to prison inmates. This service influenced many former gang leaders to return to their communities and devote their lives to gang intervention, easing tensions, and creating a peace movement on the streets.

Mr. Khan traveled to Israel as an ambassador of peace alongside Martin Luther King III, a “civil rights Rabbi,” advocating for an end to violence. Mr. Khan sat on the Economic and Poverty Alleviation Advisory Board for Xhosa King Sandle, where he was heavily involved in alleviating poverty and building peace strategies throughout South Africa.

Currently, Mr. Khan continues to bring impact and attention to local and global issues. Mr. Khan brought national attention to the Rohingya humanitarian crisis when he helped to organize a hearing before the House Foreign Affairs Committee in Washington, D.C. in 2018. This hearing brought over $130 million in emergency aid to the Rohingya refugees in Bangladesh.

Today, we celebrate the many humanitarian efforts and accomplishments of Mahomed Akbar Khan. His commitment to serving his local and global community by continuing to advocate for tolerance, peace, and non-violence.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Madam Speaker, I was unavailable and missed rollcall Vote 570. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye” on rollcall No. 570.
IN RECOGNITION OF IVAN “BUD” WARREN ATWOOD, JR.’S LIFETIME OF SERVICE TO THE VETERAN COMMUNITY

HON. JAHANA HAYES
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 23, 2019

Mrs. HAYES. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ivan “Bud” Warren Atwood, Jr., of Torrington, Connecticut, who passed away on October 20, 2019 after a long battle with cancer. As a decorated member of the U.S. Army and a longtime advocate for veterans, Mr. Atwood lived a life that was truly emblematic of service to his community.

During his time in the U.S. Army, Mr. Atwood proved himself to be a dedicated and brave soldier. As a result, he was awarded a series of medals and decorations, including the National Defense Service Medal, the Marksmanship (Rifle), the Good Conduct Medal, a Korean War Service Medal, and a Letter of Appreciation.

However, work for the Armed Services and his country continued long after he left the Army. After retiring, Mr. Atwood turned his attention to veterans. He became the Director of the Torrington Veterans Service Office, where he had the privilege of providing services and final honors to countless veterans for at least eighteen years. In addition to this, Mr. Atwood served with the Northwest Connecticut Honor Guard and was instrumental in organizing local events for veterans such as National Pearl Harbor Remembrance Day, Veterans Day, National Vietnam War Veterans Day, National Korean War Armistice Day, and many more.

Mr. Atwood’s work in the military community shows his character and integrity. His legacy lives on through the veterans for whom he advocated tirelessly, the organization which he championed, and his family members who have inherited his commitment to service. It cannot be understated how much he will be missed.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Ivan Warren Atwood, Jr. as he rests in peace after such an extraordinary life. He truly made our community a better place.

HONORING RABBI MORLEY FEINSTEIN

HON. BRAD SHERMAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 23, 2019

Mr. SHERMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor a leader in the Jewish community, Rabbi Morley Feinstein.

Ordonned in 1981 at Hebrew Union College—Jewish Institute of Religion in Cincinnati, Rabbi Feinstein served as the assistant and first associate rabbi of Temple Beth-El in San Antonio, Texas. From 1987 to 2002, he served as senior rabbi of Temple Beth-El in South Bend, Indiana. During his tenure there, Indiana’s Governor recognized Rabbi Feinstein with the state’s highest citizen honor, The Sagamore of the Wabash, for his efforts in promoting peace and justice.

Rabbi Feinstein has devoted time for thirty-four summers teaching at the camps of the Union for Reform Judaism. In addition, he has served in leadership roles with the Los Angeles Council of Religious Leaders, the Central Conference of American Rabbis, and the Board of Rabbis of Southern California.

For the past 17 years, Rabbi Feinstein has served as senior rabbi at University Synagogue in Los Angeles, where he has shared his love for teaching Torah and helped to grow a vibrant Jewish community. He has also brought his passion for music to this sacred work.

I have had the privilege of attending services officiated by Rabbi Feinstein and have seen firsthand the welcoming spiritual home he has fostered at University Synagogue.

In his role as rabbi emeritus, Rabbi Feinstein will remain a treasured resource to our community. Rabbi Feinstein is loved by his wife Dr. Margarete Myers Feinstein, sons, Aaron and Ari, twin daughters, Eliana and Renata, and his two grandchildren.

Madam Speaker, I wish to thank Rabbi Feinstein for his service to our community.

IN REMEMBRANCE OF THE MARYSVILLE-PILCHUCK HIGH SCHOOL SHOOTING

HON. RICK LARSEN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 23, 2019

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Madam Speaker, I rise to commemorate a solemn anniversary.

Five years ago, on October 24, 2014, the Marysville, Washington and Tulalip communities were violently ripped apart by a tragic shooting at Marysville-Pilchuck High School. The victims—Zoe Galasso (14), Shaylee Chulkulnaskit (14), Gia Soriano (14) and Andrew Fryberg (15)—were filled with ambition and excitement for life.

Jaylen Fryberg (15), also died. Nate Hatch survived the shooting and spent months fighting for his life.

As a father of two boys, my heart still hurts when I think of those parents who received the worst news imaginable.

Today, five years later, I recognize the strength and resilience of the victims’ families, the Tulalip tribes, the Marysville-Pilchuck High School community and the city of Marysville, Washington. When faced with unimaginable tragedy, the community came together to celebrate the young victims and give thanks for their lives which were cut short in a senseless act of violence.

CONGRATULATING DR. C. DIANE MOSBY FOR 10 YEARS OF SERVICE TO THE ANOINTED NEW LIFE BAPTIST CHURCH

HON. ABIGAIL DAVIS SPANBERGER
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 23, 2019

Ms. SPANBERGER. Madam Speaker, it is my true pleasure to congratulate Dr. C. Diane Mosby on her deeply deserved recognition for 10 years of service as a Senior Pastor for the Anointed New Life Baptist Church in Richmond, Virginia.

Over the past decade and beyond, Dr. Mosby has served as a leader in her faith and community. Her dedication is evident through her Doctor of Ministry and Master of Divinity degrees from Virginia Union University. Moreover, her work in the Commonwealth, as well as her proliferation of international ministry assignments in Ghana, France, and the Philippines, exhibits remarkable commitment to the communities she serves. In Dr. Mosby’s daily work, she has made a positive impact on countless lives and has honored the values she teaches at the Anointed New Life Baptist Church.

Dr. Mosby’s commitment is both inspiring and humbling. I hope to emulate her service as the Representative for Virginia’s 7th District and would like to thank her for all her work. I look forward to celebrating her continued service in years to come.

IN CELEBRATION OF THE AMERICAN SYRIAN ARAB CULTURAL ASSOCIATION ANNUAL BANQUET

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 23, 2019

Mrs. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the American Syrian Arab Cultural Association and celebrate its 2019 Annual Banquet. The association’s lasting commitment to supporting our Syrian American community is worthy of commendation.

The American Syrian Arab Cultural Association (ASACA) is a non-profit and non-sectarian cultural and education organization with a mission to “acquaint the American public with the rich Arabic culture and heritage through the promotion of lectures, educational seminars and cultural events.” The association aspires to strengthen ties and promote friendly relations by building bridges between Arabic culture and the American community at large. In addition, ASACA tirelessly strives to preserve and instill Arabic language, culture, and heritage within the youth of the Arab community, ensuring it will be shared with generations to come.

ASACA’s Annual Banquet exemplifies the association’s continued commitment to our Arab American community. This year, the banquet will support Syrian Youth Empowerment (SYE), a non-profit initiative that empowers Syrian youth by providing paths to higher education. Established by a group of Syrian refugees who personally experienced the challenges of pursuing higher education both in and outside Syria, SYE was created to support students in conflict areas and help them navigate the barriers they encounter throughout the college application process. ASACA’s important work alongside SYE will generate a greater awareness for the obstacles many Syrians face due to ongoing conflicts, and ASACA’s dedicated efforts with help better support students who wish to obtain their college degrees.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the American Syrian Arab Cultural Association as it hosts its annual banquet. ASACA’s commitment to empowering Syrian youth truly changes lives, and I am deeply appreciative of the association’s remarkable work.
GEORGIA SUPPORT ACT

SPEECH OF
HON. BRENDAN F. BOYLE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 22, 2019

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 598, the Georgia Support Act. This bill helps strengthen the vital U.S.—Georgia partnership, a strategically important relationship in a critical part of the world. In 2008, Georgia was invaded by Russia and the Kremlin continues to attack Georgia through subversive disinformation campaigns and cyberattacks. This bill provides Georgia with assistance to combat this threat and support its democratic institutions.

The Georgian government has long made closer integration with the EU and NATO a priority. According to recent polls, almost 80 percent of the Georgian population supports membership in the EU and over 70 percent supports membership in NATO. As a member of the U.S. delegation to NATO Parliamentary Assembly, I am pleased that the bill recognizes that Georgia has been a longstanding NATO-aspirant country.

I urge all of my colleagues to support the Georgia Support Act. Passing this bill shows our support for Georgia's sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity, as well as its democratic development, Euro-Atlantic integration, and peaceful conflict resolution in Abkhazia and South Ossetia.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 598, the Georgia Support Act. Passing this bill shows of the U.S. delegation to NATO Parliamentary Assembly supports membership in NATO. As a member of the EU and over 70 percent of the Georgian population supports membership in the EU and over 70 percent supports membership in NATO. As a member of the U.S. delegation to NATO Parliamentary Assembly, I am pleased that the bill recognizes that Georgia has been a longstanding NATO-aspirant country.

I urge all of my colleagues to support the Georgia Support Act. Passing this bill shows our support for Georgia's sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity, as well as its democratic development, Euro-Atlantic integration, and peaceful conflict resolution in Abkhazia and South Ossetia.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 598, the Georgia Support Act. Passing this bill shows of the U.S. delegation to NATO Parliamentary Assembly supports membership in NATO. As a member of the EU and over 70 percent supports membership in NATO. As a member of the U.S. delegation to NATO Parliamentary Assembly, I am pleased that the bill recognizes that Georgia has been a longstanding NATO-aspirant country.

I urge all of my colleagues to support the Georgia Support Act. Passing this bill shows our support for Georgia's sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity, as well as its democratic development, Euro-Atlantic integration, and peaceful conflict resolution in Abkhazia and South Ossetia.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 598, the Georgia Support Act. Passing this bill shows of the U.S. delegation to NATO Parliamentary Assembly supports membership in NATO. As a member of the EU and over 70 percent supports membership in NATO. As a member of the U.S. delegation to NATO Parliamentary Assembly, I am pleased that the bill recognizes that Georgia has been a longstanding NATO-aspirant country.

I urge all of my colleagues to support the Georgia Support Act. Passing this bill shows our support for Georgia's sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity, as well as its democratic development, Euro-Atlantic integration, and peaceful conflict resolution in Abkhazia and South Ossetia.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 598, the Georgia Support Act. Passing this bill shows of the U.S. delegation to NATO Parliamentary Assembly supports membership in NATO. As a member of the EU and over 70 percent supports membership in NATO. As a member of the U.S. delegation to NATO Parliamentary Assembly, I am pleased that the bill recognizes that Georgia has been a longstanding NATO-aspirant country.

I urge all of my colleagues to support the Georgia Support Act. Passing this bill shows our support for Georgia's sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity, as well as its democratic development, Euro-Atlantic integration, and peaceful conflict resolution in Abkhazia and South Ossetia.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 598, the Georgia Support Act. Passing this bill shows of the U.S. delegation to NATO Parliamentary Assembly supports membership in NATO. As a member of the EU and over 70 percent supports membership in NATO. As a member of the U.S. delegation to NATO Parliamentary Assembly, I am pleased that the bill recognizes that Georgia has been a longstanding NATO-aspirant country.

I urge all of my colleagues to support the Georgia Support Act. Passing this bill shows our support for Georgia's sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity, as well as its democratic development, Euro-Atlantic integration, and peaceful conflict resolution in Abkhazia and South Ossetia.
five years with the International Association of Heat and Frost Insulators and Allied Workers Local No. 32, Mike leaves his indelible legacy.

Born and raised in New Jersey, Mike is a third generation Insulator, following in the footsteps of his grandfather, father, uncle and brother, and he is rightly proud of this legacy. Since Mike was a high school apprentice member in 1984, Mike worked his way up to foreman, earning leadership positions as Vice President, President, and Fund Trustee. Mike’s story is emblematic of the great American story, and he has always pushed himself and those around him to be the best they could be. It is precisely these values that make me proud to call Mike a dear friend.

I would especially like to commend Mike for his work to help New Jersey workers succeed in the 21st Century economy. As President of the Bergen County Central Trades and Labor Council and President of the United Labor Agency of Northern NJ, Mike worked tirelessly to secure his members the benefits they deserve. The hard-working brothers and sisters of labor, including Local No. 32, helped build our great country, and our towering economy, and have continued to contribute to the most competitive workforce in the world.

As dedicated as Mike has been to his craft and his career, his commitment to his family and community has been even stronger. Mike is a devoted husband to Josette and dedicated father to Brian and Kelly. Despite working long days, he never missed a wrestling match or cheerleading competition. The same drive that makes Mike such a community and labor leader has also made him a successful wrestling coach for the Hackensack Junior Wrestling Program and for the workers he trains every day.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mike for his tireless efforts on behalf of working men and women in New Jersey. As Mike departs Local No. 32, I hope he can enjoy more time with his loving family and pursue his passions of cycling and golf. I am elated he is keeping a leadership role on the Council, so we can continue to work together. I thank Mike, a true public servant, and wish him all the best.

IN MEMORY OF ALBERT R. PERAZA
HON. J. LUIS CORREA
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 23, 2019

Mr. CORREA. Madam Speaker, today I rise today to celebrate the life of Albert R. Peraza. Mr. Peraza was my constituent and a prominent member of the community, whose passion in life served the Anaheim community. His life in education impacted countless lives. On behalf of the community, I wish to thank him for his life of service.

Mr. Peraza was born in 1933 in Jerome, Arizona. He began his professional career by receiving his Bachelor of Arts in Education at Northern Arizona University. After college, he moved to Anaheim, California and spent 19 years as an elementary school teacher. Furthermore, he received a master’s degree in education from the California State University, Fullerton, and completed his post graduate work both in psychometry at California State University, Fullerton and in administration at Chapman University. He was subsequently hired by the La Habra City School District, where he served as an elementary school principle and Director of the Head Start Program for 15 years.

Mr. Peraza served as the Anaheim Planning Commission for four years and on the Utility Board Commission for eight years. Mr. Peraza also dedicated himself to the Anaheim City School District, serving as a Member of School Board of Education for 13 years. Furthermore, he was also an active Member of Board of Directors of the Anaheim YMCA.

Mr. Peraza was loved by his family, friends and community. He is preceded in death by his loving wife, Rachel. He leaves behind his daughters, Patricia Peraza and Kathleen Garcia, his son-in-law, Valentin Garcia, grandchildren Michelle (David) Scharfe, Andrew (Jessica) Garcia, Matthew Garcia, Amanda Garcia, and his great-grandchildren, Eli, Evan-geline, Ezekiel, Ephraim Scharfe, and Benjamin Garcia.

I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating the successful life of Albert R. Peraza, and honoring his decades of hard work for our community. May he rest in peace.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION
HON. A. DONALD MCEACHIN
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 23, 2019

Mr. MCEACHIN. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably detained on October 21, 2019, during roll call no. 568, On Motion to Table, H.Res. 647, Raising a question of the privileges of the House. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.” I was also unavoidably detained during roll call no. 570, On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass, as Amended, H.R. 4406, Small Business Development Centers Improvement Act. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.” I was also unavoidably detained during roll call no. 570, On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass, H.R. 4407, SCORE for Small Business Act. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

INTRODUCTION OF THE VISION ZERO ACT OF 2019
HON. CHELLIE PINGREE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 23, 2019

Ms. PINGREE. Madam Speaker, I was not present for roll call vote 568, the Motion to Table on H. Res. 647, which took place on October 21, 2019. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea”:

IN RECOGNITION OF THE MUSLIM COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION OF ANN ARBOR AND VICINITY MOSQUE OPEN HOUSE
HON. DEBBIE DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 23, 2019

Mrs. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Muslim Community Association of Ann Arbor and Vicinity’s Mosque Open House.

The Muslim community is an important component of Michigan’s identity. Since the community’s humble beginnings in the state over 100 years ago, the Muslim community in Michigan has grown significantly and today represents one of the most diverse groups in the nation. In 1972, the Muslim Community Association of Ann Arbor and Vicinity (MCA) was founded by a dedicated group of Muslims to better serve the needs of Michigan’s Muslim community. The purpose of this association was to practice, propagate, and preserve Islam and Islamic heritage. Today, the association tirelessly works to serve the religious needs of Muslims, but also strives to meet the social, cultural, and educational needs of the community, as well. In addition, the association provides opportunities for people to learn more about the teachings of the Holy Qur’an and Sunnah through classes and prayer and aspires to enhance friendly relations between Muslims and non-Muslims throughout the state.

MCA’s Mosque Open House exemplifies the association’s continued commitment to unifying our community. By opening the mosque’s doors and encouraging community members to visit, countless people will be introduced to—or gain a better understanding of—Islam. Moreover, the open house presents a new opportunity for visitors to meet and speak with more of their Muslim neighbors. Thanks to the open house, MCA will advance its mission to facilitate greater unification for all members of our community, and importantly will create a welcoming space for both Muslims and non-Muslims of Ann Arbor to come together to learn more about one another.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the Muslim Community Association of Ann Arbor and Vicinity and thank them for hosting their Mosque Open House. We are grateful for the association’s dedicated efforts to serve the Muslims of Ann Arbor and promote friendly relations community-wide.

INTRODUCTION OF THE VISION ZERO ACT OF 2019
HON. EARL BLUMENAUER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 23, 2019

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, today I introduced the Vision Zero Act of 2019. This bipartisan legislation makes the development and implementation of vision Zero plans eligible for federal transportation funding under the Surface Transportation Block Grant program, the Highway Safety Improvement Program, and the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Program.

Traffic fatalities in the United States claim more than 36,000 lives every year, that is one life approximately every 14 minutes. Fatal crashes are especially common for the most vulnerable road users, that is, pedestrians, cyclists, older Americans, and children. Just yesterday, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) released their annual traffic fatalities report which found a decrease
in total traffic fatalities but an increase for vulnerable road users like pedestrians and cyclists. We need a new approach. The only acceptable number of traffic fatalities is zero.

In more than 40 urban, rural, and suburban communities across America, residents, activists, and elected officials have come together to adopt and implement Vision Zero plans. The goal of Vision Zero is the elimination of all transportation-related fatalities and serious injuries. This includes pedestrians, bicyclists, transit users, motorists, and passengers. Vision Zero is an innovative, multifaceted approach to improving transportation safety across all transportation modes by using data, new partnerships, safe planning, and community-focused solutions toward zero traffic fatalities. The Vision Zero Act of 2019 integrates Vision Zero into federal transportation policy so that safety, equity, and proper planning are finally prioritized.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DAN BISHOP
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 23, 2019

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I was unable to attend votes between October 15 and 23 due to a long standing family commitment. While this would not have changed the outcome, below is how I would have voted on each rollcall. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 556; "yea" on rollcall No. 557; "nay" on rollcall No. 558; "nay" on rollcall No. 559; "nay" on rollcall No. 560; "yea" on rollcall No. 561; "nay" on rollcall No. 562; "yea" on rollcall No. 563; "nay" on rollcall No. 564; "yea" on rollcall No. 565; "yea" on rollcall No. 566; "nay" on rollcall No. 567; "nay" on rollcall No. 568; "yea" on rollcall No. 569; "yea" on rollcall No. 570; "nay" on rollcall No. 571; "nay" on rollcall No. 572; "yea" on rollcall No. 573; "nay" on rollcall No. 574; and "yea" on rollcall No. 575.

IN RECOGNITION OF FAYROUZ BAZZI FOR HER HEROISM

HON. DEBBIE Dingell
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 23, 2019

Mrs. Dingell. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Fayrouz Bazzi for her heroism. Her quick thinking and response to a vehicle fire saved the lives of six people and greatly deserves commendation.

On August 14, 2019, Fayrouz Bazzi’s vehicle overheated and was engulfed in flames on Interstate 275 as she and her family drove to Interstate 275 as she and her family drove to Michigan. Under the pressure of circumstances, Ms. Bazzi left the vehicle only after she confirmed all six family members were safe.

I am proud that a strong, brave, and courageous woman like Fayrouz Bazzi is a part of our Dearborn community. As a graduate of the University of Michigan Dearborn, an ICU nurse, a bus driver, a business owner, and a mother, Ms. Bazzi is not a stranger to adversity and has consistently displayed a tremendous amount of motivation to tackling and solving every problem she encounters. Her quick-thinking and levelheaded actions in the face of crisis saved the lives of six children. Undoubtedly, Ms. Bazzi’s commitment to helping others makes the community a better place.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Dearborn resident, Fayrouz Bazzi. Her outstanding efforts in a time of crisis ensured the safety of her family and other motorists in the community. I am deeply appreciative of her selfless actions and heroism.

CONGRATULATING BRIAN MORIGUCHI ON HIS RETIREMENT

HON. JUDY CHU
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 23, 2019

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Brian Moriguchi on his retirement from a remarkable career in public service and law enforcement.

For the past 34 years, Brian has served in multiple capacities with the Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department. From the start of his career, Brian fought tirelessly for systemic change within law enforcement, devoting his professional and personal life to fighting for justice and fairness. While working as a Sergeant, Brian helped develop the Sheriff’s Department’s hate crime policy. He then became the chairperson for the Los Angeles County Human Relations Commission’s Network Against Hate Crimes, which develops programs to combat racism and prejudice in the county.

In 2008, Brian was elected president of the Los Angeles County Professional Peace Officers Association (PPOA), which represents over 9,000 active and retired law enforcement officials. He held this position for more than 10 years, becoming the longest serving president in PPOA’s 68-year history. As president, Brian successfully undertook a variety of initiatives. He improved communications with PPOA’s members, modernized its digital presence, and improved its outreach. Brian also increased funding for the organization’s Star & Shield Foundation, enabling PPOA to better assist the families of fallen officers. Moreover, Brian is also lauded for protecting the members’ pensions, negotiating better contracts, and providing support for numerous local charters.

Outside of his career, Brian has engaged in a variety of civic activities to continuously improve the communities around him. He served as president of the San Fernando Valley Chapter of the Japanese American Citizens League (JACL), the oldest national Asian-Pacific American organization in the country. As president, Brian helped organize protests, educational programs, field trips, and other activities to cultivate awareness of Asian-Pacific American history and the ongoing fight to combat injustice and bigotry. Brian also devoted time to other significant community organizations, serving as a board member for the McKinley Children’s Center and A Safer California Foundation.

Brian’s lifetime of service is a testament to the tremendous impact one person can have on a community. I thank him for his 34 years of contributions to Los Angeles and wish him nothing but the best in retirement.

TRIBUTE TO THOMAS LUDWIG JOHN D’ALESSANDRO III TRANSFORMATIONAL MAYOR OF BALTIMORE, CHAMPION OF CIVIL RIGHTS FOR ALL, AND SCION OF GREAT AMERICAN FAMILY

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 23, 2019

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Thomas Ludwig John D’Alesandro III, the Mayor of Baltimore from 1967 to 1971, a champion of civil rights and equal treatment for all persons, the son of a former Member of Congress and Mayor of Baltimore, and the older brother of House Speaker NANCY PELOSI, the first and only woman to ascend to the height of national legislative power.

Thomas Ludwig John D’Alesandro III died October 20, 2019 at his home in North Baltimore at the age of 90.

Thomas Ludwig John D’Alesandro III was elected president of the Baltimore City Council in 1963 before winning election as Mayor of Baltimore in 1967 and served until 1971 and whose patience and care ushered Baltimore through a very difficult period.

Thomas Ludwig John D’Alesandro III was born on July 24, 1929, in Baltimore, the first of seven children of Thomas Jr. and Annunciata (Lombardi) D’Alesandro.

Thomas Ludwig John D’Alesandro III graduated from Loyola High School and Loyola College and the University of Maryland School of Law, before serving in the United States Army from 1952 to 1955.

When Thomas Ludwig John D’Alesandro III was elected mayor, Baltimore’s public housing was in a state of terrible disrepair, crime was rising, and the middle class was retreating to the suburbs.

Under the mayoral leadership of Thomas Ludwig John D’Alesandro III, things changed as civil rights laws were enacted in the city, neighborhood centers were opened, and a housing and community development department was created. He stood strong and he wasn’t afraid to fight for equal rights. He was privileged to meet Dr. Martin Luther King. He wanted all to live the American dream.

During his first four months in office, Thomas Ludwig John D’Alesandro III appointed more African American persons to governmental offices than any predecessor did over an entire term.

Once, at a neighborhood meeting with a conservative civic group in northeast Baltimore in 1967 and right before becoming mayor, “was the only person in the room to speak in favor of equal housing.” According to his sister and House Speaker NANCY PELOSI, “Tommy dedicated his life to
our city" and was a “champion for civil rights,” who “worked tirelessly for all who called Baltimore home.”

Thomas Ludwig John D’Alessandro III leaves to cherish his memory his beloved wife, Margaret; his children, Thomas, Dominic, Nicholas, Patricia, and Gregory; a brother, Nicholas; 10 grandchildren; three great-grandchildren; and countless neighbors and friends who will always remember this family man and transformational mayor who opened up the City of Baltimore politcally. My deepest sympathy to his entire family.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE RETIREMENT OF REVEREND GREG JACKSON

HON. JOSH GÖTTHEIMER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 23, 2019

Mr. GÖTTHEIMER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the retirement of my good friend, and a great leader in New Jersey, Pastor Greg Jackson. For the last thirty-five years, after growing up in South Carolina, Reverend Jackson has shared his warmth, integrity, and compassion with our blessed community in Hackensack, New Jersey.

Reverend Jackson is the longest-serving pastor of Mount Olive Baptist Church in the congregation’s remarkable 130 years. Under the Pastor’s leadership, Mount Olive has continued to flourish; it serves not only as a vibrant spiritual center, but also as a community dedicated to serving others, especially for those in need. Among other accomplishments, during his tenure, Mount Olive Church built the Logan Family Life Center, providing emergency assistance, social services and educational programs, and advancing the church’s goal of serving humanity. Without question Mount Olive’s success is reflective of the compassion and selflessness of its spiritual leader. We are truly lucky to have Reverend Jackson in North Jersey, and I am especially lucky to call him a friend. He has, more than once, invited me to speak from his pulpit. I have often joked that I spent more time praying with Pastor Jackson than my own Rabbi.

Reverend Jackson’s efforts to improve the lives of others extends beyond his work as pastor at Mount Olive. He founded the Interfaith Brotherhood and Sisterhood breakfast, has served on Hackensack City committees, and the Bergen County Council of Churches. Even in retirement, Reverend Jackson’s service will endure as President of the Lott Carey Foreign Missions Convention. Over the course of his incredible career, Reverend Jackson has traveled across the world to preach, including in South Africa, China, India, Brazil, Cuba, and right here on the floor of the House of Representatives, where he offered the opening prayer as the Guest Chaplain. He has also welcomed transformational leaders to his church, including John Lewis and so many other civil rights leaders. I only wish my colleagues had the opportunity to experience the passion, smarts, warmth, wisdom, and conviction of Reverend Jackson.

I am proud to recognize Reverend Jackson on his remarkable career and wish him many years of happiness alongside his wife Barbara and their children, Michael, Monique and Aashon, and their grandchildren Jorden, Kennedy and Madison. In the years to come, I know he will remain a pillar of our community.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE GROUNDBREAKING OF MICHIGAN MEDICINE’S “HOSPITAL OF THE FUTURE”

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 23, 2019

Mrs. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the groundbreaking of Michigan Medicine’s new “Hospital of the Future.” The construction of Michigan Medicine’s new adult hospital on its main medical campus will transform patients’ medical and surgical care, improving the lives of many within our community. This endeavor is worthy of commendation.

Since the opening of the University of Michigan Medical School in 1850, Michigan Medicine has been the site of many transformative medical and technological advancements. Since its humble beginnings, Michigan Medicine has grown to become one of the largest health care complexes in the state of Michigan. Today, the institution continues to advance the future of healthcare and lead the nation in health care reform, education, and biomedical innovation.

The groundbreaking of Michigan Medicine’s new hospital exemplifies the institution’s lasting commitment to meeting the increasingly complex health care demands of communities across Michigan. The new 12-story facility will include a revolutionary neurological and neurosurgical center, specialty care services for cardiovascular and thoracic patients, and 264 private rooms equipped with universal intensive care. Measuring around 690,000 square feet, the hospital will expand Michigan Medicine’s breadth of services and significantly heighten access to medical care community-wide.

Notably, the new facility aligns with the University of Michigan’s commitment to enhancing environmental sustainability and continued efforts to reduce the institution’s carbon footprint. Working alongside a team of expert architects and engineers, Michigan Medicine hopes the new hospital will be a highly efficient “green” facility and achieve LEED gold status.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the groundbreaking of Michigan Medicine’s new hospital. It is critical that healthcare providers adapt to meet the changing medical needs of communities nationwide.

I am grateful for Michigan’s support in this endeavor. Among other accomplishments, I have the honor to serve alongside Elijah for over 23 years, but it is the greatest privilege of all to call him my friend. All Members who served with him know this similar affinity. The word great is often oversued, but Elijah was truly a great man. He served his district in a way that made clear to everyone his unshakable love for the City of Baltimore and its people. His love was enduring. His service and passion touched those of us serving in any capacity.

A graduate of Howard University in 1973, Elijah received his bachelor’s in political science and served as the student government president. Following the completion of his undergraduate degree, he attended the University of Maryland where he studied law, which led to two-decades of legal practice in the private sector. Elijah also served as the Chief Judge on the Maryland Moot Court, where he aided law students in their studies on appellate casework.

Prior to winning his election to the House of Representatives in 1996, Elijah served in the Maryland House of Delegates. With not only an impressive 16 years to show for this service, he successfully climbed the ranks to become the first African American to serve as Speaker pro tem—one of the many groundbreaking milestones in his illustrious career. As a trailblazer, Elijah advocated for economic and racial justice, and human rights. He was constantly working to improve the condition of his community that had been devastated by the loss of over 30,000 steel jobs, which brought about great despair. Elijah persevered for his people and community using every opportunity to revitalize and to improve his hometown.

Joining the House of Representatives in 1996, Elijah became the Representative for the seventh district in Maryland, serving and dedicated to Baltimore and its suburbs. He was truly a crusader, as he tirelessly fought as an advocate against drug abuse, gun violence, and a visionary for home ownership for all and labor unions—issues that so deeply impact our nation and his district. Amid racial conflict in his home city, Elijah was able to stand above the fray in such a riot-torn landscape and bring peace and reason. As a man who lived by example, his standing up for one’s beliefs was reflected through his years of diligent service and his grace under fire.
I can attest, during his medical challenge, which had been significant and prolonged, he never yielded. His dutiful work sustained the hope of his family and colleagues. History will attest his vision will have laid the foundation for a more honorable and respectful approach to governance of a free people.

May I extend my deepest condolences to his family, his devoted wife Maya, daughter Jennifer, and the people of greater Baltimore for sending a man of such substance and bearing to serve the people of the United States.

Elijah, the proud son of Baltimore, left his community, our nation, and this world a better place through his service. And for that, we shall remain eternally grateful. May God rest his soul peacefully and in full communion with the power of creation.

HONORING THE STRAND THEATRE ON THE OCCASION OF ITS RIBBON CUTTING CEREMONY
HON. ELISE M. STEFANIK
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 23, 2019
Ms. STEFANIK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor The Strand Theatre on the occasion of its Ribbon Cutting Ceremony.

At nearly a century old, the Strand theatre has been a staple of the Hudson River community since the 1920s. It has played host to the evolving nature of entertainment since that time. First being used as a Vaudeville theatre, it evolved with the times to start featuring films. Over the years, the Strand fell into disrepair. However, Hudson River Music Hall Productions stepped in and has just finished a full renovation and modernization project to bring the Strand back to its former glory.

On behalf of New York's 21st district, I want to congratulate Hudson River Music Hall Productions and all those who worked so hard to revive this historic venue. Historic places like the Strand connect us with our history while we chart our own paths forward. I look forward to seeing its renewed role as a centerpiece of the Hudson Falls community and to the new memories being created there.

COMMEMORATING IDAHO WHEAT 60TH ANNIVERSARY
HON. MICHAEL K. SIMPSON
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 23, 2019
Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Speaker, Idaho is recognized around the world for producing high-quality wheat. Sixty years ago, Idaho wheat farmers decided to join together and form the Idaho Wheat Commission to develop export markets, conduct research, and educate growers.

Much has changed over the past 60 years. In 2018, Idaho was the highest yielding state in the nation with an average of 90 bushels per acre. Idaho ranked fifth among wheat producing states at more than 100 million bushels.

Idaho has one of the most consistent harvests of any wheat-growing area. Wet springs and warm, dry summers combined with rich volcanic solids create ideal conditions for our high-quality wheat. Nearly two-thirds of Idaho wheat is grown under irrigation, allowing for Idaho growers to manage the crop to customers' specifications.

Idaho is one of few states that grows all five classes of wheat.

About half of the 100 million bushels produced each year in Idaho are exported. Idaho is uniquely positioned to access the global marketplace by moving grain through the Columbia-Snake River system to Portland, and then onto foreign customers, particularly Asian markets.

The other half of Idaho's wheat production goes to domestic markets via trucks and rail into products we all know and love like Pepperidge Farms Goldfish Crackers, Wheaties and Wheat Chex cereals, pasta, cookies and pastries.

This year, the Idaho Wheat Commission is celebrating 60 years of service to wheat growers in Idaho providing growers with market development, research, and education.

Let it be known that Idaho wheat is Quality Wheat Simply Grown and let us join Idaho's wheat growers in celebrating 60 years of the Idaho Wheat Commission.

CELEBRATING BRYAN K. EXUM'S RETIREMENT
HON. ERIC A. "RICK" CRAWFORD
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 23, 2019
Mr. CRAWFORD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the retirement of Bryan K. Exum. Bryan began his career with Farmers Home Administration (aka Rural Development) as a Student Trainee Agriculture Management Specialist on May 18, 1980, in the Pine Bluff, Jefferson County Office. He worked in that office for three months and then was transferred as a Student Trainee to the Paragould, Greene County Office. While working Bryan was attending Arkansas State University in Jonesboro and received a degree in Agriculture Business. In December 1982, he was hired as the Assistant County Supervisor in the Greene County Office. In 1989, Bryan was transferred to the Marianna, Lee County Office and in 1992 he was selected as the County Supervisor.

In 1995 Bryan was selected as the Rural development Manager for Greene, Craighead and Poinsett Counties and was an Area Specialist from August 16, 2007 until January 2011, in the Jonesboro Area Office. On January 16, 2011, Bryan was selected as the Area Director for the Jonesboro Area Office. In addition to his duties as Area Director in Jonesboro, he was Acting Area Director for the Forrest City Area Office on two different occasions for an extended amount of time.

Bryan K. Exum, throughout his lifetime of service, has played a significant impact on eastern rural Arkansas. Bryan is a loyal and dedicated Arkansan, and we are a better State because of his service to the agriculture business.

TRIBUTE TO BRIGADIER GENERAL JOHN CLAYTON REPPERT
HON. MIKE BOST
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 23, 2019
Mr. BOST. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Brigadier General John Clayton Reppert of Anna, Illinois, who passed away peacefully earlier this month. General Reppert dedicated his life to his God, his country, his family and his friends.

As a young man, John was a star on his high school football team and worked at his hometown, family-owned newspaper, the Anna Gazette-Democrat. While attending Kansas State, he met and later married Patricia Ann Rash. Soon after graduating, John was drafted as a private and assigned to Officer Candidate School before serving in Vietnam as a Signal Corps Officer. General Reppert proudly served in the Army for 33 years, with a focus on issues impacting relations between the United States and former Soviet Union. General Reppert became the Defense Attaché at the U.S. Embassy in Moscow, playing a key role in shaping American military and diplomatic policy.

General Reppert earned a master's degree and a Ph.D., leading him to an influential career as a professor. He later taught classes at schools such as Harvard University and West Point. He eventually served as Harvard's Executive Director for Research. Though he maintained an extremely busy life after his military and educational careers, General Reppert remained involved in his community as a Sunday School teacher at his local church. A devoted husband, father and grandfather, General Reppert lived his life in full measure, leaving his mark on all on who knew him.

Madam Speaker, please join me in recognizing Brigadier General John Reppert of Anna, Illinois, and celebrate the incredible life he lived. May he rest in peace.

Elijah Marler Eagle Scout
HON. KEN BUCK
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 23, 2019
Mr. BUCK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Elijah Marler of Boy Scouts of America Troop 46 from Fort Morgan, Colorado. On August 28, 2019, Elijah was awarded the rank of Eagle Scout for his outstanding accomplishments. Since 1920, the Boy Scouts of America has helped mold young men in a disciplined environment with only a fraction achieving the rank of Eagle Scout. Over the years, the Eagle Scout rank has become an American icon symbolizing the core principles of honor, duty, resourcefulness, and courage.

Throughout his time as a scout, Elijah has grown as a leader among his peers and is dedicated to serving others. For his Eagle Scout service project, Elijah helped organize a creative mural project at the Converge Daytime Treatment Center in Brush, Colorado. This specialized treatment center provides a therapeutic treatment program and targeted academic instruction in a structured, small
Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the completion of project critical to the economic development and prosperity of Mountain Home, Idaho: the official transfer of a rail spur from the Mountain Home Air Force Base to the City of Mountain Home. With this transfer, the City of Mountain Home will attract new businesses to the adjoining rail industrial park and increase economic activity in the region. This rail spur transfer represents the extraordinary teamwork that is so often displayed in Southern Idaho. It took the combined efforts of the City of Mountain Home civic leaders, including Mayor Richard Sykes; the Mountain Home Economic Development team; the Special Military Liaison to the Governor of Idaho; Mountain Home Air Force Base personnel; and more to complete the transfer. I also wish to thank the Air Force House Liaison Office, House Armed Service Committee professional staff, and Billy Valderrama and Katherine Myers on my personal staff for facilitating the inclusion of the transfer language in the National Defense Authorization Act of 2018. Congratulations to all parties, and I look forward to following the progress of new economic development in Mountain Home as a result of this rail spur transfer.

HON. DAN BISHOP
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I was not present for Roll Call Vote 571 which took place on October 22, 2019. However, if I had been present, I would have voted "NAY" on Ordering the Previous Question; Providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2513) Corporate Transparency Act.

HON. TOM COLE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I was not present for Roll Call Vote 571 which took place on October 22, 2019. However, if I had been present, I would have voted “NAY” on Ordering the Previous Question; Providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2513) Corporate Transparency Act.

SENIOR COMMITTEE MEETINGS
Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED
OCTOBER 29
9:30 a.m. Committee on Armed Services
To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Lisa W. Hershman, of Indiana, to be Chief Management Officer, Dana S. Deasy, of Virginia, to be Chief Information Officer, and Robert John Sand- er, of Virginia, to be General Counsel of the Department of the Navy, all of the Department of Defense. SD-G50
10 a.m. Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings to examine aviation safety and the future of Boeing’s 737 MAX. SH-216

OCTOBER 30
10 a.m. Committee on Energy and Natural Resources Subcommittee on Water and Power
To hold hearings to examine the use of technology and innovation to increase water security and enable economic development in the West. SD-366
Committee on Environment and Public Works
To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Sean O’Donnell, of Maryland, to be Inspector General, Environmental Protection Agency. SD-406
Committee on the Judiciary
To hold hearings to examine pending nominations. SD-226
2 p.m. Committee on Finance
Subcommittee on Health Care
To hold hearings to examine Medicaid, focusing on compliance with eligibility requirements. SD-215
2:30 p.m. Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on Cybersecurity
To receive a closed briefing on Department of Defense cyber operations. SVC-217
Committee on the Budget
To hold hearings to examine the Chief Financial Officers Act of 1990. SD-608
Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
Subcommittee on Federal Spending Oversight and Emergency Management
To hold hearings to examine the unauthorized and unaccountable government. SD-342
Committee on the Judiciary
Subcommittee on Intellectual Property
To hold hearings to examine promoting the useful arts, focusing on how Congress can prevent the issuance of poor quality patents. SD-226

OCTOBER 31
9:30 a.m. Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings to examine supply chain security, global competitiveness, and 5G. SD-342
2:30 p.m. Committee on Foreign Relations
To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Roxanne Cabral, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of the Marshall Islands, Robert S. Glickrist, of Florida, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Lithuania, and Yuri Kim, of Guam, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Albania, all of the Department of State. SD-419
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Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S6051–S6134

Measures Introduced: Twenty-two bills and three resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 2669–2690, S. Res. 374–375, and S. Con. Res. 28.

Measures Reported:

  S. 1751, to amend the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 to authorize pumped storage hydropower development utilizing multiple Bureau of Reclamation reservoirs, with an amendment. (S. Rept. No. 116–140)

  S. 1821, to amend the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 to provide for research on, and the development and deployment of, marine energy, with amendments. (S. Rept. No. 116–141)

  S. 1931, to require the Administrator of the Western Area Power Administration to establish a pilot project to provide increased transparency for customers. (S. Rept. No. 116–142)

  S. 2137, to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, with amendments. (S. Rept. No. 116–143)

  S. 2333, to provide for enhanced energy grid security. (S. Rept. No. 116–144)


Measures Failed:

  SALT Congressional Review Act: By 43 yeas to 52 nays (Vote No. 331), Senate failed to pass to S.J. Res. 50, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, relating to “Contributions in Exchange for State or Local Tax Credits”.

Measures Considered:

  Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act: Senate continued consideration of H.R. 3055, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto: Pages S6080–86

  Pending:

    Shelby Amendment No. 948, in the nature of a substitute.

    McConnell (for Shelby) Amendment No. 950, to make a technical correction.

  Walker Nomination—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that notwithstanding the provisions of Rule XXII, the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of Justin Reed Walker, of Kentucky, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Kentucky, ripen at 12 noon, on Thursday, October 24, 2019; and that if cloture is invoked on the nomination, at 1:45 p.m., Senate vote on confirmation of the nomination, with no intervening action or debate.

  A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at approximately 10 a.m., on Thursday, October 24, 2019, Senate resume consideration of the nomination.

Messages from the House:

Measures Referred:

Measures Placed on the Calendar:

Executive Communications:

Petitions and Memorials:

Additional Cosponsors:

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions:

Additional Statements:

Amendments Submitted:

Authorities for Committees to Meet:

Privileges of the Floor:

Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total—331)

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m. and adjourned at 6:15 p.m., until 10 a.m. on Thursday,
October 24, 2019. (For Senate’s program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today’s Record on page S6134.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

SYRIA
Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs concluded a hearing to examine United States policy and assistance in Syria, after receiving testimony from James F. Jeffrey, Special Representative for Syria Engagement and the Special Envoy to the Global Coalition to Defeat ISIS, Department of State.

SPECTRUM OF CONFLICT
Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on SeaPower received a closed briefing on the Navy’s “Spectrum of Conflict” strategic framework from Vice Admiral Stuart B. Munsch, USN, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for Operations, Plans and Strategy, Department of Defense.

SATELLITE TELEVISION EXTENSION AND LOCALISM ACT
Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the reauthorization of the Satellite Television Extension and Localism Act, after receiving testimony from Emily Barr, Graham Media Group, Chicago, Illinois, on behalf of the National Association of Broadcasters; Denny Law, Golden West Telecommunications Cooperative, Inc., Wall, South Dakota; Rob Thun, AT&T, Dallas, Texas; J.C. Watts, Black News Channel, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma; and Jonathan Schwantes, Consumer Reports, Washington, D.C.

WATER RESOURCES INFRASTRUCTURE
Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee concluded a hearing to examine improving American economic competitiveness through water resources infrastructure, after receiving testimony from Lieutenant General Todd T. Semonite, Chief of Engineers, Army Corps of Engineers, Department of Defense; and Charlotte Bertrand, Deputy Assistant Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency.

WESTERN BALKANS
Committee on Foreign Relations: Subcommittee on Europe and Regional Security Cooperation concluded a hearing to examine successes and unfinished business in the Western Balkans, after receiving testimony from Matthew A. Palmer, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State, Bureau of European and Eurasian Affairs; and Janusz Bugajski, Center for European Policy Analysis, and Majda Ruge, Johns Hopkins University Paul H. Nitze School of Advanced International Studies, both of Washington, D.C.

MARIJUANA AND AMERICA’S HEALTH
United States Senate Caucus on International Narcotics Control: Caucus concluded a hearing to examine marijuana and America’s health, focusing on questions and issues for policy makers, including S. 2032, to expand research on the cannabidiol and marihuana, after receiving testimony from Jerome Adams, Surgeon General of the United States, Department of Health and Human Services; Nora Volkow, Director, National Institute of Drug Abuse; Robert Fitzgerald, University of California, San Diego; Staci Gruber, Harvard Medical School, Boston, Massachusetts; Sean Hennessy, University of Pennsylvania Perelman School of Medicine, Philadelphia; and Madeline Meier, Arizona State University, Tempe.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action
Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 54 public bills, H.R. 4801–4854; and 4 resolutions, H.J. Res. 78; H. Con. Res. 69; and H. Res. 652–653 were introduced.

Additional Cosponsors: Pages H8459–60

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Rush to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. Page H8391

Recess: The House recessed at 10:35 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. Page H8395

Stopping Harmful Interference in Elections for a Lasting Democracy Act: The House passed H.R. 4617, to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to clarify the obligation to report acts of
foreign election influence and require implementation of compliance and reporting systems by Federal campaigns to detect and report such acts, by a recorded vote of 227 ayes to 181 noes, Roll No. 583.

Rejected the Rodney Davis (IL) motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on House Administration with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a recorded vote of 182 ayes to 225 noes, Roll No. 582.

Pursuant to the Rule, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116–35, modified by the amendment printed in part A of H. Rept. 116–253, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on House Administration now printed in the bill.

Agreed to:
DeSaulnier amendment (No. 1 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–253) that requires the FEC to notify states within 30 days of making a determination that a foreign national has initiated or attempted to initiate a disinformation campaign targeted at an election in a state;

Lynch amendment (No. 3 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–253) that generally prohibits the use of deepfakes within 60 days of a federal election and establishes corresponding criminal and civil penalties;

Levin (MI) amendment (No. 4 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–253) that prohibits foreign nationals from influencing American elections by setting up shell companies;

Langevin amendment (No. 5 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–253) that directs the Federal Elections Commission to commission an independent study and report on media literacy with respect to online political content consumption among voting-age Americans;

Swalwell (CA) amendment (No. 6 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–253) that includes a candidates immediate family members among those whose direct or indirect contacts or communications with a covered foreign national may amount to a reportable foreign contact with the term immediate family member meaning a candidate’s parent, parent-in-law, spouse, adult child, or sibling;

Brown (MD) amendment (No. 7 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–253) that requires the FBI to confirm receipt when a political committee issues a notification that they have been contacted by a reportable foreign contact; additionally, requires the FBI to submit a report to Congress on how they are managing and responding to notifications from political committees;

Delgado amendment (No. 8 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–253) that requires the Federal Election Commission to do an analysis of the extent to which illicit foreign money was used to carry out disinformation and propaganda campaigns focused on depressing turnout among rural communities and the success or failure of these efforts, together with recommendations to address these efforts in future elections;

Houlahan amendment (No. 9 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–253) that codifies the FEC definition of “substantial assistance” for an illegal foreign transaction and defines what it means to “knowingly” abet a foreign entity, consistent with FEC regulations;

Slotkin amendment (No. 10 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–253) that directs GAO to conduct an assessment of current exemptions of FARA registration requirements and what adjustments should be made to prevent foreign funding from influencing U.S. elections and political processes;

Sherrill amendment (No. 11 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–253) that expands from 60 days before an election to 90 days the provisions on knowingly prohibiting deceptive practices in federal elections, including knowingly providing false information about the time or place of voting, qualifications for voting, or public endorsements;

Cunningham amendment (No. 12 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–253) that requires the Federal Election Commission to include in its report to Congress an analysis of disinformation campaigns focused on depressing turnout among African-American and other minority communities;

Cunningham amendment (No. 13 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–253) that requires the Federal Election Commission to include in its report to Congress an analysis of disinformation campaigns focused on influencing military servicemembers and veterans along with recommendations to address these efforts; and

Spanberger amendment (No. 14 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–253) that requires that online platform records of purchase requests for qualified political advertisements include a statement that a person is acting as the agent of a foreign principal and the identification of the foreign principal involved, when applicable; qualified political advertisements include ads related to national legislative issues of public importance.
Rejected:
Lesko amendment (No. 2 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–253) that sought to remove the requirement that the Attorney General communicate corrective actions to the public (by a recorded vote of 180 ayes to 231 noes, Roll No. 582).

Pages H8425–26, H8438–39, H8441–42

H. Res. 650, the rule providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4617) was agreed to by a yea-and-nay vote of 226 yeas to 180 nays, Roll No. 580, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 223 yeas to 180 nays, Roll No. 579.

Pages H8409–10

Suspension: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measure:


Pages H8403–09, H8442–43

Meeting Hour: Agreed by unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow, October 24th, and further when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 12 noon on Monday, October 28th for Morning Hour debate.

Page H8443

Senate Referral: S. 1590 was held at the desk.

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today appears on page H8398.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Three yea-and-nay votes and three recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H8409, H8409–10, H8438, H8441–42, H8442, and H8443. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 8:06 p.m.

Committee Meetings

THE FUTURE OF WORK: PRESERVING WORKER PROTECTIONS IN THE MODERN ECONOMY

Committee on Education and Labor: Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions; and Subcommittee on Workforce Protections held a joint hearing entitled “The Future of Work: Preserving Worker Protections in the Modern Economy”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

SABOTAGE: THE TRUMP ADMINISTRATION’S ATTACK ON HEALTH CARE

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing entitled “Sabotage: The Trump Administration’s Attack on Health Care”. Testimony was heard from Seema Verma, Administrator, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services.

BUILDING A 100 PERCENT CLEAN ECONOMY: SOLUTIONS FOR PLANES, TRAINS AND EVERYTHING BEYOND AUTOMOBILES

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Environment and Climate Change held a hearing entitled “Building a 100 Percent Clean Economy: Solutions for Planes, Trains and Everything Beyond Automobiles”. Testimony was heard from Fred Felleman, Commissioner, Port of Seattle and the Northwest Seaport Alliance; and public witnesses.

AN EXAMINATION OF FACEBOOK AND ITS IMPACT ON THE FINANCIAL SERVICES AND HOUSING SECTORS

Committee on Financial Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “An Examination of Facebook and Its Impact on the Financial Services and Housing Sectors”. Testimony was heard from a public witness.

THE BETRAYAL OF OUR SYRIAN KURDISH PARTNERS: HOW WILL AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY AND LEADERSHIP RECOVER?

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “The Betrayal of our Syrian Kurdish Partners: How Will American Foreign Policy and Leadership Recover?”. Testimony was heard from James F. Jeffrey, Special Representative for Syria Engagement and Special Envoy to the Global Coalition to Defeat ISIS, Department of State; and Matthew Palmer, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of European and Eurasian Affairs, Department of State.

THE TRUMP ADMINISTRATION’S FY 2020 BUDGET AND U.S. POLICY TOWARD LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere, Civilian Security, and Trade held a hearing entitled “The Trump Administration’s FY 2020 Budget and U.S. Policy toward Latin America and the Caribbean”. Testimony was heard from Michael G. Kozak, Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Western Hemisphere Affairs, Department of State; John Barsa, Assistant Administrator, Bureau
for Latin America and the Caribbean, U.S. Agency for International Development; and Rich Glenn, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs, Department of State.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES
Committee on the Judiciary: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 4, the “Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2019”; and H.R. 565, the “AMIGOS Act”. H.R. 4 was ordered reported, as amended. H.R. 565 was ordered reported, without amendment.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES
Committee on Natural Resources: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 934, the “Health Benefits for Miners Act of 2019”; H.R. 935, the “Miners Pension Protection Act”; and H.R. 2579, the “Hardrock Leasing and Reclamation Act of 2019”. H.R. 934 was ordered reported, without amendment. H.R. 935 and H.R. 2579 were ordered reported, as amended.

EXAMINING THE OIL INDUSTRY’S EFFORTS TO SUPPRESS THE TRUTH ABOUT CLIMATE CHANGE
Committee on Oversight and Reform: Subcommittee on Civil Rights and Civil Liberties held a hearing entitled “Examining the Oil Industry’s Efforts to Suppress the Truth about Climate Change”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

THE TRUMP ADMINISTRATION’S SYRIA POLICY: PERSPECTIVES FROM THE FIELD
Committee on Oversight and Reform: Subcommittee on National Security held a hearing entitled “The Trump Administration’s Syria Policy: Perspectives from the Field”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

SPACE WEATHER: ADVANCING RESEARCH, MONITORING, AND FORECASTING CAPABILITIES
Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Environment; and Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics held a joint hearing entitled “Space Weather: Advancing Research, Monitoring, and Forecasting Capabilities”. Testimony was heard from Bill Murtagh, Program Coordinator, Space Weather Prediction Center, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration; Nicola Fox, Heliophysics Division Director, National Aeronautics and Space Administration; and a public witness.

PRISON TO PROPRIETORSHIP: ENTREPRENEURSHIP OPPORTUNITIES FOR THE FORMERLY INCARCERATED
Committee on Small Business: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Prison to Proprietorship: Entrepreneurship Opportunities for the Formerly Incarcerated”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

THE PEBBLE MINE PROJECT: PROCESS AND POTENTIAL IMPACTS
Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment held a hearing entitled “The Pebble Mine Project: Process and Potential Impacts”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

PROTECTING BENEFITS FOR ALL SERVICEMEMBERS
Committee on Veterans’ Affairs: Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity held a hearing entitled “Protecting Benefits for All Servicemembers”. Testimony was heard from Major General Dawne Deskins, Director, Manpower and Personnel, National Guard Bureau; Major General Michael C. O’Guinn, Deputy Chief, Army Reserve; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES
Committee on Ways And Means: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 4742, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose a tax on nicotine used in vaping, etc.; H.R. 4716, the “Inhaler Coverage and Access Now Act”; H.R. 1922, the “Restoring
Access to Medication Act of 2019’’; and H.R. 3708, the “Primary Care Enhancement Act of 2019”. H.R. 4742, H.R. 4716, H.R. 1922, and H.R. 3708 were ordered reported, as amended.

**Joint Meetings**

No joint committee meetings were held.

**COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, OCTOBER 24, 2019**

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

**Senate**

*Committee on Armed Services:* to hold hearings to examine the nomination of Vice Admiral Charles A. Richard, USN, to be Admiral and Commander, United States Strategic Command, Department of Defense, 9 a.m., SD–G50.

*Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:* to hold hearings to examine data ownership, focusing on exploring implications for data privacy rights and data valuation, 10 a.m., SD–538.

*Committee on Finance:* to hold hearings to examine treating substance misuse in America, focusing on scams, shortfalls, and solutions, 9 a.m., SD–215.

*Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs:* Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, with the Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs and Federal Management, to hold a joint hearing to examine E–Rulemaking comment systems, 10 a.m., SD–342.

*Committee on the Judiciary:* business meeting to consider S. 2511, to amend title 40, United States Code, to provide the Marshal of the Supreme Court of the United States and Supreme Court Police with the authority to protect the Chief Justice of the United States, any Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, and other individuals in any location, and the nominations of Halil Suleyman Ozerden, of Mississippi, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fifth Circuit, Danielle J. Hunsaker, of Oregon, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit, Steven J. Menashi, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Second Circuit, William Joseph Nardini, of Connecticut, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Second Circuit, Jodi W. Dishman, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Oklahoma, Karen Spencer Marston, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, Richard Earnest Myers II, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of North Carolina, Sarah E. Pitlyk, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Missouri, Anuraag Singhal, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Florida, Daniel Mack Traynor, to be United States District Judge for the District of North Dakota, and David M. DeVillers, to be United States Attorney for the Southern District of Ohio, Department of Justice, 9:30 a.m., SD–226.

*Select Committee on Intelligence:* to receive a closed briefing to examine certain intelligence matters, 2 p.m., SH–219.

**House**

No hearings are scheduled.
Next Meeting of the SENATE
10 a.m., Thursday, October 24

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: Senate will resume consideration of the nomination of Justin Reed Walker, of Kentucky, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Kentucky, and vote on the motion to invoke cloture thereon at 12 noon. If cloture is invoked on the nomination, Senate will vote on confirmation of the nomination at 1:45 p.m.

(Senate will recess from 10:30 a.m. until 12 noon to allow for the lying in state of Representative Elijah E. Cummings, from the State of Maryland.)

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
9 a.m., Thursday, October 24

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: House will meet in Pro Forma session at 9 a.m.
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